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ABSTRACT.

A study of the effects upon the village community of various areas of social and economic change. Based upon detailed examination of seven villages within the Leicestershire Vale of Belvoir, the thesis considers varied responses to legislative changes such as those in employment regulation and education, to economic change such as that in agriculture and in the means of transport, and to social pressures for change as in the fields of religious allegiance or public recreation. Census evidence of changing population levels, and of variations in the composition of the population in terms of age, sex, and occupation, is discussed, and causes and effects of such changes suggested. The evidence of migration from and amongst the villages is explored, with an examination of possible motivation for it. Changing class relations are explored; while small-scale land ownership is shown to have been relatively unimportant in creating status or economic stability, the continuing influence of the great landowners, notably the Duke of Rutland, is recognised, but set against evidence of a decline in deferential attitudes and a growing challenge to aristocratic political influence. The village middle class of farmers and tradesmen is shown to have increasingly assumed a leadership role, but it is suggested that the conservatism of the village population helped to preserve elements of traditional village life, and above all, the sense of an integrated community.
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Chapter 1 - INTRODUCTION.

In 1977 the National Coal Board published a report on its proposals to exploit the deposits of coal known to lie under the Vale of Belvoir in north Leicestershire. It was no surprise that in the stream of correspondence subsequently published in the local press there were expressed many anxieties about the proposal. The area is recognised in the region as being of great natural beauty, and residents were concerned at any threat to this. Less easily satisfied were the fears that the way of life of the area as a whole would be changed as industry and its attendant transport needs were intruded upon an agricultural community. The rural way of life was felt to have remained almost unchanged over many centuries, and the changes to be inflicted by the mining industry were feared as brutal, sudden and irreversible.

While having some sympathy for the residents who wrote in this way, a little knowledge of the history of the East Midlands was enough to convince me that the picture of an unchanged rural scene could not be true, and it was with some thoughts of demonstrating this that I first became interested in the Vale of Belvoir. The area had seen fundamental change for example with enclosure at the end of the eighteenth century, when, under the influence of the Duke of Rutland, there had been a swing from corn growing to pasture farming. Changing farming methods, and a national pattern of boom and depression, further changed the practice of agriculture during the nineteenth century, while changes in social legislation and political organisation, and the growing accessibility and dominance of the towns all influenced the lives of villagers. The opening of a railway across the area on which this study concentrates, and the subsequent exploitation of the ironstone near-by, could have seemed in 1879 as much a threat as did the coal mine proposed a century later. Similarly, the apparent recession in agriculture as it diminished in importance both as an employer and in its contribution
to the national economy, provides a nineteenth century parallel to the diminution of sections of industry in the 1980s, making the period one of particular interest at this time.

Change in rural life is not an unexplored theme. Mingay, in the introduction to a magnificent collection of essays on The Victorian Countryside, draws attention to their theme as change; Snell describes his book on agrarian England as an assessment of the effects of long-term change; indeed, since history is the account of change, the wide selection of books available on nineteenth century country life is in itself evidence of a widespread recognition that this was an area of change.\(^1\) For some commentators both contemporary and more recent, the changes were predominantly bad; Mingay draws attention to Lord Ernle's 'nostalgia for past harmony', and Hardy's 'sense of lost participancy in the rural community'; Smelser writes of a loss of community ties as the paternalistic landlord became a less certain protector, leaving labourers dependent on a money income, while Orwin and Whetham see in the reliance on wages a loss of status for labourers, by which the whole character of the village community was changed.\(^2\)

Other writers lay more stress upon the advantageous aspects of changes affecting villagers. Eversley, for example, describes the success of agriculture, which by 1870, although it employed fewer workers, was able to feed more people better.\(^3\) Fletcher shows the improvement in real wages and diet of agricultural workers towards the end of the nineteenth century.\(^4\) Mingay, while conceding that 'new stirrings of democracy and independence' put stress upon the cohesion of rural society, pointed the gains in equality and in challenges to subordination which went alongside improved living conditions.\(^5\)

A whole genre of nostalgic reminiscence has been added to our literature, with writers like Flora Thompson, W. H. Hudson and George Bourne, all concerned to preserve a record of a way of life soon to be lost. M. K. Ashby shows us the harsh face of village life, with the labourer
still expected to live on subsistence wages at the end of the nineteenth century. Martin Weiner and Raymond Williams have explored in depth the phenomenon of the myth of an idyllic bucolic past, while recent writers such as Alan Armstrong and Eric Newby have seen it as part of their task to point the inaccuracies of that myth.

While some commentators have seen the need to record the past as 'urgent' in face of accelerating change as did David Vincent, in other works, like W. M. Williams' account of Gosforth published in 1956, we are struck by the slowness of change, and the extent to which the village of thirty years ago resembled that of a century ago. George Ewart Evans placed the period of decisive change as late as the 1914-'18 war, with the advent of 'oil power'. As Thane and Sutcliffe have observed:

... one of the more important recent changes in our understanding of nineteenth century history is the recognition that social, economic and political change was much slower and more regionally diverse, more uneven, less unilinear than has sometimes been assumed. A new type of society did not spring up fully formed at some point in the nineteenth century; and what remained from its past were not mere archaic survivals but active agents of change, profoundly influencing the new.

Robbins identifies a growth of national identity stemming from the increasing centralisation of the nineteenth century, and culminating in the combined national effort of 1914-'18. He shows however that 'heightened contact might as easily increase an awareness of difference as confirm integration', and suggests too that 'Particularly during an epoch of social and economic change ... human beings need a specific identification with a particular community'. In other words, while widening horizons meant that a community became more open to the impulses for change which were affecting society at large, growing knowledge of the wider world could at the same time consolidate the sense of group identity within that community. This applies as much to village communities
as it does to the national groups of which Robbins writes. Change cannot therefore be assumed to be simply destructive of a way of life, but may, while altering some details, consolidate the whole. It is perhaps this phenomenon which allows a late twentieth century claim that village life has remained essentially unchanged for centuries.

While general surveys of the period, or examinations of particular aspects of change as it affected rural society in general, give an overall picture of the general trends, it is for the local historian to show how individual communities were affected. Alan Armstrong, in the conclusion to his survey of Farmworkers, writes of the importance of perceiving patterns in social history, but points out: 12.

... this is not to say that more cannot be done by historians who are prepared to tackle large issues through an examination of more limited groups, in specific contexts. More effort is required to study in detail the situational factors which typically confronted people and inevitably affected the nature of the relationships in which they were engaged.

It is such a study which I have attempted here. By examining a group of villages, none of which was overwhelmed by some major local event such as a change of major landowner, or the birth or death of a predominant industry, and by tracing through such evidence as survives the effects upon the community and upon individuals of some of the changes which swept through Victorian society, it is possible to demonstrate that change was not effected overnight, but was absorbed only gradually into the fabric of village life. Changes which appeared to some contemporary observers to be cataclysmic, such as the loss of young population to the towns, could in fact be beneficial to the surviving village, while a measure such as the introduction of compulsory education, of which so much was hoped by the ruling classes, could be tempered and diluted by the attitudes of village residents. Some of the most important changes, such as
the erosion of deference or the growth of nonconformity, did not spring from legislation, but from within the community; they were fed from outside sources, but took root among sections of the village population.

My brief then is not merely to show that there were changes taking place, but to examine the nature of those changes. I try to suggest the reasons for change, and the sources from which it sprang. Even more importantly, I ask what was the reaction of the village residents to these impulses, and whether any section of the community was instrumental in either the application or the rejection of them. Finally, in an overview of the various areas of village life examined, I hope to draw some conclusions about the way in which an unchanging core of village life can still be perceived, despite all the innovations of the later nineteenth century.

The Vale of Belvoir is not a clearly defined geographical unit, but rather an area of rich agricultural land which extends from a few miles east of Nottingham, across the north east corner of Leicestershire between Bottesford and Melton Mowbray, and into Lincolnshire. It has been suggested that the only way to arrive at a definition would be to visit each of the villages in the area and ask the residents whether or not they considered themselves to live in the Vale. The one easily identifiable element seems to be the dominance in the area of the Duke of Rutland's Belvoir estate. The area is too large to be covered in the sort of detail I have attempted here, so it was necessary to focus the study on a small group of villages chosen as representative of the whole. Because of the importance of the Belvoir estate, I have chosen to concentrate on a group of villages which lie in the Leicestershire section of the Vale, and thus within the sphere of influence of that estate; all but one of the selected seven villages were under the lordship of the manor of the Duke of Rutland. The Leicestershire villages also seemed to hold more interest, and to have more
cohesion as a group, since they were open to influences from both Nottingham and Melton Mowbray, whereas Nottinghamshire villages were more uniquely influenced by their own county town. The Leicestershire villages too were more likely to be affected by conversion to pasture farming than were the Nottinghamshire villages, itself a very important factor as the farmers' market became more open to foreign competition.

The choice was also influenced by the need to include some larger and some smaller villages, and I was also anxious to include some whose population decreased during the period as well as some which grew. All these factors led to the choice of Nether Broughton, Long Clawson, Harby, Hose, Goadby Marwood, Chadwell and Wycomb. The three last do not lie in the vale, but on the escarpment which faces north west across it towards Belvoir Castle. By the time of the period of the study however they were all under the lordship of the manor of the Duke of Rutland, and as small declining villages they provide a useful contrast with the larger villages of the group. Goadby Marwood is also of interest as containing a gentry house, unlike any other of the group. Nether Broughton, close to the Nottinghamshire border, provides the useful contrast of a village not dominated by the Duke of Rutland. I make no claim that the seven villages form a statistical sample, nor that they can be taken as typical of the whole Vale of Belvoir. It seems likely however that they are representative of the villages in the Leicestershire part of the Vale, and I have drawn in examples from other such villages where appropriate. As explained above, it is very difficult to arrive at a definition of the Vale of Belvoir, and therefore to provide statistics for the area as such. Instead, I have provided comparisons between the population trends of the Hundred of Framland, which includes most of the Leicestershire villages, and the Wapentake of Bingham, in which lie most of the Nottinghamshire villages of the Vale.
The period chosen is that of the available census enumerators' returns, and census material is used throughout as a basic source. Chapters 2 and 3 provide an analysis of census material, chapter 2 concentrating on the demographic trends revealed; it explores some of the reasons for changes in the level of population and in its composition in terms of sex and age, and traces variations in the range of employment. Chapter 3 investigates migration, both from the aspect of the loss of village population brought about by the drift to the towns, and through the evidence of migration into and between villages. Thus in both these chapters the growing awareness of opportunities beyond the village is seen to offer villagers a range of choices; the question is posed, whether the choice of so many to leave created a residue village population, unable to enjoy a continuing community life.

Chapter 4 gives an account of the changes in agricultural conditions and techniques during the period, including an investigation into the spread of dairy farming and the use of farm machinery, both stimulated by difficult farming conditions towards the end of the period. The effects of these changes on the stability of farm holdings is explored, as well as the further problem of animal epidemic and the steps taken to deal with it.

Chapters 5 and 6 explore the basic relationships on which the village community was built, those of landlord and tenant, and of master and servant. Chapter 5 examines the evidence regarding the ownership of land in the seven selected villages, and asks whether the ownership of small areas of land can be shown to have conferred any advantage of economic stability or status. The change borne in mind here is the alleged loss of smallholdings following earlier enclosures, and the contemporary claims that 'two acres and a cow' would provide security for the labourer. The second half of the chapter then turns to the relationship of the landlord with his tenants, concentrating upon the Duke of Rutland as the major local landowner, and traces the erosion of his power and of
the deference expressed towards him.

Chapter 6 is concerned with the employee within a household, of which domestic servants and farm workers were the most numerous in the villages. The restraints and opportunities with which the domestic servant was faced are discussed, including the possibility of finding work away from the village. Of the conditions of work of the agricultural servant it is possible to say a little more, including a growing independence as migration produced a scarcity of labour. Changes in the law governing employment contracts are shown however to have had beneficial effects in labour relations, while the suppression of hiring fairs and the abandonment of the system of 'indoor' farm servants contributed to a more businesslike employment relationship.

Developments in transport in the area provide the theme of chapter 7; the decline of the canal system and the promotion of road and rail are shown to have increased contacts with the nearby towns. While the Duke of Rutland's influence was crucial in the construction of a local railway, and consequently in the growth of ironstone quarrying in the district, the growing involvement of the local middle class in the management of the highways is also traced.

Chapter 8 shows the importance of efforts to give every child the opportunity of elementary education. The quality of the village school and of village school-teachers is explored, and the reactions of parents to the attempts to impose a compulsory period of school attendance. Chapter 9 similarly discusses the reactions of parishioners to the efforts of the Church of England during the second half of the nineteenth century to attract larger congregations, and suggests that the strength of nonconformity in the Vale of Belvoir demonstrates a degree of independence among villagers with a new group of leaders being formed through the congregational organisation involved.

Chapter 10 explores three further areas of village life in which the influence of the middle and upper classes made itself felt. The appeal to the magistrates or the
assizes as a means of procuring justice is the first; the means, or lack of them, of dealing with accident or illness is the second; and the opportunities for, and restrictions upon, recreation is the third, ending with an investigation of the social significance of foxhunting in the area. In conclusion, chapter 11 will draw together the threads of these various areas of experience, to ask whether there were recognisable patterns in the ways in which change affected the life of the village, either in the ways in which it was introduced, or in the ways it was received.

The choice of topic for each chapter has inevitably been influenced by the availability of material. For example, since there are very few surviving Poor Law records from Melton Mowbray Union, I have not attempted to write a chapter on poverty. However, the poverty of many villagers is I hope conveyed by the numerous accounts of incidents which reveal it; poverty was such an overriding factor in village life that, even without its own chapter, it is impossible to ignore it. One available source which I have not used is the parish registers; while recognising that these can supplement census material, I wished neither to overload the text with statistical material, nor to become entangled in too much detail of family events. Baptisms, marriages and deaths there have always been; only their quantity can change, and so many factors can vary the record of them that I felt it better to rely on the fairly straightforward record of the census.

I have had the facility of a computer for the sifting and counting of census material, and most of the original tables provided here are drawn from this computed material. In coding census entries for computer use I claim no great sophistication, but have followed descriptions as entered with only a few exceptions (noted in the text). Employment descriptions were those which presented most problems and queries, but the general rule was to follow the enumerator's listing, including the first mentioned employment as the
major one, even where this varied from one census to another for a single individual. This meant that many secondary occupations were lost, even where they are listed on the census, but I have attempted to account for some of the most important in my commentary. In this way the occupation tables are based upon the contemporary perception, be it that of the enumerator or of the villager himself, of the main source of income, and hence the status, of each inhabitant.

The Minitab program I was using was not suitable for tracing a particular family from one census to the next, so I created manually an index of households, and the various family histories referred to in the text, as well as many of the details of migrant families etc. are drawn from this. A close scrutiny of the Leicester Chronicle for the period added many more details. I made trial explorations of local newspapers published in Nottingham, Leicester and Stamford, but the Leicester Chronicle, with its regular paragraph of news from the Melton Mowbray area, seemed to be the most constant source of the detailed items I was seeking, and I preferred to scour the editions of one newspaper for the whole period than to take sample editions of several. The political bias of some of the reports quoted is however taken into account in the conclusions drawn from them.

Much of the material has been drawn from the local Record Offices. Both Leicester and Nottingham Record Offices have collections of farm papers, of which the Shipman papers at Leicester were the most interesting. Similarly the school log books on which chapter 8 is based, are drawn from both Record Offices. In addition, that for Long Clawson is kept at the village school, and I am grateful to the headmaster, Mr. D. T. Radburn, for allowing me access. As with the census entries, it has been the immediacy of the personal account which has been of the greatest value.

Trade Directories of the period have been useful, as for example to supplement census material on land ownership. For this the Enclosure Awards for several of
the villages were also consulted, and the 1874 Return of Owners of Land; extracts from this are given as Appendices I and II. Material for the chapter on churches and chapels was drawn from particularly varied sources; returns for the Ecclesiastical Census of 1851 for the Melton Mowbray area are available at Leicester Record Office, and are quoted here. Also there is the Parochial Visitation Book for 1842 which covered Framland deanery, while returns in the Ecclesiastical Visitations of 1872 and 1882 are to be found at Northampton Record Office, since Framland was by then a deanery of the diocese of Peterborough. Both the local Record Offices supplied account books and minute books relating to the churches and chapels in the area, and the theses of D. M. Thompson and G. M. Morris were very helpful.

Parliamentary Papers have been consulted widely. An unpublished history of Long Clawson by John Wilson, born in 1874, provides many illuminating reminiscences; Leicester Record Office has a copy, but I am indebted to Mr. Peter Wilford for allowing me to use the copy in his care. Mr. Wilford also has a manuscript history of Long Clawson church by John Lockton, to which I have referred. Sadly, I have not had access to the Duke of Rutland's estate papers for the Belvoir estate. Since the Duke's role in the area is such an important one, the fifth and sixth Dukes figure in most chapters; I trust the present Duke will forgive me if the consequent third-hand account of his ancestors' activities is not accurate, and hope that he will feel able before too long to entrust the papers to someone with the expertise to record them.

Unlike many local historians, I have no personal connection with the villages, and my acquaintance with them today is limited to walking or driving through them and sampling their hospitality. While I am aware that many of the families who appear in these pages are still represented in the villages, I can therefore claim to be free of the preconceptions which might colour a writer more nearly connected. It means also however that I can
make no comparisons between or extrapolations from the
villages as they were in the nineteenth century to
the villages today. Similarly, while I have made
comparisons with the findings of historians of other
areas at points at which it seemed appropriate, I have
made no consistent comparison with another area.

While exploring the various areas of change, I have
endeavoured to illustrate each point with individual
to illustrate each point with individual
each point with individual
each point with individual
each point with individual
examples, so that some of the villagers become familiar
figures. In this I have, without writing a narrative,
had the work of Le Roy Ladurie much in mind. Obviously,
would have been easier to produce a clear argument
had I taken an area where there were specific problems,
as did David Howell in his work on agricultural backwardness
in Wales, or distinctive groups of workers, like the
Miners, Quarrymen and Saltworkers discussed by Raphael Samuel
et al. 14. It seemed important however to consider the
effects of legislative and social change on the lives of
a perhaps less isolated community, living in an area
of which little has been written, and amongst whom
tradition could bear its full weight in resisting change,
and yet where those influences for change were not shut out
by geographic, economic or other factors. The Leicestershire
Vale of Belvoir is such an area, protected by an
enlightened and benevolent landlord, in close proximity
to towns and industry, yet remaining almost totally
agricultural. Such was the strength of its tradition
that, whether through the rejection of innovation or by
assimilation of it into the tradition, even today people
can believe that there are elements of village life
which have remained unchanged. Although statistics give
us some measure of the impact of some areas of change,
it is in the actions of people that we have best indication
of their acceptance or rejection of those changes. Few
villagers left any written record; my method has been
as far as possible that advocated by Peter Laslett: 15.

What has now to be done is to recognise
what it means to observe only the literate
activity of a society most of whose life was oral, above all to try to get the feel of how the attitude of the illiterate mass affected the literate few, and so was allowed for, taken into account, in the social process as a whole ...
Footnotes to Chapter 1.


   G. E. Mingay, *op. cit.* (1977) p. 74


12. A. Armstrong, *op. cit.* p. 251

13. Work on the list of manuscripts preserved at Belvoir Castle, published in 1905, began in 1885 - too early to include anything relevant to this study. Historical Manuscripts Commission, *The Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Rutland.*


Chapter 2 - DEMOGRAPHY.

The most striking changes made by nineteenth century industrialisation are to be seen in our towns and cities, where the complexities of modern social organisation are most obvious. Yet the most fundamental changes were those made in the countryside; for many centuries European society was based on landownership and the power which that conferred, until, with the Industrial Revolution and political reform, landownership ceased to be synonymous with political power. Towns had always been dependent on trade for their economic existence, whereas the peasant had traditionally lived relatively independently, supplementing what he could grow for himself by gleaning, foraging for fuel on the common, gathering wild produce, perhaps rearing some hens, a cow or a pig. Much of the life of the fields, regulated by the seasons, had continued virtually unchanged for centuries.

The changing attitudes of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, with greater emphasis on profitability, encouraged by the larger demand created in fast growing towns, produced an acceleration in the rate of enclosures. Parliamentary enclosures reached their peak between 1750 and 1830. Whereas landowners and farmers profited from changes in the distribution of landholdings, and therefore agriculture as an industry was to profit, the peasant lost his rights on common land. He could no longer graze animals there; his fuel source was lost; the gathering of wild produce on what now became private land was forbidden. As more efficient harvesting machinery was devised, gleaning became a thing of the past. The rich man, in his enthusiasm for sport, created ever harsher legislation to protect the game, and the poor man who poached a hare or even a rabbit to feed his family risked deportation. Many of those who were awarded a small holding of land at enclosure found that the cost of fencing and cultivating it was too high, and sold out.
The peasant became a farm labourer, as dependent as, and less well paid than, the factory hand. The composition of rural society had changed, and class differences between landowner, tenant and labourer were strengthened.

As corn prices fell after the end of the war against Napoleon, returning soldiers added to a glut of agricultural labour, and wages fell. Hardship led to rioting in many areas, notably the Swing riots in East Anglia and elsewhere in the 1830s, but the repressive measures taken against the rioters were so harsh that concerted protest was virtually eliminated until Joseph Arch formed the National Agricultural Labourers' Union in 1872. By 1850 the national average weekly wage for agricultural labourers was estimated by Caird to be as low as 9s.6d. Despite the attraction of better pay in factories, the rapid increase in population which affected the country as a whole in the nineteenth century, helped to maintain the village labour force. Only after about 1870 did the drift to the towns really begin to have an effect, producing a rural labour shortage in some areas; by this time anyway food prices were being forced down by competitive imports, and so real wages were rising. Caird's estimated average for 1879-'81 is 13s.9d., and increased purchasing power made the real increase greater than the figures show. This rise continued in spite of the agricultural depression of the 1880s and '90s, owing to the now depleted rural population. Landowners and farmers fared less well; shortage of labour forced them to invest in expensive agricultural machinery, while the depression sent land prices down; many estates were sold at this time to wealthy industrialists, whose interest in agriculture remained secondary, thus creating an even wider division between landowner and land worker.

The second half of the nineteenth century was therefore a period of intense change in English rural life. Social relationships within the community were changing; areas of economic stress were shifting; the labourer's bonds to his birth-place were being broken, by employment opportunities elsewhere, by the literacy instilled in the
village school, and by the increased mobility which railway transport offered. In many places villages were severely depopulated by the exodus of the work force. In other places changes in farming methods and alternative forms of industrial employment near home brought new prosperity and growth. Throughout the century however the shift in population away from the countryside and into the towns was a source of much anxiety. As early as 1830, Cobbett expressed his alarm at the apparent decline of villages, seeing the large churches, in whose porches the whole contemporary congregation could gather, as evidence of greater populations in the past. Cobbett's fears were misplaced; although there were villages which declined in the first half of the nineteenth century, like Stapleford in Leicestershire, whose population dropped from 179 in 1801 to 98 in 1851, most village populations were rising, as were those of the towns and villages of Europe. Most of the Vale of Belvoir had been enclosed in the 1790s, and the Belvoir estate largely converted to stock rearing and dairy farming, so that it was not badly affected by falling grain prices; the population of Leicestershire Vale of Belvoir villages actually increased by more than 50 per cent between enclosure and 1851. However, a 26 per cent rate of migration from the county as a whole is recorded by 1861.

Typical of those contemporary observers who expressed great disquiet at the drift of population was Broderick, who thought it certain that the agricultural labourer of 1881 was 'a degenerate specimen', of inferior physique and energy, left behind by the more vigourous and intelligent who had migrated. Caird on the other hand saw migration as a 'wholesome' process, releasing farmers from pressure to find work for surplus labour, and leaving agriculture to develop on a basis of economic efficiency. In Leicestershire in 1878, there was such a scarcity of labour for the harvest that farmers were forced to offer as much as 23s. a week in wages. However, as the Leicester Chronicle pointed out, the doctor, the
butcher and the baker profited from the extra cash this made available to pay their bills.\(^9\) Much of the hardship suffered by agricultural workers in the first half of the nineteenth century was a result of a glut of labour, so that they were under-employed and underpaid, exploited by farmers and hardly kept alive by inadequate poor relief.\(^10\) The alarm expressed by some contemporary commentators on 'depopulation' was therefore as unnecessary as Cobbett's had been. As Hunt observed:\(^11\).

... migration in Britain did not often, or in many places, reach such levels that the losing areas would have benefitted by a diminished outflow. Areas of out-migration were characterized by relatively low wages, high fertility, and surplus labour. In such circumstances migration was advantageous both to those that moved and to those that were left behind.

As agricultural wages rose, the growing possibilities of mechanisation made farmers less reliant on a ready pool of seasonal labour.

In an investigation of the nature and effects of changes permeating a group of villages and the rural society of which they formed a part, variations in population level therefore form an important part. Such changes were not only symptoms of economic change, but, particularly in small communities, could themselves cause changes in social organisation; a community would cease to be viable when it shrank to a size at which it no longer provided for its social and economic needs. This chapter will explore the population trends of the Vale of Belvoir, giving a more detailed account of the census data for the seven 'sample' villages.\(^12\). The population of these villages will be analysed in terms of its composition in sex, age and occupation, and the reasons for changes explored. It will be shown that, in the main, decline of population in the Vale of Belvoir was not grave.

The overall population figures for the census years between 1851 and 1881 for Framland Hundred and Bingham Wapentake appear on Table 1, with individual villages
listed as Tables 1.1 and 1.2. It will be seen that Framland (in which the seven villages lie) showed an increase of some 300 people over the period, reaching its maximum in 1871 with 15,682. At the same time Bingham Wapentake, lying over the county border in Nottinghamshire, saw its population diminish by 1,500, declining steadily throughout the period. Naturally, not every village conformed to the pattern; in Framland, villages like Great Dalby, Buckminster, and Sewstern lost a substantial proportion of their population, while in Bingham there was growth at Langar, Orston and Radcliffe-on-Trent. It should be pointed out however that by far the greatest growth in Framland was that of Melton Mowbray, which alone expanded by about 1,400 between 1851 and 1881; in Bingham the largest growth was that of Radcliffe-on-Trent, whose population increased by 431; Bingham village lost about a quarter of its inhabitants in the same period. While this means that in both divisions the loss of population would have been greater without the growth at a focal point, the trend for more widespread loss is nevertheless greater in Bingham than in Framland. Of villages with less than 200 population in 1851, six out of the nine in Bingham diminished by 1881, and only five out of 13 in Framland. Of larger villages, five out of 22 in Framland expanded, and only two out of 18 in Bingham. The growth of Melton in itself suggests a more prosperous hinterland, with the livestock farming of the Leicestershire Vale of Belvoir finding more success than the arable Nottinghamshire area.

Turning to the seven specimen villages (Table 1 and 6), they may be seen to reflect the trend of the Hundred. These villages fall into two groups: the four larger villages with populations above 400 - Nether Broughton, Long Clawson, Harby, and Hose; and the three smaller ones with populations of less than 200 - Goadby Marwood, Chadwell and Wycomb. In both groups the general trend to decline is clear, though most striking in the smaller villages. Only Nether Broughton showed an overall growth 1851-'81, of 7.3 per cent, and that despite a loss of 15.8
per cent in 1861-'71. Its peak in 1861 was echoed by those of Harby and Hose, and these villages also declined between 1861 and 1871 (by 13.9 and 14.4 per cent), to make some recovery by 1881. Nevertheless, their overall decline was of 5.6 per cent (Harby) and 7 per cent (Hose). Long Clawson declined throughout the period, with an overall loss of 14.2 per cent. The three smaller villages also showed consistent decline, apart from a partial recovery in Wycomb in the final decade. Nevertheless its overall loss was 20.1 per cent, compared with that of 25.8 per cent in Goadby Marwood and 48.3 per cent in Chadwell. All the villages except Nether Broughton, Chadwell and Wycomb had resumed growth by 1901. Thus only the two smallest villages suffered severe depopulation. The overall population loss in the seven villages was 73 - a very moderate loss when compared with some of the Bingham Wapentake villages.

Table 2 shows the populations of the seven villages divided into age groups. The proportion of very young (under 16) remained very high in each village, only in the later decades in Goadby Marwood dropping below 30 per cent. This was of course by no means peculiar to Leicestershire; Professor Crouzet writes of the normal age structure of the population of England and Wales throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, when high birth-rate and low life-expectancy produced a very young population. Each of the seven villages in at least part of the period exceeded the national average of 37 per cent of male population and 35 per cent of female population in this age group. The highest proportion was to be found in the smallest villages, Chadwell having 50 per cent of its population aged 15 or less in 1851. However, in those smaller villages a gradual decline in the youngest section of the population was more pronounced than in the others, as the number of potential parents of young children fell away. The continuing high proportion of very young demonstrates that it was not falling fertility which was the prime cause of falling population. While the census cannot be used to deduce fertility, since it records only intermittent
household size, it does give the number of families which included young children, and the number of those children living with their parents at the time the census was taken. The poorest families were often those with the most children, so the number of children cannot be taken as a measure of the economic condition of the village. However, the viability of the village as a social unit, and its ability to continue into the future, depended upon retaining a nucleus of breeding pairs. Table 3 demonstrates that in each of the villages except Nether Broughton the number of such families decreased over the thirty years of the study. The loss was most severe in the three smallest villages, where the number of families with children, already small in 1851, halved. The decrease in such families in Harby and Hose was checked by the inflow of railway and iron-stone workers in the 1870s, and the increase in Nether Broughton was also largely the result of this. Long Clawson was the only village which failed to attract railway workers, and was the only one of the four larger villages which did not recover some of the loss of breeding families in that decade. Nevertheless, it does not follow that a diminution of such families was necessarily a sign of economic decay, since much rural poverty had been exacerbated by a too free supply of labour; the 1871 census notes drew attention to migration away from Chadwell, Wycomb and Nether Broughton in particular as being in search of employment. Rather, the decrease helped to decelerate a growth rate which had out-run the capacity of such predominantly agricultural communities to support it.

Another point which emerges from Table 3 is a tendency for the number of large (four or more children) families to decrease. Neither the census nor the table is designed to measure family size; indeed the table, being concerned with children aged 15 or less, cannot reflect individual families since few families, no matter how long, were likely to include more than seven or eight children in that age group at one particular time. The longest family so included here is that of John Haywood, keeper of the White Hart at Harby in 1851, with 10 children aged between three and fifteen. Even on census evidence however other families were larger;
in Nether Broughton for example the family of farmer John Wright, of at least 12 children, was spread over the censuses of 1861, '71 and '81, while agricultural labourer Robert Elliott is included in the table for all four censuses, since his first wife Jane gave him at least eight children before 1861, and his second wife Elizabeth added six more and her own daughter by a former marriage between 1868 and 1881. While children could be set to work either on the land or in domestic industry a long family could help to ensure greater family income. However, as we shall see, an increase in the pressure to limit children's employment, a diminution of textile outwork, and increasing mechanisation in agriculture, all made the long family less desirable and more of a liability. Among farmers, hard hit by depression from the mid 1870s, the advantages of extra hands on the farm became outweighed by the disadvantages of extra mouths to feed. The trend away from large families was particularly marked in Long Clawson, where the number of households with five or more children had halved by 1881, and the number with four children at home was little more than one third its earlier number, in contrast to the national trend. 15.

There was a diminution of each section of the population as it aged, the fall back, particularly in the 16 to 45 cohort, being more rapid in the villages than in the country as a whole. (Compare the national figures appended to Table 2). Even bearing in mind the short life-expectancy of the period, the sharp drop from the proportion of those aged 15 or less, to those aged 16 to 30, suggests that this was the age of the greatest migratory movement. Baines comments on the prevalence of young people amongst migrants in this period, but suggests marriage as a major motivating factor in migration; the extreme youth of the largest sector of population lost from the villages again emphasises the prime importance of employment as a reason to migrate. 16. The loss was particularly marked in Chadwell and Wycomb, villages too small to offer employment to their young. It was the wastage of population in the years of early maturity which was the main cause of the decline or minimal growth of the seven villages, at a time when the population of the
country as a whole continued to expand.

In the oldest age group, those aged 60 and over, the villages tended to retain a higher proportion than the country at large, confirming perhaps the benefit of healthy country air. However, it should perhaps be pointed out that the startlingly high 22 per cent of women in Chadwell who were in this age group in 1871 merely reflects the small number of younger women in the village, since they comprised three wives, one housekeeper and an annuitant, and not a sudden influx of elderly women.

There was a noticeable trend towards a rising average age over the thirty years covered by census material in all the villages (Table 4), the only noticeable decreases being seen in the 1871-'81 decade in Wycomb and Hose, where there was a corresponding increase in population, both villages receiving an influx of agricultural and railway workers and their young families. The average nevertheless remained very low, for men scarcely exceeding 30, for women rising above 35 only in Chadwell in 1881, when 16 per cent of women were more than 60 years old. Life expectancy in England and Wales was still only 40 in the 1850s.17.

Nationally, females exceeded males by some 4 per cent during the period.18. In almost every case this pattern was echoed in the seven villages of the study. (Table 1). The notable exception was Wycomb, where males consistently exceeded females. As will be seen below, Wycomb was so small that it provided no other employment than agriculture, so that young unmarried women would have found it even more necessary than the young men to leave the village to find work. Other than daughters and nieces of farmers, or domestic servants, there were no young unmarried women in the village, and only two little girls older than 10 appeared in any of the four censuses. Few families other than those of the farmers remained in the village for more than one census; one widow who stayed after her husband's death was Mary, wife of farm bailiff George Knapp. In 1881
she not only took in laundry, but shared her home with a
namesake, Samuel Knapp, and his young family, who had
come from Chadwell for farm-labouring work. Few such
resources existed for the maintenance of women on their
own. The lower proportion of women to men in the population
of Long Clawson, Harby and Hose in 1851, was accounted
for by a shortfall in the younger age groups; this is
more likely to have been caused by girls going away into
domestic service than by unusual genetic patterns. The
tendency in the three later censuses for men to exceed
women in Goadby Marwood was the result of the presence
there of a high proportion of unmarried farm servants,
and also of a number of apprentices to village craftsmen.
Table 2 confirms this, showing higher proportions of
males in the younger age ranges. The large number of
domestic servants in the village failed to redress the
balance, since several of them were grooms or other
manservants.

Although the census data makes it clear that there was
a drain on the population of the seven villages through
the loss of many young people, probably through migration,
there were therefore no resultant severe imbalances in
the remaining population. Without new sources of
employment, the villages would have been overwhelmed had
there been no means of shedding their surplus of young
people; fortunately it seems both sexes were able to
find work elsewhere, so there was no unmarriagable surplus
of either left behind. Enough older people remained
behind, or returned to the villages, so that populations
were not without their senior members, yet the drain
of young people did not leave a great burden of aged
people for the village to support. Above all it
becomes clear that, at least for the larger villages,
the drain on population was not sufficient to arouse
fears of depopulation; only the two smallest villages
were severely depleted. It seems likely (and the point
will be expanded below) that such small villages had
never been independent settlements, and had always been
sattelites of nearby larger villages.
Another important test of the economic and social viability of a village is the range of occupations of its inhabitants. Here too the census provides valuable information; Table 6 shows the village populations divided into occupational groups according to their declaration on the census of their primary occupation. By far the largest group in every case was those working in agriculture. This includes farmers and graziers and their wives and children; farm servants, agricultural labourers, and the various specific occupations named in the census, such as ploughboy, cowman, dairymaid, or waggoner. The wide variation in percentage of population in this group in some villages from one census to another needs some explanation. In several of the categories of employment, including agriculture, there is likely to be some overstatement of numbers, since not only employees and apprentices are included, but wives and families where the enumerator has so described them. For example, a 'butler's wife' is included under domestic service, although she was not necessarily so employed. The figures are therefore subject to wide variation according to the enumerators' definitions of employment status.

In each of the villages except Long Clawson the concentration upon agriculture as an employer increased over the thirty year period. However, in each of the villages except Hose and Nether Broughton, the number of employees in agriculture (as distinct from owners and occupiers of farms) was less in 1881 than in 1851. (See Table 18, chapter 6). In Nether Broughton and Harby the peak of employment came in 1861; only in Hose was it as late as 1871. The villages conformed to the pattern identified by Crouzet of a decline in agriculture which eased between 1831 and 1851 or '61, only to reassert itself thereafter. It becomes clear that, whereas fewer people were employed on farms, they formed a higher proportion of the total population as the period progressed. There was therefore a greater corresponding loss of population from amongst non farm employees. The clearest
loss in percentage terms is seen in the proportion of villagers described as 'without income'. As well as those described as unemployed, this category includes wives without specified occupation; widows with no obvious income; infants and scholars; those described as 'formerly ...', as distinct from 'retired'; beggars, gipsies, and paupers; also visitors, since their occupations may be regarded as irrelevant to the employment patterns of the villages. These people were dependent, in one way or another, upon the breadwinners of the village for their sustenance. While recognising the variations produced by enumerators' definitions, the clear decrease in their numbers shows that migration had a helpful effect in reducing claims upon village income. If nothing else, it suggests that migrants took their dependents with them. The only exception to the pattern was Long Clawson, where diminishing employment in agriculture was matched by an increase in the population without work, and this in spite of a falling population.

In Long Clawson, as in Nether Broughton, Harby and Hose, the other field of employment in which there was a clear decrease was that of textiles. This category includes lace, framework knitting, and linen weaving. Nether Broughton had five framework knitters in 1851, as well as a linen dresser, lace workers and a lace agent. There was also a labourer's wife who called herself a 'knitter', presumably not with a machine. From then on however the field diminished rapidly, so that by 1861 there was only one framework knitter, aged 72, and the lace workers were much reduced. The lace agent, John Stone, still lived in the village, aged 81, but the son who had assisted him was now an agricultural labourer, and another younger man, Thomas Goodbourn, seems to have taken over the agency or set up a new one. The decline continued, so that the industry employed only one per cent of population in the later censuses. There were four framework knitters living in Long Clawson in 1851, all elderly men, and none of them practised the trade ten years later. A former agricultural labourer described himself as a weaver of
linen in 1861, but he had returned to labouring by 1871. The 36 lace workers, mainly 'runners', or embroiderers, in the village in 1851 were reduced to 18 by 1861, and to three by 1871. These three are listed as lace 'spotters', a craft recalled in the reminiscences of John Wilson, involving the knotting of chenille thread into lace net to produce a pattern. Since Wilson was born in 1874 his memory of the craft implies that it was practised in the village for some time after 1881, yet the 1881 census lists only one lace worker and two lace hands (presumably in a factory). In 1861 there were two lace agents in the village, John Wrath and Richard Bailey. Bailey was still a lace agent in 1871, but was working as a shepherd in 1881. Harby had only lace workers, 44 of them in 1851, diminishing to 11 in 1861 and three in 1871. An increase in lace spotting raised the number to seven in 1881.

Hose had three resident framework knitters in 1851, but despite their relative youth (two of them were in their early thirties) none of them was practising the craft in the village ten years later. The period 1851 to 1871 saw a large increase in the number of lace workers in the village, from nine to 27 in 1861, and on up to 56. It seems likely that some of the work at least came from Braithwaite's lace factory in Stathern, only about a mile away. Yet in 1881 not one lace worker was recorded in the village. It is possible that this reflects a changed attitude on the part of the census makers towards part-time employment. As Higgs points out: The 1881 census report was the first in which women working at home were removed from the main body of the occupational tables and placed at the end in a residual 'unoccupied' class ... This might have reflected a recognition of the decline of the household as a productive unit in the market economy.

On the other hand, Higgs is referring to the summarising report, not to the body of the census. Why farmer John Stokes, the enumerator for this village, should exclude outwork for the village, it is difficult to say; it is
possible that for some reason the work had finished in
the village. Almost without exception the lace workers
had been the wives and daughters of labourers, some of
them as young as eight or nine years of age, and often
including several members of one household. Some elderly
widows were also lace workers. The diminution or total
loss of the employment would have been a grievous blow
to poor families. On the other hand, if the omission
from the census is a reflection of the census makers'
dismissal of outwork as unimportant, a mere female
pastime, and if lace working continued as it seems it
may have done in Long Clawson, then the income of many
village households would have been rather higher than a
first inspection of the census might suggest. In any
case, the apparent loss did not directly encourage
migration. In Hose, the greatest fall in female population
occurred in the decade 1861-1871, when the number of
females fell by 54 (21 per cent), at the same time as the
greatest expansion of employment in lace making. In the
decade 1871-1881 the female population actually increased,
though only by 18. This emphasises how many of the lace
workers were married women, tied to the village by family,
not by a work commitment, and providing a secondary
income for the household. In other parts of the region
framework knitting had become a primary employment, and
its decline caused severe hardship, but the Duke of
Rutland saw the danger and discouraged it on the Belvoir
estate, so the villages were protected from the harshest
effects of any decline in textiles as a cottage industry.24

The effects of loss of employment in agriculture and
textiles were eased by new openings in the railway and
in iron-stone mining. Whereas the run-down of the Grantham
canal caused some losses in three of the villages in the
early decades, all of the seven villages housed some of
the employees in these new occupations by 1881. Hose did
particularly well, with 23 railway employees living there
in 1881, some with their wives and children, comprising
8 per cent of the village population. The line which
opened in 1879, crossing this part of the Vale of Belvoir from Bottesford to Melton Mowbray, enabled the iron-stone in the area to be quarried, and so brought work and more newcomers to the area. There were 19 iron-stone miners in Long Clawson in 1881, nine of them born locally, and 10 in Nether Broughton, four of them local men. Like the railway workers, many of these were married men, bringing wives and several children with them, while others married local girls. Without these newcomers, and without the openings for local men, the loss of population in Long Clawson would have been considerably greater than it was. Chapter 7 will explore in more detail the changes in road, canal and railway transport in the area, and the beginnings of iron-stone mining there.

Some of the remaining occupational groups shown in Table 6 can be dealt with briefly. Those engaged in building trades, including the manufacture of bricks and tiles, were a very small element in the population, which did not vary in number to any great extent. Domestic service is dealt with more fully in chapter 6; sufficient here to point out that the very high proportion in Goadby Marwood employed in this way was a consequence of the presence there of Goadby Hall, the only gentry house in any of the seven villages. Other houses where several servants were employed were those of the clergy, the few professional residents such as the doctor and the veterinarian, and on the larger farms.

The local doctor from the mid 1850s until he died at the age of 100 in 1927 was John Swain, M.R.C.S. He took over the practice at Long Clawson from Francis Silbery sometime between 1851 and 1856. His household in each census year included a young medical assistant, and his 16 year old nephew was listed as his pupil in the 1861 census. In 1871 and 1881 he employed a resident dispenser. The other medical services of the area were those of village nurses, elderly labourers' wives with years of experience as their qualification. Nether Broughton housed a 19 year old chemist's apprentice in 1871,
Edwin Woollerton, living in the household of his uncle John Wilford, and who, we can only suppose, travelled to work, perhaps in Melton Mowbray or Waltham. In 1851, a 'chiropedins' (sic.) was lodging with a local brewer in Hose; his birthplace was in Northamptonshire, and it seems likely that he was an itinerant, cutting out corns from village to village. Similarly there was a dentist in Harby at the time of the 1861 census. To care for animal health, Robert Littler, M.R.C.V.S., lived in Long Clawson throughout the period. He was born in the village, and raised at least one son there to follow in his footsteps as vet. Thus in terms of provision at least there was little change in the care of the sick in the villages during the period. Some further comment on the health of the villagers appears in chapter 10.

The professional and Arts category comprises almost exclusively the clergy (see chapter 9) and schoolteachers (see chapter 8). The most important change in this area is the replacement of unqualified teachers by certificated schoolmasters, a change in quality rather than number. The increase in this category in Nether Broughton in 1871 is another result of the over-enthusiastic policy of the enumerator discussed above; it includes an architect's wife, living on her brother's farm, and a 'pianoforte maker's wife', living with her father the Parish Clerk. Whether either of their husbands were ever resident in the village we do not know, but it is unlikely that their place of work could have been nearer than Nottingham or perhaps Melton Mowbray. However Nether Broughton did house some more interesting artistic residents. In 1851 John Elliott, aged 21, lived with his agricultural labourer father, and described himself as a violin maker. In 1881, James Kirk, the Nottingham writer, lodged with grazier's widow Frances Bowley, together with his sister Mary and her companion. Mary was described in the census as lunatic. The relevant period of Kirk's life is clearly identifiable in the biographical note in Mellor's _Men of Nottingham and Nottinghamshire_, included here as
Appendix IV. Writers more properly considered as resident in the area were journalist William Jackson, who lived in Long Clawson in 1851 and 1861, and the vicar of Long Clawson throughout the period, the Rev. Thomas Mitchell, who published poetry. Thus the villages were not entirely without culture. Other professionals included the village policeman, either in Harby or Long Clawson, an elderly solicitor in Long Clawson in 1861 and 1871, and an insurance agent in 1881. Although the contribution of some of the people in this group was perhaps peripheral to village life, it was nevertheless a very influential group, because of the importance of the clergy, the schoolteachers, and indeed the policeman. All of these will feature in the pages which follow.

Perhaps the most crucial measure of the extent to which a village remained a viable social unit was the provision within it of needed craft and trade skills and of shops and consumer services. To some extent villages were interdependent; not every village needed its own wheelwright or blacksmith. Similarly agricultural machinery proprietors served a group of accessible villages. As mobility increased, stimulated by the spread of railways, it became less essential for villages to be self-sufficient in providing foodstuffs or clothing, as 'ready-made' varieties became available. Travelling hawkers and the regular markets in Melton had in any case long added variety to the goods on offer in the village, and the carrier services provided a regular contact for supplies from Melton Mowbray or Nottingham. Nevertheless as Bunce points out, a decline in the services available in a village was not only a sign of population loss, but a spur to migration, as the quality of life in the village became, or was seen as, increasingly restricted.

Despite migration, the range of important crafts available in the seven villages scarcely changed over the thirty year period, although there was some decrease in the number of people practising those crafts. In Long
Clawson, for example, there were in 1851 five carpenters, joiners or sawyers, three blacksmiths, three millers and one wheelwright. By 1881 all these crafts were still represented, by four carpenters, two blacksmiths, one miller, two saddlers, and one wheelwright. Harby in 1851 had three carpenters, two blacksmiths, three millers, and one wheelwright, reduced in 1881 by only one carpenter. Of its carpenters, blacksmiths and miller, Nether Broughton lost one carpenter and both blacksmiths, while Hose lost its miller and one blacksmith, but gained a fourth carpenter. In the smaller villages it is doubtful whether there had ever been independent provision; the only craftsman amongst them was a carpenter in Goadby Marwood in 1851. By 1881 there was still a carpenter in the village, and another in Chadwell. Such small settlements had probably always been dependent on the nearby villages like Scalford or Waltham for most services; Scalford could supply blacksmiths, wheelwright, carpenters and miller, a fell-monger (or hide merchant) and 'casterators' (sic). Waltham, as well as the usual agricultural trades, housed a maltster, a harness maker and a horse breaker, as well as two steam thrashing machine proprietors, and a plumber and glazier; it was obviously an important centre, with National and private schools, a doctor and veterinarian, a druggist's shop, a post-office and a Registrar of Births and Deaths, and not only a resident police constable, but a police sergeant as well by 1881.

Shops and domestic services were also almost totally absent in Chadwell and Wycomb. The coal merchant living in Wycomb in 1881 (profiting no doubt from the nearby railway line) was the first and only tradesman there entered in the censuses of the period. Chadwell had one shoemaker in 1851, joined by a grocer in 1861, but nothing thereafter. Goadby Marwood was little better off; a grocer, a shoemaker, and a tailor lived there in 1851, but the grocer had gone by 1861, and the shoemaker ten years after that. Two further grocers who appeared in 1871 did not survive until 1881. Only the tailor stayed
in business throughout the period; perhaps Mr. Norman at the Hall made use of his services in keeping the staff tidily dressed. Scalford or Waltham could however provide all the usual shops.

In the larger villages the provision of shops even expanded in some cases. Long Clawson had seven grocers in 1881, compared with four in 1851, while Nether Broughton, Harby and Hose each gained an extra grocer over the period, with two, four, and three respectively in 1881. Harby had gained a plumber, a newsagent, and a chimney sweep by 1881, while the post office in Nether Broughton had opened by 1871, and a clock- and watchmaker in the same decade. The provision of butchers remained fairly stable, with one each in Harby and Nether Broughton throughout, and Long Clawson left with one in 1881 in place of three in 1851. The number of bakers diminished, Nether Broughton losing one out of three and Harby one out of two, while the one in Hose and four of the five in Long Clawson had all gone by 1881. In some cases at least the baker's business was absorbed into the grocer's shop; bakery items were among the items brought from town by the carrier; nevertheless it is perhaps surprising to find this loss of local bakers in a period when home baking was becoming less common. 28. A Report published by the British Association for the Advancement of Science in 1881 revealed that the national expenditure on bread, formerly a major item of diet, had been overtaken by that on meat, and that on dairy produce and eggs. 29. So the loss of bakers in villages may be a sign of improvement in diet rather than of regression.

Shoemakers and tailors remained fairly stable in three of the larger villages; Harby had one shoemaker and one tailor in 1851, and had added another shoemaker by 1881. Hose had three shoemakers in the earlier census, and added two more and a tailor before the next, to revert to three shoemakers and a tailor by 1881. Nether Broughton similarly added a tailor and a third shoemaker during the first decade, maintaining that number for the rest of the period.
Long Clawson contrasts with this stability however, reducing its five tailors of 1851 to one, and its ten shoemakers to two. There was a draper's shop in Hose in 1851 and 1861, another in Nether Broughton in 1861, while Long Clawson had a draper's shop in 1851 and a haberdasher's in 1861 and 1871, but none of these survived until 1881. Factory made clothing and shoes were becoming increasingly available by the end of the period, either in the town markets or brought to the villages by hawkers. While this produced competition for village drapers, with more attractive garments available from the town shops, village shoemakers and tailors would still have found employment in repairs. The large number of shoemakers in many villages reflects the hard wear which footwear was given in country life.

Finally, among essential amenities, the larger villages maintained their provision of public houses - three in Harby, two in Hose, two in Nether Broughton and three in Long Clawson. For this too the smaller villages were dependent upon their neighbours.

Some pattern of migration from the villages can be seen, and its effects. There were losses of population from amongst tradesmen and shopkeepers, though not to such a degree as to cause a severe decline in the amenities of the villages; within the smaller villages such amenities had scarcely existed in 1851. The village which showed the severest losses in services was Long Clawson, which was also the village which lost the greatest segment of its population. Bunce's argument, that lack of amenities accelerated migration, is supported. However, the greatest loss of population was among the young; very few of those aged 15 or less in the earlier censuses remained in the village in the later ones. Children were sent away to work, whether in other agricultural areas or in the towns it is impossible to say. Many girls certainly went into domestic service, thus preventing an accumulating surplus of unmarried females in the
villages. Apart from the two smallest villages, all remained viable communities, with a mix of sex- and age groups, and a core of services. The two smallest, Chadwell and Wycomb, and possibly also Goadby Marwood to some extent, had probably long been in some ways dependent upon their larger neighbours, as Waltham provided a school for their children, for example. Despite the opening of a local railway line and the iron-stone quarries towards the end of the period, there were few opportunities for work outside agriculture, so that without the escape valve of migration, the natural increase in population would have been catastrophic. Because of it the villages maintained an equilibrium within which the life of the community could develop, adjusting itself to the challenges presented by changes in the world around them.
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5. Almost no Leicestershire villages were smaller in 1851 than they had been in 1801. The 1851 Census notes commented on only three - Appleby (erroneous return in 1821), Coleorton (demolition of several houses), and Keyham (removal of a ladies' school). The notes drew attention to growth in 7 villages.
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19. We have no information on the number of old people from the villages who were taken into Melton Mowbray workhouse. Such was the fear of the workhouse that the number is not likely to have been high. While the ratepayers of the village contributed towards the maintenance of those who were admitted, for most old people their admission effectively ended their inclusion as residents of the village.

20. There was some confusion amongst enumerators over the definition of women's occupations, so that some, like William Bowley in Nether Broughton in 1871 defined not only wives but young children as participating in their fathers' work. Farmer William Cropper for example had four children aged between five years and one month, all described as 'farmer's son' or 'daughter', and who should therefore properly
be included as agricultural workers; I have however edited the entries so that no child of four or under is included as other than 'infant', and without employment, but in this case for instance the five-year-old daughter remains amongst the employed. I am also deeply suspicious of entries of 'agricultural labourer's wife' or, even more, 'general labourer's wife', but have recorded them faithfully none the less. Some comparison of figures however does confirm that in years when a particularly high proportion of agricultural workers is recorded, the proportion without employment, and particularly those with no employment specified, who were mainly wives, was low, and vice versa.

The difficulty is typified in Nether Broughton, where agricultural workers averaged 24 per cent of population. There was a dip to 19 per cent in 1861, followed by an extraordinary bulge to 44 per cent in 1871, but this is largely a question of the enumerators' differing interpretation of the instructions on entering wives' occupations. In the 1851 and 1861 censuses for Nether Broughton there were no entries of 'agricultural labourer's wife'; in 1871 2 per cent of all occupational entries were just that, and there were no entries without an occupational description. If the wives, sons and daughters of all other agricultural workers are also included, the higher figure is comprehensible.

For a discussion of the difficulties surrounding the identification of women's employment in census material, see E. Higgs, *Women, Occupations and Work in the Nineteenth Century Censuses*, History Workshop, No. 23, 1987. p. 59

21. F. Crouzet, *op. cit.* p. 67


23. E. Higgs, *op. cit.* p. 70
24. For the exclusion of stocking frames from the Duke of Rutland's villages in the Vale of Belvoir, see D. R. Mills, Landownership and Rural Population, with special reference to Leicestershire in the mid-nineteenth century. Ph.D. thesis, University of Leicester, 1963. p. 207 Quoted there is William Pitt, writing in 1809 of the Vale: "A numerous and able-bodied peasantry is here supported, no stockingers, or other manufacturers, and care taken that there shall be none".

The notes to the 1851 census for Leicestershire commented on population lost because of a decline in framework knitting in Wigston, Market Bosworth, Hinkley, and Hathern.

25. This was perhaps an informal introduction to medical practice before embarking on a course at university or an approved school of medicine. Whereas apprenticeship was an accepted route into the medical profession earlier in the century, the Medical Act 1858 (21 & 22 Vict. c. 90) abolished it, requiring candidates to pass the examinations of a recognised institution to obtain registration. It became a criminal offence to claim falsely to be registered, although to practise without registration was not an offence. It was not until the Medical Act 1886 (49 & 50 Vict. c. 48) that doctors were required to have passed in all three branches - medicine, surgery, and midwifery.


J. Lockton, Notes respecting the History Ancient and Modern of the Village of Claxton or Long Clawson. (unpublished manuscript)

28. A bill issued by William Starbuck, carrier, of Harby, to the Executors of the late Rev. Brooks, of Colston Bassett, in 1888, included deliveries of bread and 'pycletts' from Nottingham on January 4, 7, 11, 14, 18, 21, 25 and 28, and amongst the estate papers is a bill from E. Cooke, Baker and Grocer of Bridlesmith Gate, Nottingham. Thus fresh bread could be obtained from Nottingham on a regular basis. Nottingham Record Office, DD. TB. 3/1/14.


30. M. F. Bunce, op. cit. p. 393
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1851 m.</th>
<th>1851 f.</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>1861 m.</th>
<th>1861 f.</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>1871 m.</th>
<th>1871 f.</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>1881 m.</th>
<th>1881 f.</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.Broughton</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.Clawson</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goadby Mwd.</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadwell</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wycomb</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harby</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hose</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Framland Hundred  
15,290  
15,005  
15,682  
15,602

**Bingham Wapentake  
14,069  
13,553  
12,697  
12,529

Note - The village population figures here are those included in my census analysis, which are not in all cases the same as in the enumerators' summaries. As explained in the text, some entries are not included, as for example, those where no details are given for some reason or in the block entries of otherwise unidentifed gipsies. (cf. Table 5)


** Figures from Victoria County History of Nottinghamshire, Vol.II, Table of Population, pp.311,312.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gt. Dalby</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickwell</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ltl. Dalby</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton Lazars</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melton Mowbray</td>
<td>4434</td>
<td>4446</td>
<td>5033</td>
<td>5820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welby</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sysonby</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Broughton</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Clawson</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hose</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harby</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stathern</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eaton</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branston</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastwell</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goadby Marwood</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadwell &amp; Wycomb</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scalford</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ab Kattleby</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holwell</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyfordby W. Brentingby</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe Arnold</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham o. t. Wolds</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonesby</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bescaby</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltby</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sproxton</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckminster</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewestern</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coston</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garthorpe</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeby</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxby</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmond Thorpe</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stapleford</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>2054</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>1673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Bridgford</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>1078</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CarColston</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elton</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flintham</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granby</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawksworth</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kneeton</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langar &amp; Barnstone</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orston</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarrington</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screveton</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoroton</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whatton</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiverton Hall</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Bridgford</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upr. Broughton</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ColstonBassett</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotgrave</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CropwellBishop</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickling</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HolmePierrepont</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinoulton</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owthorpe</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumtree</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radcliffe o. Trent</td>
<td>1273</td>
<td>1371</td>
<td>1340</td>
<td>1704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelford</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tollerton</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tythby</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source - Victoria County History of Nottinghamshire, Vol. II.  
Table of Population. pp.311,312.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-15 yrs.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 yrs.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 yrs.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30 yrs.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35 yrs.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40 yrs.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45 yrs.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50 yrs.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55 yrs.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-60 yrs.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-65 yrs.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-70 yrs.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 and over</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**England & Wales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-14 yrs.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-29 yrs.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-44 yrs.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59 yrs.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 yrs. and over</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3. Number of Families with Children at Home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 child</th>
<th>2 children</th>
<th>3 children</th>
<th>4 children</th>
<th>5 or more children</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Broughton</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lv. Clason</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodby Mad.</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadwell</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hite</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hite</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Households where children aged 15 and under were living with their parents only, and without taking into account any children older than this.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1851 m.</th>
<th>1851 f.</th>
<th>1861 m.</th>
<th>1861 f.</th>
<th>1871 m.</th>
<th>1871 f.</th>
<th>1881 m.</th>
<th>1881 f.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Broughton</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Clawson</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goadby Mwd.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadwell</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wycomb</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harby</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hose</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1801</td>
<td>1831</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Broughton</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>369</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Clawson</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>776</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goadby Mwd.</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadwell &amp; Wycomb.</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earby</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>652</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hose</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>443</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 6. PROPORTION OF POPULATION EMPLOYED IN VARIOUS OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS.

| Occupation                  | 1851 | 1852 | 1853 | 1854 | 1855 | 1856 | 1857 | 1858 | 1859 | 1860 | 1861 | 1862 | 1863 | 1864 | 1865 | 1866 | 1867 | 1868 | 1869 | 1870 | 1871 | 1872 | 1873 | 1874 | 1875 | 1876 | 1877 | 1878 | 1879 | 1880 | 1881 |
|-----------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| No income                  | 44   | 44   | 44   | 44   | 44   | 44   | 44   | 44   | 44   | 44   | 44   | 44   | 44   | 44   | 44   | 44   | 44   | 44   | 44   | 44   | 44   | 44   | 44   | 44   | 44   | 44   | 44   | 44   | 44   | 44   | 44   | 44   | 44   | 44   | 44   |
| Independent means           | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    |
| Professional and Arts       | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    |
| Medical services            | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.3  |
| Domestic service            | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    |
| Canal, road, rail           | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  |
| Iron-stone                  | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   | 13   |
| Building                    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    | 2    |
| Consumer & retail           | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    |
| Agricultural trades         | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    |
Figures which show the national drift of population in the nineteenth century away from the countryside and into the towns tend to give an impression that this was the only direction of the movement. John Saville, for example, demonstrates that population decrease 1861 - 1911 was greatest in rural counties; the South Midlands, including Leicestershire and Rutland, lost 14.4 per cent of population, compared with Cornwall, which lost 27.1 per cent, and Buckinghamshire and Hertfordshire, which lost only 6.3 per cent.¹ He attributes falling rural population to migration and emigration as a consequence of declining rural industries. He points out, however, that it was the villages most remote from urban centres which were most likely to decline, while some larger villages were able to absorb some of the drift towards nearby or accessible towns, to maintain or even expand their own population.² This point is well illustrated by the group of Belvoir villages; Goadby Marwood, Chadwell and Wycombe are still today, even with motor transport, very much more remote and with less broadly based economies than their larger neighbours, and it was in them that population loss was most apparent.

Saville refers to the model for laws of migration set out for the Royal Statistical Society in 1885 by E. G. Ravenstein.³ Redford however gives an earlier quotation from the Transactions of the Lancashire and Cheshire Historical Society, which in 1857 set out the same interpretation of the migratory movement.⁴

... each district which is brought into a condition to offer and make known remarkable facilities for the profitable employment of labour, may be held to occasion as it were, a succession of waves of population pressing after each other from a considerable distance, and gradually increasing in volume up to the point of attraction ... the increase derived from places comparatively near is always much greater than from a distance.

Thus, as villagers moved away from the larger villages to find employment in nearby towns, so other workers might be
expected to take their place. Tables 7 and 7a support this idea, showing that, in general, a smaller proportion of villagers were drawn from each successively more distant area. In Long Clawson in 1851 for example, 63 per cent of villagers were native, 17 per cent born within 5 miles of the village, 11 per cent elsewhere in Leicestershire, 7 per cent in other East Midlands counties, and 3 per cent elsewhere. Before 1881 this pattern remained very little changed in the village, with the proportion of native born villagers reducing gradually to 58 per cent, while most of the other categories increased slightly - those born within 5 miles to 19 per cent, in neighbouring counties to 10 per cent, and further afield to 5 per cent. Only those born in more distant parts of Leicestershire were reduced, to 9 per cent. The close proximity of the border with Nottinghamshire, Rutland and Lincolnshire meant that migrants from these counties could have travelled less far than those from wider Leicestershire, so that a larger intake from the East Midlands than from Leicestershire does not invalidate the pattern. Nether Broughton was so close to the Nottinghamshire border, for example, that it is hardly surprising that its population consistently contained a larger proportion of East Midlands than wider Leicestershire born inhabitants.

In the previous chapter it has been suggested that there was a notable loss of village population by migration, and that in several of the villages the effect of contraction was in part off-set by an inward movement of workers in the railway and iron-stone industries. This is however a simplification of the picture, since census evidence alone shows that there was a wide degree of mobility amongst villagers. Certainly, most of the movement into the villages was from no great distance - perhaps twenty or thirty miles at most, from across the county borders - but nevertheless much of it was from beyond the Poor Law district of Melton Mowbray. As Hunt points out, the New Poor Law had already in the 1840s reduced the incentive to remain in the area of settlement, since recourse to relief
was no longer an easy option. Other commentators trace the mobility of country people even further back into the eighteenth century, challenging the stereotyped view of the village as a static community. The system of farm service by which agricultural workers were taken into the farmer's household for agreed periods of (usually) a year at a time, had encouraged mobility even under the most restraining periods of Poor Law administration. Armstrong shows that the reduction in such service following the end of the Napoleonic wars even decreased mobility in the earlier nineteenth century.

Mobility in and out of the village is not therefore to be regarded as in itself a change in the pattern of village life during the 1851 - 1881 period. However, the national rate of migration away from the rural areas accelerated from about 1830 on, leading, as has already been shown, to a decline in rural population after 1850. There is no reason to suppose that the Vale of Belvoir villages did not conform to the national trend. What is of interest here is to see whether the pattern of migration tells us anything about changing social or economic conditions in the villages, and whether there are any clues as to the motivation of those who left.

In this chapter, the source for information on what must be loosely labelled 'incoming migrants' is the census data on birthplace. Table 7 assumes that every inhabitant whose birthplace was outside the village in which he resided was a migrant. Some would have come to the village to work, some to marry, even some few perhaps to retire to a pleasant spot. However, some will be included who, despite inclusion in the census, had no settled home in the village; visitors are included, and lodgers in the inns - some of them beggars or hawkers, so presumably itinerant. I have omitted the groups of gipsies recorded in Nether Broughton in 1851 and 1861, since the enumerators could obtain few details to record; Charles Harvey in 1851 managed to obtain the ages of the 17 males and 21 females,
name unknown, but John Elliott in 1861 noted only that '38 Gipsys lay on Green Hill whose names and ages I was unable to ascertain'. In Harby however, four 'Persons in a Canal Boat' were recorded in 1871, and the Goadby Marwood enumerator in that year recorded with great accuracy the 'Cause of the Presence of Strangers' as -

- Burrough Races 3 males 1 female
- Visiting before marriage 1 female
- Visiting relations 1 male 1 female

In such ways the number of incoming migrants will be exaggerated.

A much more important source of overstatement lies in the number of children born elsewhere but now resident in the village. Even where the parents were true immigrants, there are many cases where they appear to have established a permanent settlement in the village, so that the children probably grew up regarding themselves as native to that village even if not literally born there. In 1871, for example, Clawson Lodge was farmed by William Pickard; he and four of his children had been born in Wartnaby, but had apparently settled in Long Clawson between nine and seven years before, between the birth of Arthur (9 years old) and John (7 years old). By 1881 it was the eldest son, Joe, who had a farm in Long Clawson, and one sister, Jane, remained in his household. Thus two of the four children born in Wartnaby had become permanent residents in Long Clawson, though still appearing on the census as migrants. Many farmers moved similar short distances, some from adjacent counties, bringing their families with them.

Tradesmen and labourers were equally likely to bring children into the village who had been born elsewhere. For example, Nether Broughton born William Greaves had apparently spent some years working over the county border in Hickling, where his two elder daughters were born. Then, something more than three years before the 1881 census, he and his wife had removed to Nether Broughton where two more children were born. James Pears, innkeeper in Hose in 1851, the village in which he was born, had spent some years in his wife's birthplace, Long Clawson, where they had five children.
The family appear in each subsequent census, until 1881 when one of the sons born in Long Clawson, Thomas, was landlord of the Black Horse Inn. By now his birthplace had been forgotten, and he is entered as having been born in Hose. In the interval however, he had lived for some time in Nottingham, it seems, where his wife and eldest son were born. In this way one family, long based in a village, provides statistics which indicate migration from elsewhere. It is therefore necessary to treat the apparent numbers of inward migrants with great caution. Table 8 shows the numbers of children shown in each census as born outside the village of residence. Although falling far short of numbers born within the village, it may be seen that in most cases at least 17 per cent of all aged 0–15 were recorded in the censuses as born away from the place of residence.

Even when these reservations are born in mind however, Tables 7 and 7a show some interesting features. Whereas in most cases at least 50 per cent of villagers were native born, it may be thought surprising that the percentage was not higher. What is more, over the three decades this percentage fell in each one of the villages, and most strikingly in those with the greatest overall decline—Goadby Marwood, Chadwell and Wycomb. At the same time in all but Harby and Hose the percentage intake from the villages within five miles increased, although only in Nether Broughton and Long Clawson did this mean an increase in numbers. It is interesting to note the large number drawn into Hose from the nearby villages in 1861 when lace making was at its height there; however as the group did not then decline as steeply as those from further afield it cannot be claimed that the draw of the lace industry was particularly local. It is to be remembered however that most of the lace workers were wives, who would still be rooted in the village even though their employment had ceased.

The intake from wider Leicestershire seems to have remained fairly stable in most cases; the exceptional villages were again the smallest, where a single family could alter the
balance of the composition of the population. In Scadby Marwood, one newly arrived family, the seven members of the household of Thomas Wright, farmer, were all born in Burton Lazars, and in 1881 formed one-third of all the villagers born in wider Leicestershire. It is a similar story with the noticeable 25 per cent of Wycomb inhabitants drawn from the East Midlands area in 1881: nine of the 15 were to be found in one household, Henry Bird having brought his six children from Rutland, while his wife and a lodger were born in Lincolnshire.

Although these instances create a wide divergence from the norm, they serve to illustrate some features of the migratory movements in the group of villages as a whole. For example, Table 10 shows the decrease of 3 per cent 1851 - 1881 in the proportion of agricultural workers, including farmers, born in the village of residence, while Table 9 shows that, among non-native villagers, the largest increase of agricultural workers was among those from wider Leicestershire, rising from 25 to 36 per cent of such immigrants. Of all the immigrant groups, except those from beyond the East Midlands, more than half of those in employment worked in agriculture (Table 9). However, an even greater proportion of each incoming segment was composed of those without occupation, largely dependent families. As shown in Table 8, a decreasing proportion of the village children in each of the villages was native born; incoming migrants therefore not only filled jobs vacated by departing villagers, but helped replace the population stock for future generations. It becomes clear that migration was not an option only for the young and unattached, but for the family as well. Hunt quotes a contemporary comment which even suggests that having a large family to support gave an extra incentive to migration.10.

[Farm labourers] do not abstain from marrying early and having large families because they know that employment cannot be found for their children ... the result is that as they must work to live, so they must migrate in order to work.

The Vale of Belvoir was attractive to migrants because of
the stability and relative prosperity of pasture farming, and because of the high reputation of the Duke of Rutland as landlord.

The only occupational group in which the proportion of local-born workers increased was in agricultural trades. As shown in the previous chapter, there was little change in the provision of services like those of the blacksmith or wheelwright; there was a permanent need for them, so fewer problems of under-employment than among the farm workers. Businesses were often run on family lines, so that although many trained sons left, to migrate to a better paid job in industry perhaps, another brother could often take his place. Robert Mann, master carpenter and joiner of Long Clawson in 1851 and '61, was succeeded by his son Robert, while both the younger sons who had been apprenticed to their father in 1861 left the village, as did other apprentices from outside the family. Harby's blacksmith throughout the period was Edmund Hall, who employed the same journeyman from before 1861 on, but the young journeyman of 1851, as well as his son James who was working with him in 1871, both left the village before the following census. The wheelwright in Harby in 1851 was Samuel Musson, and he had two apprentices at that time. Ten years later, aged 63, Musson described himself as a carpenter only, and both apprentices had left the village. By 1871, although Musson was still described as master carpenter, the village was supplied with a wheelwright from Lincolnshire, William Medley, replaced in his turn before 1881 by Thomas Martin from Lowdham, Nottinghamshire. Thus when there was no family heir to the trade, essential services were filled by immigrants. An apprenticeship in such a trade obviously provided an incentive to migrate rather than to remain as journeyman with the apprentice-master. A reduction in apprenticeships further decreased the intake of workers into such trades from beyond the village.

One of the most interesting features shown in Table 10 is the increase in the number drawn into the villages from further afield than the East Midlands by 1881. Neither
Broughton, Chadwell, Harby and Hose show particularly high increases, all of which are mainly accounted for by the arrival of the railway. The increased demand for expertise did not come only from the railways however; as Table 9 shows, by 1881 50 per cent of the medical and professional services of the village were supplied by people born outside the East Midlands. It may be seen also that the percentage of domestic servants thus brought in also increased, mainly as middle-class families imported servants with them. Thus the new professionalism which was reshaping society began to make itself felt even in remote villages.

Census returns give only occasional clues as to outward migration; when a complete family disappears from one census to the next it is probable that they had moved elsewhere for work, but it might be for example that the head of the household had died and his widow and children returned to her home village. Certainly widows and grandchildren are to be found having returned to the parental home in the villages here reviewed. The place of birth of grandchildren may suggest the destination of their parents' migration, but the majority of those who disappeared from the census listings did so without leaving any clue.\textsuperscript{11} What the census does reveal is that the population of these villages was not static; some families disappeared for one census, only to reappear before the next. Many families had children born in several places, indicating several changes of home. William Smith, for example, living in his birthplace Harby in 1861 had children born in Cropwell Butler, Nottinghamshire, and Melton Mowbray and Plungar as well as Harby. William Hainsworth, foreman miller, born in Rutland, had children born in Belgrave and Mount Sorrell in Leicestershire, Elm in Norfolk, and Ilkeston in Derbyshire, before coming to Harby in 1871, and by 1881 had, it seems, moved on again. Many such examples are to be found, across all occupational categories and all classes, which combines with the disappearance of a majority of children from the villages during the decade in which they reached the age when they might begin full-time work to suggest that mobility
in pursuit of work was a common and necessary aspect of life.

The loss of young people from communities which are in decline or failing to expand economically is a phenomenon familiar to our own time. The extent of the loss from, for example, Harby, is shown by endeavouring to trace children described as 'scholars' in one census through subsequent censuses for the village. Of 104 such children in 1851, only 45 were still identifiable in the village ten years later. By 1871 only 18 remained, and by 1881 only 9. Of 150 scholars listed in 1861, only 35 still lived in the village in 1871, and 27 in 1881. Of the 97 who formed the 1871 cohort, 42 remained in 1881. Thus the rate of loss diminished in the 1870s as new opportunities of employment reached the village, and as the living standard of agricultural workers improved.

A high birth-rate ensured that, even with the losses here described, the larger villages retained a high proportion of young people. Migration did not therefore create a population of elderly people, nor a work force of old men. (See Table 2). More indicative of the economic pressures on the village are the departures of older men, household heads who had already found some employment in the village. In a list of male heads of household, aged less than 50 at the time of the census, who failed to appear on subsequent censuses for the villages, we have further indication of the areas of the village economy which were under pressure.

After 1851, Harby lost two agricultural labourers and one farmer; three trade journeymen, a tile maker, a brickmaker and a carpenter left, as did a tailor, a cordwainer and an innkeeper. (There were also several changes of schoolmaster between each census in most of the villages). After 1861, 14 agricultural labourers, two farmers and two graziers were lost, as were a miller and his journeyman, two brickmakers and a cordwainer. The decade also saw the loss of a canal labourer, a gardener and a groom. Following the heavy agricultural losses of the 1861-'71 decade, the final decade of the study period, despite the early stages of the period of depression, saw fewer losses, with only a few agricultural labourers apparently leaving. Another boatman left however,
as did two millers and a miller's carter, and a brickmaker. A cordwainer, a baker and a tinman/brazier also failed to appear in the later census, as did another innkeeper.

From Long Clawson, the largest of the seven villages and also that which showed the most persistent loss of population over the study period, lost household heads were even more concentrated in the agricultural sector. In the decade following 1851, 13 agricultural labourers were lost, after 1861, 10, and after 1871 a further six. Two farmers and one grazier left following both the 1851 and 1871 censuses, and one 'occupier of land' after 1861. Among tradesmen, a carpenter, a cordwainer, a butcher and a baker appear to have left following the 1851 census, a brickmaker, a joiner, a grocer and a plumber following that of 1861, and a brickmaker, a bricklayer's labourer and a butcher after 1871. After 1871 also one man in an occupation new to the village, an iron-stone miner, seems to have moved on, as did a group of workers possibly connected with one property i.e. a groom, a gardener and a bailiff. Like the schoolmasters, the police constables changed between each census, and can be excluded from a count of possible migrants. It may be fairly assumed that this pattern of substantial migration of agricultural workers, was common throughout the Vale of Belvoir, and that migration of craftsmen and tradespeople was secondary to it.

Such a count in each of the larger villages of the specimen group confirms that the number of household heads who left the village, apart from agricultural labourers, was small, emphasising again that it was young people as they approached adulthood who formed the majority of migrants. The changes in agriculture and economic pressures which encouraged the movement of labourers and even farmers during the period are discussed in a following chapter. Apprenticeship in a craft or trade had always provided a possibility of mobility for the country craftsman. The mere handful of 'houses in construction' at each census tells us that those in the building trades needed to be mobile, while their skills were likely to be in demand in growing towns. Publicans appear to have been a restless
breed, few of the pubs and inns remaining in the same hands as consistently as the Black Horse at Long Clawson. As we have seen, shopkeepers were, with some exceptions, largely replaced as they moved away. Despite the high degree of mobility among the population, therefore, the social structure of the larger villages at least seems to have remained stable. A population overweighted with the very young was maintained as an economically viable unit by the departure of the young as they reached the age of employment. Agriculture, satiated with workers in the earlier part of the century, shed its surplus to the benefit of all. Essential and social services were maintained. Only in the smallest villages was the loss on such a scale that the pattern of village life would have been perceptibly changed, and such villages were unlikely to have been formerly self-sufficient. As Barron has argued, population loss, though unfamiliar and alarming to contemporaries, was not necessarily a sign of economic morbidity.15.

There have been some attempts to elucidate the motivation behind migration, seeking reasons beyond the purely economic need to find employment. Bunce stressed the importance of the amenities which the village could offer; as these became inadequate, or were seen as inadequate by villagers as they gained more knowledge of the world outside the village, dissatisfaction drove them, and the young in particular, to move elsewhere.16. But this is a 'chicken-and-egg' situation; a prosperous shopkeeper does not close his doors and move away; shops close because there is not sufficient trade for them. Village tailors and shoemakers left because their products were replaced by ready-made garments, which were cheaper and probably more attractive than the village made ones, even if less hard wearing. We have seen that in the seven villages there was little deterioration in services between 1851 and 1881, so that any dissatisfaction which drove people away was more one of perception than of declining amenities. Lawton suggests that the poor quality of rural housing
encouraged migration to the towns, since the legislation designed to improve working class housing was more quickly and effectively applied in the towns than in the countryside.\textsuperscript{7}

Little can be said of the quality of houses in the Vale of Belvoir, but the census does give some indication of the adequacy of provision. Of the seven villages, only in Chadwell and Wycomb were there fewer houses in 1881 than there had been in 1851, Chadwell losing six out of 17, Wycomb three out of 13. Goadby Marwood increased its number of houses by one, to 34. Nether Broughton had the same number, 99, in 1881 as in 1851, having increased its provision briefly to 107 with its peak of population in 1861. The number of inhabited houses in Hose grew from 97 in 1851 to 103 in 1881, in Harby from 117 to 129, and in Long Clawson from 177 to 183. In terms of density of occupation, this meant that Hose reduced from 4.9 to 4.3, Harby from 5.5 to 4.6, and Long Clawson from 4.9 to 4 persons per house. Goadby Marwood, having been the most crowded of the seven villages in 1851, with 6.3 persons per inhabited house, reduced this to 4.6 in 1881, and Chadwell dropped from 5.2 to 4.2. Only Wycomb, with an increase from 5.9 in 1851 and 4.9 in 1871, to 6.1 in 1881, and Nether Broughton, with an overall increase from 4.3 to 4.6 persons per house, were more crowded at the end of the period. However, even in the villages where an improvement was made, the availability of houses for a young couple wishing to marry must have been poor, since in the 1871-'81 decade an increase in population of 35 was housed in only nine additional houses in Hose, and an increase of 52 in Harby was contained in an unchanged number of houses. Shortage of housing might well therefore have been a factor influencing the decision to migrate.

The attractions of the towns (in this case Scunthorpe and Grantham) were identified by White as adding to a sense of restlessness and dissatisfaction amongst rural workers.\textsuperscript{18}

Bright lights were more important than higher wages in drawing rural dwellers into the towns and cities.
Hunt attributes to education the growing awareness of opportunities in the towns, and points out that for the young in particular they offered not only a chance to earn more money, but - 19.

... greater freedom and independence, ... fewer hours of work and infinitely more fascinating ways of filling the rest of the day.

In her econometric analysis of overseas and internal migration, Dr. Morgan includes literacy as a measure of labour force skill amongst the variables affecting the decision to migrate.20. The number of males in Leicestershire who signed the marriage register with a mark fell from 21.8 per cent in 1861-'70, to 11.1 per cent in 1881-'90, and females from 29.6 per cent to 11.7 per cent. Increasing literacy, though not in itself a motivating factor, allowed an increased awareness of the possibilities, and gave a wider range of skills to facilitate migration; it enabled those seeking work to read press advertisements, and those in work to write home to friends and kin to inform them of positions available. Personal recommendation was a much favoured means of hiring labour, and has been particularly noted in the case of domestic service. (See Chapter 6, p.183).

Growing political awareness is suggested by White to have been another factor in the restlessness which encouraged migration. The message of Arch's National Agricultural Labourers' Union and the movement which surrounded it in the 1870s was heard even in areas in which, like the Vale of Belvoir, it seems to have created little militancy. As White expresses it:- 21.

... the real importance of unionism lies in the way it raised expectations and spread the idea of migration and emigration into so many labouring homes. ... Horizons were widened, restlessness increased.

This more serious aspect of village unrest is discussed by Newby.22. He describes the superficially tranquil life of the village in the period 1846 - 1873, but goes on to warn:-

... it is important not to mistake the placid and relatively undisturbed surface
of these relationships as implying any deeper sense of social harmony and commitment. There remained a thriving rural underworld in which a whole range of activities, such as arson, poaching, and the propagation of usually inconsequential subversive talk in the tap room of the local alehouse, bore witness to a continuing, if covert, sense of deprivation and class antagonism. ... Indeed, the most demonstrative verdict, was given by the thousands who, individually and quietly, turned their backs on rural society and sought to improve their lives by moving to the towns.

This picture of seething discontent is later qualified for pasture districts, however, where there tended to be less sharp social divisions between farmers and workers.23. Certainly, in the pages which follow there is little evidence of arson, or of poaching on a large scale, while, as far as we can tell, any disturbance emanating from the village pub was the result of beer rather than politics. That there were changing social attitudes I shall attempt to demonstrate, but these were not expressed through violence. Movement away from the Vale of Belvoir was primarily to escape the trap of underemployment and consequent poverty.

The conservatism of country people meant that migration was never an easy decision. A contemporary observed in the Journal of the Royal Statistical Society:24...

... though of all classes ... agricultural labourers are under the greatest necessity to leave their birthplaces, and have the greatest inducement to do so, no class is so hard to move away.

For the children of farmers too it was not a simple choice; Anderson draws attention to the compensations of security which remaining at home could offer to the children of those farmers whose farms were large enough to support them.25. Yet still the great majority left.

However, the fact that the movement was not all in one direction, that newcomers arrived and that natives returned, confirms that the larger villages at least still had something to offer. The comparative economic stability of villages in the pasture area of the Vale of Belvoir...
reinforced this, as is emphasised by a comparison with the greater loss of population in arable Bingham Wapentake. (See Chapter 2, p. 20, and Tables 1.1 and 1.2).

Of the seven villages, only Chadwell and Wycomb lost so heavily that they were kept alive by the arrival of workers from other areas. The activity surrounding the Hall at Goadby Marwood probably helped to ensure the survival of a community there. The reduction of Chadwell and Wycomb to the bare bones of a working community only emphasises the extent to which the four larger villages remained viable, with insufficient deterioration in amenities, housing, or range of employment to have provoked the increase in migration. It seems that the aspirations of villagers were rising, and that many of them were not willing to tolerate a continuance of their impoverished style of life. There is much in the pattern of migration from the seven villages to support the contention of D. R. Mills: 27.

... that locational decisions are taken in the context not of real environments, but of environments as perceived by their inhabitants.

The leader writer of the Leicester Chronicle was aware of people's restlessness when he wrote at the end of 1869: 28.

Rapidly are town improvements extending to villages. The differences between town life and village life are thus gradually diminishing ... and thus new requirements and new necessities are awakening into activity.
Footnotes to Chapter 3.
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6. *e.g.* the anonymous reviewer of G. E. Mingay, *Rural Life in Victorian England*, in *Rural Population Studies*, no. 26, 1981, who cites the Bedfordshire village of Cardington as having lost a third of surviving sons in 1782 through migration, and challenges a suggestion by Mingay that village communities were static.


8. There are several instances of elderly new arrivals listed in the village censuses, with no apparent reason for choosing to live there. For example, in Harby in 1871, John Rose, 75, retired farmer, born in Kinoulton, Notts., and his wife Elizabeth, 77, born in Cotgrave, Notts.

9. Gillis refers to the customary preference of young wives to return to their parents' home to give birth, as may have happened with Thomas Pears' son. Such a custom would of course further exaggerate the number of children apparently migrant to the village of residence, and perhaps give a misleading
impression of the extent of the father's travels. However, where the wife was born at any distance from her husband's home, one at least of the parents had obviously re-located to make a meeting possible.


10. E.H. Hunt, **op. cit.** p. 55
Gillis, (**op. cit.**, p. 233) stresses the importance of wider family relationships, particularly the parent-child relationship.

Anderson reveals the continuing importance of the family among migrants into Preston, and the tendency to re-create the rural pattern of family structure.


11. For Long Clawson alone the censuses contain entries of grandchildren born in Nottingham, Leicester, Derby, Lincoln, Loughborough, Manchester, Birkenhead and London, as well as Melton Mowbray and the surrounding villages. The list supports the supposition that many of the migrants moved to large towns. I have found no evidence of emigration from the seven villages in this period, despite John Wilson's report of a group going to America in 1814, which contact might have been expected to encourage others. The best negative evidence is the lack of any comment on emigration in the school log books; elsewhere in the Vale of Belvoir the departure of families was sometimes noted in this way, as for example by the schoolmaster at Waltham, who on 7 March, 1868 recorded that Thomas, William and John Wilford had left to go to America. Baines has established that only a small proportion of emigrants were agricultural labourers (2.1 per cent in the decade 1861-'70).
12. Girls who married within the village may have been overlooked, though: I have endeavoured to identify them.

13. Compare Armstrong's argument that it was the reputation of agriculture as an employer of set and older men, amongst whom the young did not want to work, which created the false image of it as an un-progressive industry. If the pace was slow, he suggests, it was probably the result of poor food for old and young alike.

A. Armstrong, *op. cit.* pp.117-8

14. There is less probability that those aged 50 or over at their last census appearance had migrated. Low life expectancy or the poverty so often connected with old age would be at least as likely to be responsible for the disappearance. The *Leicester Chronicle* occasionally carried notices of the death of aged paupers from the villages who had died in the Union Workhouse. For example, William Scarborough, aged 83, late of Long Clawson, a veteran of Waterloo, who died at Melton Mowbray, 7 July, 1872.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Same village</th>
<th>Within 5 miles</th>
<th>Leics.</th>
<th>East Midlands</th>
<th>Elsewhere</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N. Broughton</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L. Clawson</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goadby Mwd.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chadwell</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wycomb</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Harby</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hose</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABLE 7.a. POPULATION BY BIRTHPLACE, expressed as a percentage of total village population.</td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same village</td>
<td>Within 5 miles</td>
<td>Leics.</td>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>Elsewhere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>per cent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Broughton</td>
<td>1851 55</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1861 53</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1871 54</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1881 47</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Clawson</td>
<td>1851 63</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1861 66</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1871 59</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1881 58</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goadby Mwd.</td>
<td>1851 53</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1861 56</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1871 48</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1881 38</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadwell</td>
<td>1851 51</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1861 42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1871 42</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1881 25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wycomb</td>
<td>1851 44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1861 38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1871 34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1881 20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harby</td>
<td>1851 64</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1861 65</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1871 61</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1881 61</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>1851 60</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1861 59</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1871 61</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1881 56</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same village</td>
<td>Within 5 miles</td>
<td>Leics.</td>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>Elsewhere</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N. Broughton</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>110 (71%)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>130 (71%)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>121 (78%)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>106 (63%)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lg. Clawson</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>295 (82%)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>251 (84%)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>228 (80%)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>184 (75%)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goadby Mwd.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>74 (83%)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>69 (85%)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>43 (83%)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>24 (65%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chadwell</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>33 (73%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>21 (57%)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>18 (69%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>5 (36%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wycomb</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>30 (83%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>20 (83%)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>13 (76%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>7 (30%)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Harby</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>217 (85%)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>228 (83%)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>143 (75%)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>145 (69%)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hose</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>161 (80%)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>152 (80%)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>120 (83%)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>123 (74%)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 4 - AGRICULTURE.

Farming was of primary importance in the economy of the Vale of Belvoir. It remained overwhelmingly the largest source of employment, and its success or failure affected the welfare of almost every inhabitant. This chapter will trace the developments in agriculture in the area during the period 1851-1881, setting them in the national pattern. First, it will examine the pressures for change; then, having described the type and potential of the land, it will trace changes in land use, revealing a growing concentration upon livestock farming. The reasons for this will be discussed, including the agricultural depression of the later part of the study period; in an examination of the stability of farm holdings, the effects of the conversion to stock farming, and of this depression, will be investigated. A summary of the evidence for the establishment of dairying in the Vale of Belvoir will lead to a discussion of some of the difficulties of the work.

The chapter will then turn to a consideration of the advances in farming technique made during the period of High Farming which preceded the depression, including the local availability of agricultural machinery. Tracing the evidence on farming conditions throughout the period of the study raises the question as to how far the accepted definitions of 'Golden Age' and 'Depression' were accurate; did they, as generalisations, over simplify trends which were far from clear cut in individual localities? In particular, it will be suggested that the assumption that conversion to livestock farming avoided the problems of an agricultural depression based upon the falling price of grain, is unduly optimistic. The chapter will conclude with an account of the outbreaks of animal epidemics which created problems for farmers in the mid 1860s and late 1870s, and the steps which were taken in the Vale of Belvoir to control their spread.
Pressures for change.

The pressures upon farmers to change farming practice in the second half of the nineteenth century were of three different kinds. In the first place, the market was changing. The rise in population, which had doubled during the first half of the century and continued to rise from 18 million in 1851 to 26 million in 1881, created a growth in demand for foodstuffs. At the same time, the growing concentration of population in towns, and the improvement in the means of distribution changed the nature of the market. The quantity and quality of produce had been improved through farming technology. Prices were sustained even after the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846 because of the demand. Distribution to the markets was improved by the use of the railways and by improved techniques of marketing such as the growing use of factors or middlemen. When poor weather reduced harvest yields in the 1870s, foreign suppliers, particularly from America, were able to meet the demand at prices which undercut many British producers. The development of refrigerated ships in the 1880s led to growing imports of meat and dairy produce from overseas.

While economic pressures were encouraging farmers to farm more efficiently, the movement of population away from the countryside left them as the century advanced with a reduced pool of labour. Machinery was increasingly available, but it was expensive; earlier in the century its introduction had been resisted by workers who feared that their employment would be jeopardized, but as the century progressed it was accepted, like other improvements in farming technique, and very gradually began to change the face of farming.

The third set of changes which farmers faced in the nineteenth century as always were changes in weather. The mid-century period had produced, it seems, the usual mixture of good and bad, but from the mid 1870s through the '80s there was a period of exceptionally bad weather which made farming very difficult. The coincidence of this period with the increased competition of foreign imports produced
The positive response of farmers to the earlier challenges had produced what Lord Ernle called 'an era of advancing prosperity and progress' in English agriculture, and he picked out the years between 1852 and 1863 in particular as a 'Golden Age'. He writes glowingly of...

... rising rents and profits, of the rapid multiplication of more numerous, better bred, better fed, better housed stock, of varied improvements of every kind of implement and machinery, of growing expenditure on the making of the land by drainage, the construction of roads, the erection of farm buildings, and the division into fields of convenient size.

This was the era of 'High Farming', when rising prices and land values encouraged investment, and a plentiful supply of farm labour kept wages low and made intensive methods possible. Grain was considered to be the most important crop, and so much did English productivity increase that in spite of the repeal of the Corn Laws there was as yet little competition from other countries.

The depression which farmers faced in the late 1870s and 1880s was largely the effect of lost or poor grain harvests combined with an upsurge of cheap imports. Areas which were able to convert to pasture farming profitted from the growing demand for meat and dairy products. It is therefore often assumed that conversion to pasture farming was a new trend in areas such as Leicestershire, but as E. L. Jones points out it had been the rising trend of livestock prices which underpinned the 'Golden Age', providing an 'elegant but precarious balance' of income when combined with arable or mixed farms. He criticises farmers for failing to convert to stock rearing, and for clinging to what they saw as the traditional pattern, ignoring the economic shortcomings of mixed farming, and blaming the weather when it was the cheapness of imports which posed the real threat.

As a later paragraph will demonstrate, the years of the depression certainly saw an increase in land devoted to
pasture farming in the Vale of Belvoir as well as in the county and country at large. The trend however was a continuing one; G. E. Fussell, in his study of four centuries of Leicestershire farming, shows that although in the 1770s the Vale of Belvoir was renowned for its high quality corn, the county as a whole was described by Arthur Young as consisting mainly of grazing farms. Bakewell's achievements in animal breeding in Leicestershire are well known; a forerunner, Joseph Allom of Clifton, bought some of his breeding stock from Mr. Stone of Goadby Marwood. By 1836 it was reported that much land in the county which had been used to grow wheat was exhausted, and could do so no more. On the Duke of Rutland's estates, as they were enclosed (between 1766 and 1810) 'all the richest land that was valued at a guinea an acre was laid down to permanent grass'. In addition, a continuing policy of tree planting meant that by 1866 the Duke of Rutland had 1,700 acres of woodland in the county, much of it presumably lost to arable farming. By contrast, the more westerly section of the Vale, centred on Bingham, remained primarily arable.

The conversion of the Vale of Belvoir to pasture farming was then a long-term move led by the Dukes of Rutland from the late eighteenth century on, and not a response to the depression of the late nineteenth century. Even if it had been, mid-nineteenth century pasture farming was not without problems. The period of very bad weather in the 1870s and 1880s adversely affected hay and fodder crops as well as grain, so that feeding the animals became difficult and costly. At the same time, possibly encouraged by the poor state of underfed and over-exposed beasts, a spate of epidemics spread among them; in an effort to control the spread of infection (a principle better understood with the medical advances of the century) farmers found themselves liable to restrictions on the sale and movement of animals, and even to compulsory slaughter orders on infected beasts. It was not a time to enter incautiously into the grazing business.
The Land and its Use.

Agriculture, like any other industry, relies for its success upon the judicious exploitation of labour and capital, raw materials and consumer demand, and land is its most important raw material. The predominant soil of the Vale of Belvoir has been identified as poorly drained, fine textured Lias clay, with an area of thin boulder clay overlying the Lias in the area of Hose and Hickling, giving well drained, highly productive soil. In the area of Stathern and Harby however, non-calcareous Lias beds give coarse structured, poorly drained or silty clays, only suitable for grass or cereals, not for root crops. Goadby Marwood, Chadwell and Wycomb lie on the limestone escarpment to the south of the Vale, with good agricultural land and drainage. The clay on which the four larger villages of the study stand had long been used for mixed farming; the area around Bottesford had been renowned for the high quality of its wheat in the seventeenth century. By 1809 however William Pitt was writing with concern of the widespread conversion to grass of the Vale of Belvoir following the Duke of Rutland's enclosures, aware that lower corn production would have a 'natural tendency to decrease the population of that district'. Despite his fears, he concluded nevertheless that 'the enclosure of this Vale has not at all ... hitherto lessened the number of its inhabitants, as the farms are small, and few changes of tenantry have taken place'.

In 1854, according to the analysis made by J. Philip Dodd of the experimental crop returns collected at that time, the Vale of Belvoir 'was fairly balanced with permanent grass at 434 and arable averaging 395 acres per 1000 of total area'. In the Melton Mowbray Union as a whole, 661 acres per thousand were in permanent grass, with the emphasis on fatstock sheep and cattle. Dairying had, Dodd suggests, at this time declined somewhat in the area.

Table 11 gives extracts from the crop acreages returned for the seven villages of the study in the annual surveys conducted by the Board of Inland Revenue after 1865. The
most noticeable feature is the sharp decline in acres devoted to grain crops, particularly in the years after 1880. Only Hose came near to maintaining its levels in wheat and oats, but even here barley declined steeply. Beans and peas became less important, while turnips and swedes were to some extent replaced as a fodder crop by the newly introduced mangolds. Potatoes, carrots and cabbage were not significant crops in any of the villages; however, the rise in potato cultivation in Chadwell and Wycomb in 1885, along with the maintained turnip and swede crop there and at Goadby Marwood suggests an attempt at specialisation in arable crops on the well drained uplands of these villages. The area of clover grown for hay increased steeply - almost 50 per cent overall by 1881. The very high hay acreage for Long Clawson in 1885 seems to have been achieved by cultivation of what had been bare fallow or permanent grass earlier in the decade; even so, it is difficult to see where these extra acres were found, as both these categories had been rising at a faster rate than the grain areas were declining. Most of the villages reached a peak of bare fallow acres in 1881, and for many of them this was also the point at which permanent grass was at its maximum.

In the county as a whole (Table 12) wheat growing was increasing until 1870, when almost 48,000 acres were recorded. By 1875 however this had fallen by some 3,500 acres, and the decline continued until 1885 when only 28,567 acres of the county were under wheat. Only oats showed a small increase over the period, presumably in response to a rising horse population; total grain acres fell from 116,000 to less than 80,000. Pea and bean cultivation in the county decreased rapidly, and root crops showed marked decline by 1880, only potatoes making a recovery by 1885. In all this the trends for the country as a whole were followed; already in 1874 collecting officers reported that high prices of meat and dairy produce and the increased price of labour were leading to the conversion of arable into grass land, and a government report of 1885 commented on the continuing diminution of wheat and the growth of stock farming.
The Conversion to Pasture Farming.

Conversion to grazing was not a negative response by farmers to the falling profitability of grain farming. Population, and particularly that of towns, continued to rise, increasing the demand for food and clothing. Incomes were rising, so that there was a better sale for meat and dairy products, to add variety to the diet, and during the first decade of the recession the prices of these items showed a rising trend. Improvements in transport, particularly the building of railways, also favoured the trade; in raw milk alone the amount carried by the Midland Railway increased sixfold between 1872 and 1880.¹³ A Royal Commissioner commented in 1881 on the amount of dairy farming in the Vale of Belvoir, and on the amount of Stilton cheese produced there.¹⁴ Table 13 shows the number of livestock declared as kept in the villages in the official returns. Nether Broughton, Long Clawson and Hose all show substantial increases in dairy cattle between 1866 and 1881, and were joined by Harby in an even greater increase by 1885. Breeding and store cattle showed more fluctuation, but overall these tended to increase in the area. The very low numbers of livestock declared for Long Clawson in 1867 may be explained by a failure of farmers to fill in the returns; the schedule shows only 43 farms for the village, while there were 51 in 1875. There had been cattle plague in the area, but it is doubtful whether its results had been this drastic; there is certainly no indication of such a decimation in the local press. The reluctance of farmers is perhaps explained by the following paragraph from the Leicester Chronicle, referring to the Melton Mowbray district.¹⁵

We are sorry to hear some of the farmers of this neighbourhood are labouring under a mistaken notion as to the papers issued for returns to Government of the number of cattle on their respective farms, and which are of course made in order to enable the authorities to issue correct statistics as to the effects of disease upon the national supply of meat. We understand that by some the forms are erroneously thought to be some official test
upon which to impose some new or increased measure of taxation, a conclusion entirely unwarranted.

Supporting evidence of the swing towards livestock farming in the seven villages is supplied by Table 14, which shows the census entries describing the occupation of household heads as 'farmer' or 'grazier'. The steady increase in graziers is most noticeable in Long Clawson and Hose. The continuing success of grain and arable farming on the better drained land of Goadby Marwood, Chadwell and Wycomb is reflected in the almost total absence there of graziers. A comparison of Tables 15 and 16 emphasises the smaller size of grazing farms; both the larger grazing farms of 1871, at Harby and Hose, had been broken down into smaller units by 1881, confirming perhaps that these were difficult times for graziers as well as for farmers. On the other hand, although the largest holdings at Nether Broughton, Goadby Marwood and Hose all appear to have been split up between 1871 and 1881, those at Wycomb and Harby had become substantially larger.16.

During the earlier two decades of the period, 1851-1871, the largest farms increased in size only in Nether Broughton and Goadby Marwood. The largest farm in Nether Broughton in 1871 was that of William Cropper, of 376 acres; he had come from Lincolnshire, probably during the last five years, and ran a mixed farm. In August 1873 he was fined at the Petty Sessions for allowing horses to stray on the highway, and after that there is no further reference to him to be found; he certainly was not included in the 1881 census for the village. His farm therefore was not the result of judicious High Farming in the area, and even the presence of livestock was not enough to ensure its survival there through the first years of the depression.

The largest farm at Goadby Marwood in 1871 was Hallam's Lodge. Edward Hallam had farmed 110 acres in 1851, which by 1861 had increased to 305 acres. At this time he certainly had some livestock, as a shepherd and a cowboy were listed among his household. Edward Hallam died in 1865,
but in 1871 the farm, by now 430 acres, was still held by his wife Rebecca. Since there was a 21 year old son helping to run the farm at this time, its dispersal and the family's disappearance from the district during the next decade are unexplained. Could the depression really have hit what had obviously been a very successfully run business, or did the son perhaps see a brighter future elsewhere?

Another large farm at Goadby Marwood which changed hands after 1871 was the White Lodge, 260 acres of which had been held by Samuel Walker in 1851. By 1871, at the age of 67, he had relinquished 39 acres of this, and we must assume that he died before 1881. His eldest son at home was only 18 in 1871, so again the loss of continuity is not easily explained; the 1894 Royal Commission was told that farmers in the area were not encouraging their sons to stay in farming since times were so hard, and that anyway sons who had never been paid for their work had no money to take over the tenancy when their fathers died.17.

Not every large farm in Goadby Marwood changed hands however. The largest farm in 1881 was that held by Elizabeth Carter. Her husband John had taken over the 260 acres formerly farmed by his uncle, John Godwin, before 1861, and Elizabeth continued to run the farm, with the help of a bailiff, after she became widowed some time before 1871. The 170 acres of the Elson farm (Old Lodge) also remained in family hands, passing from father to son during the 1850s. For those farms which were divided during the '70s, there appears to have been no difficulty in finding new tenants, since there were four newly arrived farming families in Goadby Marwood by 1881, though, since not all these declared the acreage worked, it is not possible to link them directly with previous tenancies. The Vale of Belvoir remained a desirable area in which to farm as the depression continued. In 1894 -18.

In the neighbourhood of Melton Mowbray and Belvoir I find that the tenants seem to be more satisfied than in any other part of the county, and rents there have been greatly reduced.
The Duke of Rutland had reduced rents by as much as 25-30 per cent; while such reductions made life easier for farmers hard pressed by falling prices, few landlords could afford to be so generous.

Since farm names are seldom given, a family's continued inclusion in the census does not guarantee that they were farming the same land throughout the period; however, their continued presence as farmers, particularly where there is a similarity in acreage worked in each census year, does suggest an element of stability. Almost half the farmers listed in the seven villages in 1881 were working in the same village, probably on the same farms, which their families had worked in 1851. All the 1881 farmers in Nether Broughton and Harby, all but one in Long Clawson, all but three in Hose, had had families farming in the same village in 1871; the highest turn-over in these early years of depression was at Goadby Marwood and here there were four newcomers in 1881. There had in fact been more changes in the seven villages during the prosperous '60s, when about a third of local farms had apparently changed hands.

Amongst graziers there was more instability. Only one grazier's family at Nether Broughton and two at Harby remained farming there between 1851 and 1881. At the same time, nine of the 13 at Nether Broughton in 1881, all four of those at Harby, and three of the five at Long Clawson, had been there in 1871. The concentration of graziers was at Nether Broughton, and of those who appeared as such on only one or two censuses, many lived permanently in the village, either coming to grazing from other occupations, or returning to them when grazing, it seems, had failed. A miller's widow, several labourers, a brick-maker, a sawyer and a grocer all had spells as graziers. Demanding only a few acres and a few beasts it was an inviting opportunity for the man who aspired to independence.

Amongst graziers as amongst farmers, the census suggests therefore that the early years of the depression produced no greater instability in the Vale of Belvoir than had
existed in more prosperous decades.

It may well be that the remaining twenty years of the century showed more cumulative ill-effects for farmers as the depression continued; the publication of the 1891 census will perhaps shed some light on this. William Coleman's estate based on the new Hall at Long Clawson was halved to 200 acres between 1871 and 1881, and the remainder turned over to grass as the effects of American competition were felt. Even so, the difficulties were not overcome, since in the 1890s it was reportedly only the production of Stilton cheese which saved the estate. Finally in 1900, despite an attempt to diversify into the brewing trade, the estate had to be sold. 19.

John Wilson tells of the distress shown by the old men, including his grandfather, who had worked on the estate, and continues:

... from that day to this I have hated the towns and what they stand for with a loathing only to be matched by men like John Ruskin and William Morris with their deep-seated disgust of the industrial civilisation.

But this is a projection into the twentieth century. By 1881 there is little to suggest that the depression had caused such distress or created such bitterness in the villages of the Vale amongst farmers or graziers. 20.

The Employment of Stock- and Dairy Hands.

The increased emphasis on live-stock farming in the seven villages of the study is not reflected in related occupational categories represented in the census. Nether Broughton, Long Clawson and Harby each had resident cattle-dealers, with each business remaining in the hands of a single family throughout the period. Farm workers identified as working with cattle e.g., cowboys, were few in any census, with only two or three in any village in a single census, except Long Clawson in 1861 when there were seven. By 1881 the designation had disappeared; it is obvious that even before this the general descriptions of
agricultural labourer or farm servant must have included cattle-men. Shepherds were also sparsely represented, only Long Clawson presenting the category in each census, with three in 1851, but only one in the later years. Goadby Marwood had one shepherd in 1851 and 1871, increased to two in 1861, while Wycomb had one in 1851 and Chadwell one in 1871. The only other entries are in Nether Broughton in 1871, and Hose in 1881. Whereas almost all the cow-hands lived in their employers' households, half the shepherds were themselves household heads. Very few of the cow-hands remained in the same village for more than one census, whereas several of the shepherds are identifiable as labourers in other censuses. Shepherds were more highly paid than other farm workers, with the possibility of substantial bonuses at shearing and lambing times, so they tended to be older men with experience, capable of working alone and unsupervised.21.

There is little evidence to confirm that dairying increased after 1870. In 1851 there were butter-dealers in Long Clawson and Hose, with a dairymaid and a milk-boy living on Long Clawson farms. In 1861 there were butter-dealers in Long Clawson and Nether Broughton, with two dairymaids in Long Clawson and four in Nether Broughton. There were also two dairymaids in Wycomb, one in Harby and one in Hose. By 1871 the only butter-dealer was in Hose, where there were then four dairymaids, with another in Harby. There were also two dairy managers, one of them female, at Nether Broughton. In 1881 however there is no record of any butter-dealer in the seven villages, nor of dairy managers, only two dairymaids at Nether Broughton, one at Harby, and a dairyman at Hose. Writing in 1881, Broderick commented on the increased reliance of farmers on middlemen to market their produce; it seems likely therefore that the local dealers were replaced by factors, perhaps in Melton or Leicester where cheese markets were regularly held.22.
Developments in the Dairying Industry.

Much of the work of the dairy was of course done by the farmer's wife and daughters, so is obscured in the census; while the status of 'farmer's wife' or 'farmer's daughter' implied involvement in the work of the farm, it tended to be read as implying, like 'housewife', a lack of economic activity. The contribution of the family was rarely accounted as part of the cost of running a farm; few farmers indeed had any system of adequate book-keeping, so the value of the income from the dairy could seldom be measured. Nevertheless, butter and cheese making were regarded as arts - 'almost every mistress of a dairy had some secret peculiarity or mystery, fancied or real, which was studiously kept from her equally clever neighbours. This was as it had always been'.

By the mid 1860s hygiene and a more scientific approach to dairying were beginning to be understood, and the new ideas propagated by farming journals. The British Farmers' Association was founded in 1876, and did much to promote them. The great problem in the production of butter and cheese seems to have been in producing a consistent quality; the manager of one Midlands hotel is reported as purchasing his butter supplies from Normandy simply because he could not buy a sufficient supply of dependable quality in the local market. The local press frequently reported on the varying quality on offer at cheese markets, commenting that while the best sold well there was no market for inferior products. For example, at Leicester Cheese Fair in May 1865, 'There was as much Stilton cheese as expected, but the quality was so indifferent that it would not be received into the warehouses of those in the trade'. Fussell tells us that the secret of Stilton manufacture lies in the freshness of the cream, which needs to be used as it is collected each morning, but that was not understood, and it was the richness of the pasture which was considered the essential element. John Wilson repeats the older theory of the importance of good grazing
land, and also that the cows should be fed grass only. He also states that most farm dairies in the Long Clawson area were not started before the mid '80s, so that this response to the changing market was too slow to be seen in the period of this study. Nevertheless, Mr. Coleman's dairy at Long Clawson New Hall won the first prize for Stilton at the 1879 Royal Show thus setting the example. Evidence given to the 1881 Royal Commission on Agriculture by another Mr. Coleman, an estate manager in Derby and adjoining counties, reiterates the problem of achieving high standards of cheese and butter production; in Derbyshire cheese factories had been set up in an effort to standardise quality. Mr. Coleman blamed farmers and their families, who would not take the trouble to learn the necessary skills; they 'were hardly so hard-working as their forefathers, and the dairymaids from the lower classes certainly did not do the work as they used to do twenty years ago'. While his opinion may well have been coloured by nostalgia, it is perhaps worth notice that dairy work was extremely demanding, in time and strength as well as expertise. Even William Howitt, whose book is an adulation of 'the extraordinary blessings and privileges of English rural life' in 1864, fails to make it sound anything other than very hard work.

The wife is ready to take a turn at the churn, or to turn up her gown-sleeves to the shoulders, and kneeling down on a straw cushion to press the sweet curd to the bottom of the cheese-pan. To boil the whey for making whey butter, to press the curd into the cheese-vats, place the new cheese in the press; to salt and turn, and look after those cheeses which are in the different stages of progress from perfect newness and white softness, to their investment with the unctuous coating of a goodly age ... she is ready to see that the calves are properly fed, and to bargain with the butcher for the fat ones; to feed her geese, turkeys, guinea fowls, and barn-door fowls; to see after the collection of eggs; how the milk is going on in the dairy, the cream churning, and moulding butter for sale.

It is understandable therefore that witnesses from
Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire told the 1881 Royal Commission of the reluctance of women to undertake dairy work, so that men had to be hired to do it.\textsuperscript{32} Alternatively, the farmer relied on his wife and daughters, whose unpaid work was considered to be 'a duty in the former case and a wholesome discipline in the latter'.\textsuperscript{33}

Some mechanical aids in the dairy were available by the mid 1850s; a cheese maker invented by Keevil and made in Birmingham was on sale, but there is no evidence of its acceptance in the Vale of Belvoir. Whereas mechanical milkers had been available since 1836, the \textit{Leicester Chronicle} surmised that a demonstration of 'the American Milking Machine ... will no doubt excite much interest on the part of agriculturists' at the Leicester and Waltham Agricultural Show held at Melton in September 1862, where it was obviously regarded as a novelty.\textsuperscript{34}

The national trade in liquid milk increased greatly during the 1860s, accelerated by the loss of town-kept cows in the cattle epidemics of that decade. It is possible that milk was taken by road from the Vale to Nottingham, but the more important outlet for midlands milk was in London via the railways. As an indication of increased demand, and the measure to which that demand was supplied via the railways, Grigg gives figures which show 4 million litres of milk sent by train into London in 1850, rising to 50 million in 1870, and again to 187 million by 1890.\textsuperscript{35}

Milk from the seven villages would have had to be taken by road to Melton or Bottesford to reach a railway before the joint line was opened in July 1879. It may be significant to notice that both attendance and the show of cattle at Melton Mowbray September Fair in 1879 were 'unusually large', and a 'fair amount' of business was reported to be done; at both Leicester and Market Harborough fairs of that season sales were described as 'very flat', so it may be that the new railway line had given some stimulation to the graziers of the Vale of Belvoir.
High Farming.

Before recounting the difficulties which farmers faced in the years after 1874, let us see what evidence there is of improvements made in the Vale in the era of High Farming. Caird's comment in 1851 that Leicestershire landlords had 'given little attention to the improvement of their estates' is widely quoted.36. E. L. Jones points out however that High Farming can be defined not only, as Caird had done, as the application of high investment to the improvement of farming land with the aim of increasing output, but also as 'any system which interlocks the growing of cereals and the keeping of either sheep and cattle'.37 As has already been suggested, both crop returns and census evidence imply that the latter definition had been met in the villages of this study. A farming diary kept by Henry Smith of Cropwell Butler shows that as early as 1843 he was using his land there, at Harby, and at Hickling, to combine wheat and barley growing with the cultivation of grass and the breeding of cows, pigs, horses and sheep, providing an example of mixed farming which extends into Nottinghamshire and Leicestershire areas of the Vale of Belvoir.38 Any increased investment is however much more difficult to assess. Some much needed drainage had been provided; as late as 1881 a land-drainer appeared in the Long Clawson census, although most landlords are said to have abandoned expenditure on drainage once the recession set in.

A notebook compiled in 1847 contains the initial observations made by a committee of the Waltham Agricultural Society on farms entered for a £30 prize offered by the Duke of Rutland to a farm within 15 miles of Waltham.39 Two of the farms offer a striking contrast. Mr. Bradford's farm at Stonesby seems to have been run on a three year rotation of parsnips, barley and oats or wheat. Parsnips were not fed with manure but with '10 bushels bones dissolved'. The whole of the farmyard manure from March onwards was used for beans or another spring crop. Thus the farm was
run without the purchase of additional manure. It is also noted that there was 'no pecuniary aid from the landlord for Repairs of Fencing or the Buildings'. Labour costs were calculated as averaging £374 a year.

For Mr. Beasley's farm at Harston we are given fewer details. However, the expenses for the year include amounts of £504.11.0 in labour, £43.6.8 in building, and a total of £116 on purchases of manure, lime and guano. £43.4.5 was also spent on labour in draining during 1847, and it is noted that the landlord found all the tiles for that draining. We do not know the result of the competition, nor do we know the identity of the landlords referred to. It is however possible that the Duke of Rutland was Mr. Beasley's landlord, since drainage formed part of his efforts towards 'the foundation of that great agricultural improvement from which the estates have derived so much benefit', commented upon in the memorial notice published after his death in 1857. The fifth Duke also understood the importance of manure, since in the lean seasons of the early '50s he required that the rent remissions he gave should be spent entirely on extra manure. 40.

The Shipman notebooks make no mention of expenses of drainage at Croxton Kerrial, nor of the purchase of artificial fertilisers. During the winter of 1852 however £7 was paid to the Manchester Concentrated Manure Co., and in 1867 42 tons of manure were purchased from Smith of Nottingham. Mr. Shipman was a member of the Royal Agricultural Society, and would have been aware of publicity given to modern farming methods. 41. The local agricultural societies were formed with the aim of promoting such publicity, holding regular shows and competitions to encourage progressive farming. Until 1862 Waltham had its own Agricultural Association, but then being in debt, it amalgamated with the Leicester society, so that thereafter the annual show was not as often held in the Vale of Belvoir area. 42.

A leading article in the Leicester Chronicle in August 1864 questioned whether, despite the excellence of its cattle
show, the Leicester and Waltham Agricultural Society did enough to inform its readers of the latest developments in agricultural science. It urged graziers in particular to pay more attention to hygiene and to the provision of irrigation in pastures in dry seasons. 'If we are told of the expense, we ask whether it is less expensive to pay for labour and machinery to irrigate the meadows, or to allow sheep and cattle to perish of hunger and thirst wholesale'.

We cannot tell whether this article had any particular relevance to the Vale of Belvoir, but the strictures on hygiene were certainly to be repeated in the autumn of the following year when 'cattle plague' became a threat.

Threshing machines were in use in the Vale before 1851, and Melton Mowbray magistrates declared in that year that, as implements of husbandry, they would be exempt from toll on turnpike roads. Most such machines were hired as needed, and the report of an incident in Harby in 1855 in which 19 year old Edward Hallam was killed by a threshing machine makes it clear that it was the custom to 'wet' the machine as it passed through the village, the farmer, or perhaps the proprietor of the machine, offering drinks to the villagers and so helping to ensure that there would be no resistance to its use. William Shipman took out an insurance policy in 1853, annual premium £1.6.3, on a steam engine, thrashing part and cover, valued at £250. It bore the nameplate Richard Hornsby and Son, which was 'to be in place at time of accident'. In Harby, John Moulds described himself as an engineer and engine driver in 1851, and as a machine owner in 1861. In 1871 he was farming and keeping the Black Horse Inn at Hose, but his two sons, Henry and Samuel, were described as machinists. In 1881 the men of the family were absent, but Joseph's wife, now back in Harby, still described herself as 'machinist's wife'. Threshing machines were specifically mentioned in Chadwell in the 1861 census, when William Shelton described himself as a feeder of a threshing machine, and also at Nether Broughton in 1871 when Stephen Cowley drove one. Joseph Cooke of Long Clawson was a 'letter out of Agricultural
machines for hire' in 1851, but in 1861 specified that he was proprietor of a 'steam thrashing machine.' By 1871 and 1881 it was his son John who was described as 'machinist'.

John Wilson tells us that the Coleman estate at Long Clawson was one of the first in the midlands to be mechanised, and describes the Coleman and Co. steam ploughing set. It consisted of a portable engine, moved by a horse team, with two winding drums dragging a five furrow plough back and forth across the field. Wilson gives us no date for the acquisition of this machine, but tells us that John Cooke, the machinist already mentioned, supervised it for Mr. Coleman. Cooke moved to another Coleman property in Bedfordshire for a time, but returned to Long Clawson when that estate was sold some time after 1875.47.

Another ploughing engine was seen in the streets of Melton in August 1863, apparently of a much more advanced kind, as it was self-propelling.48.

The inhabitants of Melton were startled on Friday evening last by the appearance in their streets of one of Fowler's monster engines, which had been purchased by Mr. Sharman for Mr. Percy of Garthorpe. It is a fourteen horse traction engine, with four furrow patent balance plough and cultivator complete, and its cost was £955. On its arrival by rail, steam was got up, and it moved majestically homewards, turning the corners of the streets without difficulty, and it appeared to be under perfect control ... Those farmers and gentlemen who are interested in these novel implements may see this one at work daily on Mr. Pacey's farm during the present dry season. We have reason to be proud of having in our neighbourhood a farmer of so much enterprise, and we heartily wish him success.

Machinery as expensive as this was obviously available to very few farmers; there is no evidence in the locality that machines other than threshing machines were available for hire, though they may have been shared or borrowed among neighbours. Fourteen years after the delivery of Mr. Percy's (Pacey's ?) engine, children at Hickling arrived late for school because they had stopped on their way along Broughton Lane to see a cultivator at work, which it seems was still a novelty.49.
As in the rest of the country, it seems therefore that the use of machinery made slow progress in the Vale of Belvoir. By 1880 the shortage of labour was only just beginning to be felt, so that even large-scale farmers felt little need to invest in machinery, and on smaller farms it would be some time before machinery was efficient enough to become indispensable.

Golden Age and Depression.

If we attempt to trace the pattern of 'Golden Age' into 'Depression' in the Melton Mowbray area through newspaper reports of harvests, fairs and weather, we find that it is less distinct than Lord Ernle's definition would imply. This may be in part of course because of the natural pessimism for which farmers are notorious. Newspaper comments inevitably reflected alarmist views of prices or the weather, and perhaps exaggerated reports of local triumphs. Nevertheless, the protectionist meetings which Lord John Manners and Mr. Packe were organising in the county in 1850 seem inappropriate when compared with a report on the harvest of that year, which stated that grain prices in the county were good, while it was sheep and cattle of all kinds for which prices were low.\(^{50}\) The sentiments of the editor of the Liberal Leicester Chronicle are revealed in an item printed the following June under the headline 'Agricultural Distress', which reported the marriage of a farmer's daughter in the county in a dress which 'did not cost less than one hundred pounds', and where there were ten carriages in attendance.\(^{51}\)

In August 1854, well into that 'Golden Age', harvest in the Vale of Belvoir was reported as delayed by corn being only partially ripened, and with crops in places thin and short. However, by November grain prices in the county were good, the best wheat fetching 80s. per quarter. Fat beef and mutton were fetching 6d. per lb., but the dryness of the past summer had created a shortage of fodder.\(^{52}\)
The cut of both natural and artificial grasses for fodder cannot be estimated at more than one-half the produce of ordinary years, and the grazing pastures have been so scanty of food, that stock have with difficulty obtained enough to keep them in moderate condition. ... Unless the winter should prove of a mild character, we fear great losses in stock are to be apprehended, without great care be taken of them. From this scarcity of grass, all milking beasts have yielded less produce to the dairy by about one third than in abundant seasons; and the better kind of feeding stock, even on the best grazing land, have not made that progress as to fit them for the butcher by the usual time without the appliance of extraneous food, which, being expensive, the grazier will not realize much profit, though meat has fetched a high price.

In the autumn of 1857 Melton October Fair produced a larger show of stock than ever before. However, unfavourable news from America, and 'monetary pressure' were blamed for a substantial drop in prices from former levels, by as much as £1 to £1.10.0 per head. By 1862 conditions for graziers had improved, and a fat stock sale held on the Duke of Rutland's farm at Belvoir produced a show of beasts whose 'beautiful condition elicited warm eulogies'. More importantly, prices were good, with 160 sheep sold at an average of £3 per head, oxen at £26.7.9, and cows at £24.14.9. A fine bull fetched as much as £40. An autumn fair in Melton in 1863 attracted buyers from Norfolk, a large amount of business being done, and with prices higher by 10s. a head than the previous year. The improved state of the turnip crops and the recent rain were thought to have produced the improved quality.

The summer of 1865, ten years before depression struck, demonstrated that weather which was helpful to graziers could be unwelcome to farmers whose interest was in grain. While Melton Lammas Fair saw 'remarkably high' prices paid for beef and store cattle, and for sheep, farmers were struggling to get in the harvest between constant showers, and finding signs of mildew in their crops. However, cattle plague was beginning to threaten, and by the autumn of that year Melton markets were closed. Throughout 1866
only sheep and horses could be sold at Melton market, and again that year heavy rainfall made harvest very difficult. While conditions governing their profitability are so often outside farmers' control, they are not always adverse; in July 1870 for example, it was reported that following the declaration of war between France and Prussia, wheat was fetching 6s. to 8s per quarter more in Melton market.\(^{54}\)

If newspapers give little evidence of a Golden Age for Vale of Belvoir farmers, they make very clear the immediate effects of the bad weather which contributed to the depression which followed. In an assessment of the 1874 harvest, the Mark Lane Express commented on the poor figures for Leicestershire, with under average crops, picking out turnips and mangolds as having done particularly badly in the Melton district, while hay had yielded less than half a normal crop. Only potatoes in the area had achieved an average, disease-free crop. At the 1875 April Fair at Melton Mowbray the great scarcity of feed led to very poor prices being paid for store cattle, while the few beasts fattened for slaughter were 'fearfully dear'. At Waltham Fair in September 1876, although horses and sheep sold well, store cattle fetched lower prices than ever.\(^{55}\)

A report in the Leicester Chronicle in February 1877 on the county's agriculture commented on the incessant rain, which had made everything backward.\(^{56}\)

> Slugs, snails, and other insects have hitherto reigned rampant ... The cattle yards, in a large number of instances, are in a most pitiable state, due to the shortness of fodder and the incessant rains. Numbers of cattle, where short of hovel room, are hardly ever dry from one week to another.

Two weeks later the story was reiterated. While there had been a massive increase in the amount of land devoted to pasture, the years since 1874 had seen a decline in the numbers of sheep and cattle. The Leicester Chronicle accounted for the decline as follows:\(^{57}\):

> The fear of foot and mouth disease was very general, and small farmers were afraid to
make their business success depend too exclusively on animals which at any time were subject to loss by disease. Then in 1875 there was a short hay crop; and in the long winter which followed keeping ran short, and farmers who could get a great price in the markets from the butchers sent their sheep and cattle to the shambles.

The 1877 wheat harvest was reported to be below average in quantity and quality in the Vale of Belvoir as in the rest of the county. However, pastures were reported as fresh and green, and Melton Mowbray Cattle Market that October found ready buyers for large numbers of beasts at good prices. Nevertheless, an agricultural review of the year published the following January summarised it as 'one of almost unparalleled depression in every department of trade and agriculture', and sounded a note of alarm at the amount of meat being imported from America.58.

July 1878 brought reports of grazing pastures being brown and burnt from lack of rain, while in the following summer the plaint was once more of too much rain. Mr. Nuttall of the Manor House, Beeby, wrote of north Leicestershire in the Agricultural Gazette:-59.

The Crops of Corn are very bad and very full of weeds in this neighbourhood, and there never was a worse prospect for the farmer. Barleys on the clays are well-nigh perished, and in many instances look like scarcely yielding seed again. Mangols are nearly gone, and those left are choked by weeds, and with this continued wet weather there is no chance of clearing them. Clovers alone are good. Fallows are simply green fields, and must be a season lost on them. Beans and peas generally bad. Wool bad in quality, and crops of lambs very indifferent and generally in weak condition. Altogether, the prospect is very disheartening.

As noted above, Melton September Fair in 1879 was reported as unusually large, as contrasted with other fairs in the county which saw only poor trading. The reporter at the Plough Day Fair in January 1880 commented on the distress being felt in the area as it was affected by the great agricultural depression, but noted that goo
animals still sold at fair average prices. As the summer of 1880 brought nothing but cold dry weather the shortage of pasture and fodder became acute, so that trade at the Melton Mowbray Whitsun Fair, despite a large attendance of people who came by train, remained very poor, and a scarcity of cash was notable. 60.

Despite the arrival of much needed rain in June, trade in the Melton area remained very slack, and by late August the Leicester Chronicle reported 'everybody requiring money of everybody, and everybody finding it impossible to get it from those who owe it to them'. Waltham Fair that September was 'dull and slow', and the shortage of money was reflected in low wages offered at Melton Mowbray Martinmas Market, 'farmers feeling very naturally that they could not pay as aforetime'. The closing of the cattle market in January 1881, because of an outbreak of cattle plague, brought the comment that things were 'wearing a very serious aspect, and the prospect for farmers and tradesmen in this part is anything but encouraging'. This was reiterated in February, when the situation was summed up - 'Work is scarce, and trade is bad. Melton has never before experienced such times'. 61.

The picture which emerges therefore is one of constant difficulty for farmers and graziers alike. While the 'Golden Age' presented problems which are too easily glossed over by that definition, the depression brought acute problems to graziers, so that any idea that conversion to pasture provided an escape is scotched. In addition to the vagaries of climate, graziers were faced with the problem of animal epidemics, and it is with an account of these, and the methods which were adopted to control them, that this chapter will end.
Dealing with Animal Epidemic.

The period with which we are concerned saw two waves of animal epidemics, one in the mid 1860s, and another beginning in 1878. What is striking is that the epidemics were not of a single disease, nor amongst a single type of animal; cows, sheep and pigs were afflicted, although it seems that the worst losses were amongst the cattle. The Vale of Belvoir was perhaps less affected than some other areas, the epidemics arriving later and clearing more quickly than in some other places, probably because of steps taken to contain them.

The first note of alarm in the area was sounded in July 1865, when a Goadby Marwood farmer, Simpson Ellaby, was prosecuted and fined for allowing sheep infected with the scab to graze on the highway between Six Hills and Eastwell. A month later came a report of murrain amongst cattle, particularly in the London area, and small-pox amongst sheep on the South Downs. Readers were informed that a society was to be formed to prevent the spread of contagious diseases, and to try to persuade farmers to destroy infected cattle by offering them financial compensation. An editorial drew the attention of farmers to the need for a greater awareness of hygiene in caring for beasts. 62.

Over the next six months the Leicester Chronicle carried letters and articles arguing claims over the source of cattle plague. The favourite argument was that it was brought in by cattle imported from abroad, but this was disputed. At Melton Lammas Fair, although local cattle sold well, 'Welsh cows were quite unsaleable, in consequence of the dread of cattle plague'. 63.

In September 1865 a group of farmers and graziers meeting in Melton decided to enrol local farmers into a society to provide an insurance against cattle plague. Three local veterinary surgeons were appointed as inspectors of cattle, two from Melton and Mr. Goodall of Waltham. Within a fortnight there were 200 members, and the deadline for enrolment was extended by another two weeks. The Duke of Rutland
had offered his support, promising to contribute as much to the society as his tenants paid in subscriptions - 'an example, it is hoped, that will not be lost upon other landlords in the neighbourhood'. In late October 'cattle plague' was named as rinderpest, and Melton market was closed for six weeks as a precaution. By 18 November the markets were totally suspended, and an official notice was displayed to that effect, signed by local magistrates George Norman (of Goadby Marwood) and H. C. Bingham. 64.

Mr. Norman was in the chair of a meeting at Melton of farmers and magistrates in December which called for the slaughter of all imported cattle at the port of entry. 65.

Some conversation ensued upon the advisability of a more extended system of insurance than the present local organisation, which would be found quite inadequate to meet an emergency, should it arise, and the Chairman recommended that Mr. Oldham should write to the Clerk of the Peace for Hertfordshire, for instructions upon the admirable plan of county insurance established there, and highly recommended by Mr. Disraeli, with a view to its adoption in this county.

At the end of 1865, the Privy Council prohibited any movement of livestock, and before the end of January, James Rouse was fined for moving heifers from Hose to Stathern without a licence. The precautions proved effective in Leicestershire, and in February the county was still relatively free of cattle plague, with no fresh cases. The Leicester Chronicle commented: -66.

It is to be hoped that, by rigid attention to ventilation, cleanliness in the shed and yard, drainage, the supply of pure water and good food, and the keeping of healthy animals apart from those which are diseased, the graziers of Leicestershire may sustain fewer losses than those of adjoining counties, if they do not escape altogether.

After such expressions of optimism, perhaps it is not surprising that the editor should react with indignation to the order requiring the slaughter of all infected cattle which was made in March: -67.

It is the spirit of panic - we might say madness - which prompts this wild system
of slaughtering to prevail without protest in the County of Leicester? - We have at least this consolation - it must come to an end.

In April the cattle plague was reported as being at last on the decline, and the editor of the Leicester Chronicle took the opportunity for a further tirade against the 'unwarranted' slaughter of cattle. In early May Melton market was reopened, at least for trade in sheep and pigs, but not before Simpson Ellaby had again been charged with 'unlawfully depasturing 2 sheep and 3 lambs on the highway ... the same being infected with the small-pox'.

A report from Leicestershire Midsummer Sessions in July 1866 suggests that the optimism about the county's escape from cattle plague had been misplaced. A county scheme of insurance had been set up, presumably on the Hertfordshire model as suggested earlier, and a rate imposed. All contributions had been paid, and more than £2,200 had been raised. However, claims for compensation already exceeded £2,800, and more were expected, so a further rate was to be levied. 69.

At the end of July, when it seemed that the disease had left the county, rinderpest struck cows belonging to Matthew Bishop at Nether Broughton. The magistrates declared the area within one mile radius of the farm as a restricted district and Melton fair in August saw only sheep and horses for sale. The rest of the county was confirmed as free of disease, but the Nether Broughton area remained closed; Thomas Brex was fined 3s. and costs in September for moving two cows out of the village. Despite petitions in February and April 1867 the magistrates refused to reopen Melton market to cattle. In May, James Barlow of Chadwell was prosecuted for moving two cows on a road between Wycomb and Scalford, after sunset. A system of cattle orders licensing the removal of cattle operated in the county for some time after this, but presumably the alarm gradually died down. Melton market seems eventually to have reopened without press comment. 70.

In September 1878 cattle plague was once more a major
concern, and the Quarter Sessions Justices were required to form a committee to organise the county's defences. Veterinary Inspectors were appointed for each area of the county, and included Francis and Baring Talbot for Belvoir, and Henry Goodall, George Eaton and Robert Littler (of Long Clawson) for Melton Mowbray. From mid-October when Twyford was declared an infected area, fresh reports were received each week of outbreaks of pleuro-pneumonia, foot-and-mouth disease, glanders and sheep scab in various parts of the county, but with nothing nearer to the Vale of Belvoir it seems than Garthorpe. It was agreed that the cost of slaughtering diseased animals should be borne by the county, and 65 claims were met. Veterinary expenses of £329.17.10 were paid for the first quarter of the committee's operations, including £50.9.6 to Messrs. Goodall, Eaton and Littler. On 11 January 1879, sheep scab was reported on the premises of Mr. H. M. Orson at Harby, spread over six fields. The following six months saw continued outbreaks, with typhoid fever in swine adding to the list. In June there was sheep scab at Melton Mowbray and pleuro-pneumonia amongst cattle belonging to Mrs. Carter at Goadby Marwood. The Melton veterinaries claimed the highest portion of expenses in the county for the half year - £61.9.0 between them. There was pleuro-pneumonia at Eaton in July, and also at Long Clawson, while pigs at the Huckerby farm at Hose were stricken with typhoid. Swine fever ran through farms at Redmile, Bottesford and Long Clawson for the rest of that year, while sheep scab appeared at Bottesford, Nether Broughton and Long Clawson. Nevertheless, fewer claims were made in the half year than in the corresponding period of 1878, £224.1.0 covering 43 claims. Inspectors' bills were very high however, totalling £416.9.6, of which £64.16.6 was claimed by the Melton vets.

On 28 February 1880 the committee could record for the first time that there were no reports of fresh infections, and the only cases in the Belvoir area for the half year were of sheep scab at Old Dalby in March, and swine fever at Hose in June. Only 17 claims for compensation were made, and Inspectors' expenses were correspondingly low.
In July and August however there were several cases of swine fever in the Melton Mowbray area, and an outbreak of pleuro pneumonia at Scalford. In October cases of sheep scab were reported on the Duke of Rutland's farms at Harston and Knipton, and others followed at Nether Broughton and Melton in the next month. By the end of December there had been 18 claims for compensation in the county, but some of these had been for outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease, and it was the threat posed by this disease which caused the committee anxiety. It was decided to request the Privy Council to declare the whole county an infected area, as had already been done in the counties of Northampton and Derby. No licences were to be issued for markets, fairs or sales. During January 1881 there were outbreaks at AbKettleby, Long Clawson, Asfordby and Melton, while sheep scab reappeared at Stathern. In attempts to stem the spread of infection it was agreed that any animals sold at Leicester Borough market should be slaughtered before they left the town, and a restriction was also placed upon the removal of dung from infected areas.

On 21 May there were reported to be 27 new cases of foot-and-mouth disease in the county, three of them in the Melton area, and two days later Earl Spencer, Lord President of the Council, finally declared Leicestershire an infected area. A deputation from Melton Mowbray was sent to plead that Melton market should be kept open, and after some discussion it was agreed that the magistrates should be empowered to grant licences for the holding of public sales of animals intended for immediate slaughter. Following the restriction of the county, veterinary inspectors could claim not only expenses, but also a fee for issuing licences for the movement of cattle. The largest claim in the county was made by Mr. Hack of the Leicester area, who claimed £149.16.0 for issuing 2,996 licences. Only £37.9.0 of this was allowed. Mr. Littler in the Melton district was also deemed to have over-claimed, asking for £59.18.0 for issuing 1,198 licences, and was granted £15. Mr. Goodall asked for and obtained £17.2.6
In early June the committee received a delegation of farmers complaining of losses they were suffering through the closing of markets while those in neighbouring counties were open. They requested that animals certified as free from disease might be exempt from the order demanding their slaughter upon sale. A representative put this before Earl Spencer, who refused to relax the rule, but suggested that areas where no disease was present might be excluded from the restriction order. This idea was rejected, as it seemed too difficult to define areas whose borders were distinct; a suggestion that the Petty Sessional divisions might be used was not acceptable as the public did not know the boundaries.

By 20 August 1881 however a request to the Privy Council to declare the northern division of the county (with the exception of Ashby parish) free from infection was agreed, and by 15 October the whole county was released. Some cases of sheep scab continued to be reported, including some at Stathern and Burton Lazars before the end of the year. There were also a few new cases of foot-and-mouth disease, but on 17 December 1881 the county was declared quite free of disease.

The Committee continued in existence until February 1884 with some cases still arising. Melton Mowbray was one of the 11 infected parishes in that month. The Committee realised however that every possible measure was now provided in legislation, particularly in that restricting the movement of beasts from infected areas. There were still prosecutions for non-compliance, and magistrates were encouraged to treat them severely - 'severity in such cases is true kindness to the whole community'. Much had been learnt in the management of epidemic, and even where farmers were impatient of the restrictions the experience was to be to their benefit in future years.
Summary.

While there is evidence of a widespread conversion to pasture farming in this part of Leicestershire during the second half of the nineteenth century, the change formed part of a development which had begun much earlier, probably with the enclosure of the Duke of Rutland's estate. The conversion of arable land to pasture did not present a simple and immediate answer to the problems of the depression; despite growing technical expertise, both farmers and graziers remained at the mercy of the weather while foreign competition grew. While Vale of Belvoir graziers may have suffered less direct losses of herds through epidemic than farmers elsewhere, the restrictions on marketing and moving animals also brought hardship.

There is little to suggest that the 'Golden Age' had given farmers much opportunity to build up reserves, and by 1881 neither mechanisation nor the expansion of the dairy trade appear to have made major contributions to the prosperity of the area.

On the other hand, there is no evidence that the early years of the depression created greater insecurity in farm holdings; it may of course be that the less successful farms changed hands more often than is revealed by the census, but without adequate farm accounts or estate papers such rapid changes of occupancy are not obvious. Tenants of the Duke of Rutland were protected as the depression continued by remissions of rent, so that it was the landowner not the tenant farmer who bore the brunt.

Although central legislation provided the strongest weapons in the control of animal epidemic, it was a local committee of landowners and other interested parties who operated the controls and made local decisions. Agriculture remained an area in which local conditions, local needs, and local decisions were of greatest importance in the response to national trends, and, as the next chapter will show, where the influence of the landlord over his tenant was more keenly felt than that of central government.
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### Table 9. Occupational Groups Shown as Percentages of Segments of Population Drawn from Various Birth-Place Areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Within 5 miles</th>
<th>Leeds</th>
<th>East Midlands</th>
<th>Elsewhere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1861.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agr. trades</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consumer trades</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quarries, transport</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dom. service</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No earned income</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agr. trades</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consumer trades</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quarries, transport</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dom. service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No earned income</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agr. trades</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consumer trades</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quarries, transport</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dom. service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No earned income</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agr. trades</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consumer trades</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quarries, transport</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dom. service</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No earned income</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Computer figures are shown here and elsewhere corrected to the nearest per cent except where they fall short of 1% when they are shown to the nearest decimal place. Totals do not therefore invariably amount to 100%.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Same village</th>
<th>Within 5 miles</th>
<th>Leics.</th>
<th>East Midlands</th>
<th>Elsewhere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural trades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer trades, including textiles and building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarries, railway, road and canal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical services, arts and professions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>1.445</td>
<td>1.669</td>
<td>1.410</td>
<td>1.181</td>
<td>1.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grass</td>
<td>1.110</td>
<td>1.588</td>
<td>1.380</td>
<td>1.290</td>
<td>1.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barley</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>0.312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page).
### TABLE 11 (cont’d).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wheat</th>
<th>Barley</th>
<th>Oats</th>
<th>Beans</th>
<th>Peas</th>
<th>Potatoes</th>
<th>Turnips &amp;</th>
<th>Swedes</th>
<th>Mangolds</th>
<th>Carrots</th>
<th>Cabbage</th>
<th>Vetches</th>
<th>Clover for Hay</th>
<th>Bare fallow</th>
<th>Permanent grass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADWELL &amp; WYCOMB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>479</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>533</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>469</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>515</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **HARBY** |       |        |      |       |      |          |           |         |          |         |         |        |                |             |                |
| 1866     | 317   | 80     | 54   | 149   | 30   | 7        | 12        | 13      | -        | 39      | 96      | 66     | 775             |             |                |
| 1867     | 301   | 90     | 59   | 131   | 46   | 4        | 8         | 17      | -        | 34      | 83      | 73     | 998             |             |                |
| 1870     | 328   | 84     | 92   | 85    | 40    | 11       | 41        | 13      | 1        | 26      | 77      | 43     | 1,052           |             |                |
| 1875     | 273   | 118    | 73   | 55    | 6     | 19       | 19        | 19      | 1        | 24      | 137     | 112    | 1,057           |             |                |
| 1877     | 221   | 88     | 42   | 51    | 29    | 3        | 9         | 16      | 1        | 15      | 182     | 83     | 1,062           |             |                |
| 1880     | 197   | 110    | 45   | 67    | 27    | 3        | 2         | 18      | 1        | 6       | 75       | 103    | 1,192           |             |                |
| 1881     | 202   | 56     | 69   | 73    | 9     | 8        | 13        | 15      | 1        | 1       | 7       | 112    | 134             | 1,228       |                |
| 1885     | 164   | 22     | 85   | 59    | 24    | 2        | 10        | 25      | 1        | 14      | 155     | 73     | 1,379           |             |                |

| **HOSE** |       |        |      |       |      |          |           |         |          |         |         |        |                |             |                |
| 1866     | 267   | 114    | 52   | 181   | 49    | 3        | 10        | 10      | -        | -       | 19      | 50     | 90               | 1,044       |                |
| 1867     | 272   | 124    | 57   | 98    | 42    | 1        | 25        | 16      | -        | -       | 28      | 58     | 87               | 1,207       |                |
| 1870     | 356   | 115    | 80   | 59    | 63    | 4        | 22        | 14      | -        | -       | 26      | 185    | 93               | +           |                |
| 1875     | 271   | 106    | 32   | 102   | 25    | 3        | 11        | 20      | -        | -       | 21      | 104    | 86               | 1,445       |                |
| 1877     | 253   | 101    | 38   | 88    | 37    | 11       | 20        | 20      | -        | -       | 15      | 191    | 120              | 1,277       |                |
| 1880     | 194   | 103    | 91   | 50    | 16    | 3        | 29        | 13      | -        | -       | 3       | 141    | 121              | 1,431       |                |
| 1881     | 188   | 93     | 142  | 47    | 22    | 3        | 6         | 15      | -        | 1       | 13      | 118    | 217              | 1,370       |                |
| 1885     | 262   | 26     | 49   | 87    | 12    | 2        | 12        | 16      | -        | 16      | 213     | 98     | 1,147            |             |                |

+ denotes figure missing or illegible.

(Fractions of acres ignored)
## TABLE 12. EXTRACTS FROM AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS, 1867-'88. LEICESTERSHIRE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>43,679</td>
<td>32,004</td>
<td>20,663</td>
<td>115,764</td>
<td>12,121</td>
<td>7,210</td>
<td>2,041</td>
<td>15,418</td>
<td>4,097</td>
<td>9,176</td>
<td>23,330</td>
<td>257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>43,416</td>
<td>31,940</td>
<td>20,791</td>
<td>115,107</td>
<td>11,870</td>
<td>6,952</td>
<td>1,638</td>
<td>16,196</td>
<td>4,211</td>
<td>10,817</td>
<td>25,980</td>
<td>274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>47,947</td>
<td>31,395</td>
<td>21,271</td>
<td>116,653</td>
<td>9,478</td>
<td>6,408</td>
<td>2,184</td>
<td>16,862</td>
<td>3,829</td>
<td>9,064</td>
<td>27,009</td>
<td>278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>44,404</td>
<td>33,493</td>
<td>20,866</td>
<td>111,170</td>
<td>8,691</td>
<td>3,551</td>
<td>1,533</td>
<td>14,631</td>
<td>5,321</td>
<td>10,179</td>
<td>28,435</td>
<td>293</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>34,778</td>
<td>29,165</td>
<td>22,032</td>
<td>94,090</td>
<td>5,560</td>
<td>2,467</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>12,650</td>
<td>4,785</td>
<td>16,709</td>
<td>27,923</td>
<td>312</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>28,567</td>
<td>20,434</td>
<td>20,081</td>
<td>79,678</td>
<td>5,586</td>
<td>1,911</td>
<td>2,104</td>
<td>13,925</td>
<td>4,227</td>
<td>10,150</td>
<td>30,862</td>
<td>329</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Milk cows</th>
<th>Other cattle</th>
<th>Sheep</th>
<th>Pigs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 2 years</td>
<td>- 2 years +</td>
<td>1 year +</td>
<td>- 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>29,336</td>
<td>27,340</td>
<td>32,439</td>
<td>203,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>31,303</td>
<td>34,453</td>
<td>49,292</td>
<td>293,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>33,328</td>
<td>25,238</td>
<td>51,165</td>
<td>290,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>33,567</td>
<td>41,153</td>
<td>62,128</td>
<td>296,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>32,908</td>
<td>39,228</td>
<td>54,676</td>
<td>239,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>42,270</td>
<td>49,301</td>
<td>58,174</td>
<td>202,965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: - Agricultural Returns of Great Britain. H.M.S.O. 7506/1
### TABLE 13. EXTRACTS FROM ABSTRACTS OF SCHEDULES FOR RETURNS OF LIVESTOCK.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Milk cows</th>
<th>Other cattle</th>
<th>Sheep</th>
<th>Pigs</th>
<th>Horses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 2 years</td>
<td>2 years +</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>- 1 year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NETHR BROUGHTON</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1,151</td>
<td>807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **LOCU CLAISON** |          |              |       |      |        |
| 1860           | 254       | 192          | 162   | 1,169| 400    |
| 1867           | 12        | 27           | 31    | 148  | 65     |
| 1870           | 269       | 333          | 157   | 1,659| 680    |
| 1875           | 261       | 441          | 258   | 1,687| 809    |
| 1877           | 301       | 323          | 190   | 1,676| 900    |
| 1880           | 316       | 287          | 296   | 747  | 383    |
| 1882           | 318       | 310          | 283   | 2,483| 269    |
| 1885           | 423       | 215          | 336   | 661  | 605    |

| **GADDBY MARKWOOD** |          |              |       |      |        |
| 1860           | 52        | 87           | 182   | 649  | 340    |
| 1867           | 70        | 109          | 127   | 1,632| 668    |
| 1870           | 88        | 109          | 145   | 882  | 571    |
| 1875           | 58        | 127          | 145   | 1,190| 596    |
| 1877           | 73        | 137          | 148   | 1,066| 597    |
| 1880           | 68        | 138          | 134   | 1,975| 747    |
| 1882           | 62        | 130          | 134   | 1,111| 442    |
| 1885           | 90        | 148          | 141   | 1,008| 492    |

| **SEARDWELL & UTCHE** |          |              |       |      |        |
| 1860           | 46        | 87           | 66    | 948  | 430    |
| 1867           | 54        | 63           | 54    | 714  | 484    |
| 1875           | 37        | 96           | 90    | 770  | 436    |
| 1877           | 39        | 95           | 67    | 750  | 436    |
| 1880           | 31        | 101          | 79    | 629  | 417    |
| 1881           | 48        | 79           | 75    | 583  | 302    |
| 1885           | 83        | 91           | 75    | 495  | 262    |

| **HARPT** |          |              |       |      |        |
| 1860           | 146       | 96           | 133   | 240  | 344    |
| 1867           | 164       | 84           | 141   | 578  | 486    |
| 1870           | 175       | 155          | 137   | 736  | 379    |
| 1875           | 166       | 126          | 132   | 792  | 350    |
| 1877           | 162       | 157          | 142   | 777  | 120    |
| 1880           | 146       | 169          | 207   | 586  | 437    |
| 1881           | 157       | 141          | 218   | 213  | 69     |
| 1885           | 249       | 138          | 222   | 387  | 199    |

| **MOSE** |          |              |       |      |        |
| 1860           | 108       | 117          | 141   | 562  | 203    |
| 1867           | 186       | 156          | 148   | 826  | 353    |
| 1870           | 217       | 172          | 262   | 879  | 140    |
| 1875           | 150       | 228          | 145   | 1,085| 382    |
| 1877           | 161       | 180          | 105   | 920  | 423    |
| 1880           | 247       | 216          | 190   | 965  | 392    |
| 1881           | 248       | 213          | 151   | 619  | 213    |
| 1885           | 257       | 120          | 227   | 393  | 145    |

* denotes figure missing or illegible.

Source - Leicester County Record Office. MF 174
### TABLE 14. HEADS OF HOUSEHOLD DESCRIBED ON CENSUS AS 'FARMER'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nether Broughton</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Clawson</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goadby Marwood</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadwell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wycomb</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harby</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hose</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HEADS OF HOUSEHOLD DESCRIBED ON CENSUS AS 'GRAZIER'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nether Broughton</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Clawson</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goadby Marwood</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadwell</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wycomb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harby</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hose</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5 - LANDLORD AND TENANT

The structure of authority in England had been built upon the ownership of land. Despite the distribution of smallholdings and common land amongst the lower orders of society, the edifice of authority rested upon the ownership of large estates. As late as 1848 Disraeli thought it worth putting himself deeply into debt to acquire an estate and country house at Hughenden to bolster his ambitions to achieve high office in government. The swelling tide of enclosures in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries reflected the determination of landowners to rationalise their holdings, and, by using modern methods, to make them as profitable as possible to ensure their continuation.

There was no general intention at enclosure to deprive the smallholder of his land; in the Vale of Belvoir, where enclosure was used to convert much of the land to pasture for animal husbandry, some villages even showed an increase in the number of land holdings in the following decades. Nevertheless, there were problems which beset the smallholder which did not diminish during the nineteenth century. In 1768 Young had written:

"Indeed I regard these small occupiers as a set of very miserable men. They fare extremely hard, work without intermission like a horse, and practise every lesson of diligence and frugality without being able to soften their present lot. All the comfort they have, which the labourer does not possess, lies in the hope of increasing their little stock enough to take a larger farm; but this is not effected so often as many people may imagine."

In 1775, Kent had deplored 'the destructive practice which has prevailed for near half a century back of demolishing small farms'. In the nineteenth century, Chambers and Mingay identify a long-term tendency to larger and more efficient farms, even before techniques of high farming and increasing use of machinery made them more desirable.

However, changes which were perceived as taking place are not always reflected in statistics. Using returns for 1851
and 1885, Clapham shows that whereas 4.5 per cent of the total acreage in the country reported on in 1851 had been in farms of more than 1,000 acres, only 2.7 per cent were so constituted in 1885, and at the same time the percentage of land farmed in parcels of less than 100 acres had risen from 21.6 per cent to 28.5 per cent. While the total acreage in each category below 500 acres was greater in 1885 than in 1851, suggesting an improvement in the collection of data, the acreage of farms over 500 acres fell by nearly 800,000. It seems, then, that whereas greater size had seemed to offer greater efficiency and therefore greater stability, it did not provide protection against the depression of the 1880s; as we have already seen, the Coleman farm at Long Clawson was eventually to collapse under the pressure.

F. M. L. Thompson traces the declining influence of the landed classes in nineteenth century England as industrialisation brought new perceptions of class structure in society and changing attitudes towards the status of land ownership. To Martin Weiner, these social changes 'meant that by the middle of the nineteenth century there was no longer a rural society distinctly different from the national society based in the cities'. So in a discussion of landownership it is necessary to consider the relationships which it created, and to see whether there are any signs of changing attitudes over the short period under review. Whatever may have been the perceptions (or lack of them) of class, the census makes it clear that, taking domestic servants as a measure of social status, it was still mainly the holders of land who were likely to have the more comfortable households. The scattering of professional people - the doctor, the veterinary surgeon - were in any case set apart from other villagers, as were the clergymen, most of whom were ipso facto substantial landowners.

This chapter will examine the distribution of landholding within the seven representative villages of this study. In a survey of the evidence for each village the implications of land ownership in terms of economic stability will be
investigated, particularly where it can be compared with the occupation of rented land, and, using resident servants as an indication, the degree to which it conferred social status. After summarising this section, the chapter then turns to a discussion of the social relationships which were created as a result of the landlord-tenant connection, concentrating upon the position of the Duke of Rutland as major landowner in the Vale of Belvoir. Various aspects of his exercise of power and influence are examined, and signs of gradual diminution in the deference with which he was regarded are noted. One such area of decline was that of his political influence, and an account of a challenge to the Duke's political sway in north Leicestershire leads into a discussion of criticism incurred by the sixth Duke's brother and heir, Lord John Manners. Thus the decline of deference from the time of the fifth Duke to that of the seventh is traced.

The Duke of Rutland was indisputably the most prominent man in the Vale of Belvoir area, and the greatest landowner. Many if not most of the farmers of the area would have been his tenants, and members of his family provided local Members of Parliament and several of the local clergy. He involved himself in the organisation of local affairs such as the provision of schools, the County Chamber of Agriculture, and attempts through local associations and competitions to improve standards of farming in the area. He received praise from contemporary commentators and in the Reports of Parliamentary Commissions for his humane and progressive landlordship. If newspaper reports and obituaries are to be believed as indicative of his tenants' attitudes, he was much loved and respected. Even if the aristocratic house parties at Belvoir Castle contributed little in financial terms to the locality, the maintenance of the Belvoir Hunt and Croxton Races certainly aided to its prosperity, and to the enjoyment of the villagers. While not contiguous, the Vale of Belvoir and the Belvoir estate overlapped to such an extent that the relationship between the Duke and his tenants is of prime importance in an account
of the area, and the quality of that relationship explains much of how change was allowed to take place gradually, neither applied with pressure from one side nor resisted with violence from the other.

The records of landownership in Britain give only a very unclear picture of who owned what. Even the 1874 Return of Landowners records only the county in which a stated number of acres were held by individual owners; although the name and place of residence of the landowner are given, this is not necessarily where the property lay. Nevertheless, it seems that if a man owned land in Leicestershire, lived in a Vale of Belvoir village, and above all if he appears in the 1871 census as farming land in that village, it is likely that his holding was in or near the village. In Appendix I and II are listed entries in the 1874 Return of those who owned land in Leicestershire and Nottinghamshire, who lived in the Belvoir area, and they are marked with an asterisk if they were also listed in the 1871 census for any of the seven villages picked out in this study. Where the census entry included a declaration of acreage worked, this has been inserted into the listing for comparison. Two things immediately become clear; first, that the acreage worked was in most cases considerably more than that owned, so that even farmers who owned part of their land were at the same time tenants; and secondly, that at least in the four larger villages of the group, the majority of resident landowners (50 out of 76) owned less than 20 acres each.

Using these lists, together with census information and entries in trade directories of the period, let us now examine each of the villages of the representative group, to see what can be learnt about the identity of landowners great and small in them.9.
NETHER BROUGHTON.

Lords of the Manor and chief landowners of the village were the family of the Earl of Radnor, the Bouveries. Philip Pleydel Bouverie gave his address as Haymarket, S.W., but the greater part of his land was in Somerset. The 1874 Return lists 15 owners of land resident in the village, 10 of whom were also included in a Directory of 1870, where they were indicated as farmers who also owned land. The names on the Directory list all also appeared on the 1871 census, and include three not on the Return. One of these was Joseph Bissill, who had been farming about 85 acres in the village since before 1851; only with approaching old age did he reduce his holding, and by 1881, aged 69, was grazing livestock on 14 acres of land; it may be that this change had already taken place when the Return was compiled, since although he does not appear on it, his son does, as owner of 8 acres. This however was not enough to keep the younger man in the village, and by 1881 he had disappeared. Others missing from the 1874 list are John Crafts and Edward Hopkin; both were graziers, John Crafts appearing on each of the censuses for the period, and in 1871 declaring that he worked 20 acres. He was still working in 1881, aged 52, so it is difficult to see whether he had been missed on the return, or whether a mistake had been made in the Directory. Edward Hopkin (or Hopkins) appears to have taken over his father's grazing farm shortly before 1870, presumably when his father died. His marriage to the daughter of a Melton Mowbray tailor in September 1868, when he was already 40, was probably part of the same change of circumstance for him. By 1871 the 33 acres which his father George had held had increased to 35 acres, and by 1881 to 38 acres; here was one grazier at least who was not hurt by the depression, and whose household had expanded by 1881 to include two young domestic servants. The consistent size of the holding suggests that it may have been held on a very long-term tenant agreement; such agreements were sometimes seen by tenants as giving them title to the land - but this is speculation.
Among the farmers in the 1870 list were Thomas Woodruffe and William Hatton, both of whom seem to have owned the whole of their farms, of 34 and 53 acres respectively. Woodruffe first appeared in the village census for 1861, already aged 72, and with a 10 year old daughter born in Long Ashton, Somerset. It is tempting to wonder whether there is a connection with the Bouverie family. Owning their land seems not to have brought prosperity to either household, since neither had resident servants (except a lad of 16 when Thomas Woodruffe was in his eighties), and none of the Hatton children were listed as scholars. All the other residents named as landowners in that list seem to have worked considerably more land than they owned.

Matthew Bishop and John Wright both appeared on all four censuses, Matthew Bishop working 135 acres in 1871, compared with the 12 acres which the 1874 Return shows him as owning. John Wright owned 27 acres, but declared a working area of between 100 and 133 acres in the censuses. Both were substantial farmers, with domestic servants and resident farm servants. Similarly John Lovett owned 13 acres, and farmed 117 acres in 1871. He seems to have been the son of another John Lovett who had farmed 82 acres twenty years earlier, and to have been the brother-in-law of John Wright; like his brother-in-law he had a household which included several servants. Elizabeth Shelton seems to have moved to the village with her husband from Grimstone, to take over her father-in-law's farm when he died about 1865. By 1871 Elizabeth was herself a widow, but kept on the 133 acre farm at least until 1881, working it with the help of her son and daughter and one resident farm-hand. Her own property was only 21 acres, and it is notable that by 1881 only two of her five children were still living on the farm, which suggests that it was not profitable enough to support them all.

The remaining two names in the 1870 Directory do not appear on the census as farmers. William Bowley was a miller, owning 2 acres of land, and his wife owned another 5. On the 1871 census he declared a holding of 50 acres, and had a farm servant living in his household, although
he did not describe himself as a farmer. In 1881 his widow described herself as a grazier, so perhaps the grazing farm had been acquired as a retirement project. Mrs. Bowley kept one domestic servant, but had taken in lodgers. However, they were not inconsiderable lodgers, consisting of Nottingham property owner Mary Kirk, described as lunatic, with her author brother James and a lady's companion. (See Appendix IV).

The landowners living in the village listed on the 1874 Return and not in the Directory, apart from two sets of executors, were George March, of whom I can find no trace in the census, T. B. Edlin, Charles Harvey, and Rev. John Noble. Thomas Edlin owned 7 acres of the 12 on which he grazed stock in 1871; by 1881 he had taken a second wife, had four more children, and was reduced to labouring. One wonders what had happened to his 7 acres. Charles Harvey kept one of the public houses in the village, and in addition owned 13 acres of land in 1874. He seems to have had one or two brushes with the law, being warned by magistrates in January 1870 that they would withdraw his licence if he were charged again with selling beer outside the permitted hours. In April 1881 he was fined 10 shillings for fighting with John Smith over two fowls purchased at a sale. A few weeks later when the census was taken it was his widow who was running the pub., the two servants and an ostler of 1851 reduced to a single female servant, and the house filled with two hawkers and two general labourers as lodgers. Again, the ownership of land does not seem to have provided security.

Finally there were the 304 acres attributed to the rector, the Rev. John Noble. The living was in the gift of the Bouverie family, and the glebe land would have been let to local farmers, whose rents were assessed at yielding an income of £419 per annum. The clergyman was thus maintained as a substantial landowner. He was rural dean of Framland; two of his sons, Humphrey and Robert, became clergymen, while another, Charles, joined the Bengal Staff Corps. His eldest daughter married Robert Ogilvie Esq., of Sussex
Place, Regents Park. Even as a clergyman Rev. Noble protected his interests as a landowner, for in September 1868 he charged Henry Johnson, a labourer from Upper Broughton, with killing a hare on his land. 12.

In Nether Broughton it appears that, apart from the rector, none of the residents owned large acreages, and the greater part of most farms were rented, in most cases from the Bouverie family. The census suggests however that it was the size of the total holding, be it owned or rented, which gave a degree of stability and status, and that in itself ownership of a small plot had no great advantage. The larger holding of the clergyman on the other hand contributed to his gentlemanly status, and continued to separate him from the village community.

LONG CLAWSON.

The Lord of the Manor and principal landowner was the Duke of Rutland, but William Coleman and the Newcome family were also consistently listed in Directories as important landowners. The 1874 Return of Owners of Land lists 22 residents of Long Clawson as owning land in Leicestershire and three more as owning land in Nottinghamshire; all but three of these names are identifiable in the 1871 census. Five of the landholdings in Leicestershire and two in Nottinghamshire were of more than 100 acres; nine of those in Leicestershire were of less than 10 acres. The largest area owned by a resident of the village in the 1874 Return was that of Mr. F. P. Newcome, who had 515 acres. He was a prominent man in the area, a solicitor, who appeared often in accounts of the business of this part of the county. A widower, he lived alone with his housekeeper, Miss. Eliza Gamm, and a housemaid. There was another family of Newcomes in the village, although without tracing the family tree I cannot be sure that they were related. Thomas Newcome had farmed some 180 acres or more in 1851 and 1861, but by 1871 had died; his elder son, Thomas, was then at
Clawson Lodge, farming 88 acres, while the younger son seems to have taken over the 185 acres of his father's farm. Neither of the brothers was included in the 1874 Return, and it seems possible that, if they were related to Mr. F. P. Newcome, they may have rented land from him. Long Clawson Old Manor had at one time belonged to the Newcome family.\textsuperscript{13}

William Coleman, father and son, owned a substantial farm; their Leicestershire holding in 1874 was recorded as 320 acres. John Wilson records that their property was the result of the amalgamation by marriage of the earlier Thurman and Coleman estates. The family built the New Hall, and the younger William 'slipped easily into the role of the farming, fox-hunting, sporting squire of tradition. The Hall became a centre of sporting and social activity, and its influence was felt throughout the life of the community'.\textsuperscript{14} The father farmed 436 acres in 1851, reduced to 345 acres ten years later. The household at Clawson Hall included not only the seven children recorded in the census, but three domestic servants and some farm servants - three in 1851, one only, a shepherd, in 1861. In 1871 the younger William had inherited the property, and at the time of the census he and his young wife were entertaining half a dozen visitors, there to attend Croxton Park Races and the Melton Steeplechase. The area farmed at this time was stated to be 400 acres.\textsuperscript{15} The household still included two farm servants as well as domestic servants. By 1881 the area farmed was reduced to 200 acres, but the household was still substantial, including Mr. and Mrs. Coleman and their two small children, Mrs. Coleman's mother, niece and nephew, a governess, cook, housemaid and groom, as well as a visitor, Mr. Plantaganet. Despite the reduction in the size of the estate, it appears that the Coleman family was still the most prosperous in the village. Changing fashions for the middle class are marked by the absence of farm-servants in the household of 1881.

Other large holdings recorded on the 1874 Return were those of William Cooke and Elizabeth Stokes. William Cooke
first appeared in the 1861 census for the village, although it was his birthplace. At that time he was employed as a farm bailiff; since we know that another member of the Cooke family, Joseph, worked as machine manager for William Coleman, it seems probable that he was also employed by him. (See Ch. 4, p. 91). By 1871 William Cooke was farming 328 acres on his own account, of which, according to the 1874 Return, he owned 296 acres. By 1881 his farm had grown to 351 acres, and his household included not only a domestic servant but also a dairymaid. He may therefore have been benefitting from the growing importance of cheesemaking in the village.

Elizabeth Stokes was recorded as owning 259 acres in 1874. Her husband William had farmed some 240 acres since before 1851, but by 1871 Elizabeth, then aged 82, was a widow, and had reduced the area farmed to 34 acres. She continued to employ one resident domestic servant, and had a 14 year old farm boy living on the premises. She died in 1880 at the age of 91, leaving her daughter Elizabeth, 40 years younger than herself, to retire and live alone with a young servant girl. It is to be assumed that this daughter inherited the land, or whatever was left of it, but there is no suggestion, other than the fact that the mother's death was announced in the Leicester Chronicle, that the family enjoyed any particular prosperity.

Neither of the remaining owners of more than 100 acres resident in the village at the time of the 1874 Return appear to have been farmers. Rev. Thomas Mitchell, who owned 132 acres, was vicar of Long Clawson throughout the period. He not only held the living, but it was in his own gift. His household always included two resident servants with the addition of a nursemaid while his three children were very young. In 1881 his son, Herbert, while still living at the vicarage, described his occupation as farmer, so was perhaps working his father's land. The Doubleday family was well represented in the village throughout the period, and two members of the family had received 146 acres between them in the enclosure award of 1780.17. The family had sold some property in 1853, when to be held in Melton Mowbray.
All that undivided Sixth Part or Share of and in the Money to arise from the Sale upon the death of a Lady, now in her sixty-fifth year, of a capital MESSUAGE or Tenement, with the Closes, Pieces or Parcels of rich Arable and Grazing LAND, situate lying and being in Long Clawson, ... now vested in the Trustees under the will of JOHN DOUBLEDAY, late of Long Clawson aforesaid, gentleman, deceased.

In 1871 there were two heads of household named Edward Doubleday, including one who farmed 112 acres. However, the Edward referred to in the 1874 Return seems to have been the retired physician, aged 73 in 1871, who included 'landowner' in his occupational description. His prosperity as the owner of 138 acres was marked by the inclusion of two domestic servants in his household, while farmer Edward, his nephew, had only one. Other members of the family were also landowners; John, the grocer-draper, apparently owning 7 acres, while Samuel, who farmed 167 acres in 1871, owned 6 acres in Nottinghamshire. Despite the large farm which he held throughout the period, and a family of six children, it was only on the 1881 census, when Samuel Doubleday was 81 years old, that his household included a domestic servant, although in each census it included at least one farm servant.

Elizabeth Blagdon, who owned 281 acres in Nottinghamshire, was the widow of a surgeon. She lived in the village throughout the period, maintained into her old age in some comfort, with three resident servants including, at least until 1871, a groom. Mrs. C. Willows, listed as proprietor of 139 acres in Nottinghamshire, does not appear on the census for Long Clawson; she is probably the same lady as Catherine Willows, listed as owning 33 acres in Leicestershire and living in Upper Broughton. However, it seems there may have been some connection with the village, as Mrs. Mary Willows had lived there in 1851 on an annuity, and in 1854 had won a legal dispute with James Musson over the occupation of a house said to have belonged to her husband's mother.19. In 1861, aged 74, she was living in Long Clawson with her daughter, Mary Shelton, in a household prosperous enough to include a servant.
Other substantial landholdings were those of James Hind (95 acres), John Shilcock (68 acres), and William Wilford (35 acres). William Wilford was an agricultural labourer in 1851, but despite a family of at least nine children had acquired a holding of 35 acres by 1861. An earlier namesake had received 33 acres in the 1780 Enclosure Award, so perhaps this was an inheritance. The household seems never to have included a resident servant or farm-hand, and it may be assumed that the large family worked the farm themselves. John Shilcock was a master miller, who had diversified into farming by 1861. In 1871 he owned 68 of the 94 acres he worked. By 1881, widowed for the second time, he had handed over the mill to his son, John, increasing his farming interest to 150 acres. From 1861 his household included a domestic servant, as well as general servants in the mill and on the farm. It is of course not possible to assess how much of his growing prosperity came from the land he owned and how much from the mill or other sources. James Hind, returned as owner of 95 acres in 1874, was in fact dead before 1871, and his farm, 129 acres in 1861, seems to have been let outside the family. In 1871 his widow, Elizabeth, described herself as a landowner, but lived alone with her daughter, and by 1881 this daughter, Sarah, was herself retired, but with sufficient income to employ a young village girl, Kate Musson, as 'company keeper'.

The remaining landowners identifiable in the census for the village each held less than 20 acres, and most were farmers or tradesmen. William Pickard, John Milnes, John Easom and Stephen Daft each owned small portions of the land they farmed, but only Stephen Daft among them employed a servant in 1871; since his wife was at that time 86 years of age no doubt this was necessary. Day Scarborough was a cottager owning 8 acres, while John Kellam, who had been a master shoemaker, was by 1871 a grazier on his 11 acres. His son Thomas was also listed as owner of 6 acres in 1874, when he was still employed as a carrier; by 1881 he was working the grazing farm of 11 acres, now owned by his
widowed mother. Other tradesmen who owned small holdings were John Barnard, a joiner and wheelwright, and Francis Huckerby, a master bricklayer. While all these smallholdings may have given a certain amount of security to their owners, they obviously were not sufficient to bring any notable prosperity. The only person listed as owning a small area who was indubitably more prosperous was Ann Swain, who owned 7 acres, but her prosperity was due more to her being the wife of the doctor than to her own landholding. It is notable that it is her husband, John Swain, who is described in the 1871 census as 'landowner'.

As in Nether Broughton, it is clear that ownership of a small plot of land offered no advantage of security or prosperity. However, despite the position of the Duke of Rutland as principal landowner, land ownership within the village was more diverse in Long Clawson, and the social status of several families was obviously either built upon or expressed by their ownership of larger areas. The inclusion of tradesmen among the smallholders also marks a difference between the two villages.

HARBY.

The Duke of Rutland was Lord of the Manor and owned a major part of the land, but the Directories of the period also list several residents as principal landowners. The only names mentioned in the Directories which are not identifiably those of village residents are Thomas Manners Esq., in 1861 and John Smith in 1877 and 1883. The former was probably a member of the Duke's family; the Smiths who lived in Harby however, and there were several, were all labourers, so are unlikely to have held land. Neither of these names appears on the list of Harby residents who were landowners in 1874.

The other names mentioned in Directories are Shipman, Orson, Whittle, and Lamin, all of which appear on the 1874 Return. Of Harby resident farmers in the Return, John
Whittle was the one owning and working the largest area. In 1851 his mother had farmed 60 acres, but before 1858 John had taken charge, and in 1861 was farming 115 acres. By 1871 the farm was 118 acres, all of which he owned himself, and it had only diminished by 2 acres ten years later. His household included a domestic servant, but by 1881 there was no longer a resident farm servant. His grandmother Elizabeth was among those who were awarded land at the enclosure of the village.  

John Orson was described in 1871 as a retired farmer and landowner, his holding in 1874 being 184 acres. His family had also held land at the time of the enclosure, the farm which he had worked since before 1851 being about 80 acres. He was unmarried, and his nephew Robert farmed 130 acres of his land in 1871. John Orson died in 1875, aged 80, and Robert also disappeared from the village. The estate seems to have passed to John Orson's sister-in-law (?) Annie, and in 1881 it was her son Francis who farmed 164 acres. The household always included several servants; John Orson employed a housekeeper along with two or three farm- or general servants, while Mrs. Orson had two domestic servants and a nurse in her household.

The 1877 Directory names Andrew and William Shipman as owners of land in Harby. Andrew was a resident of Stathern, not Harby, but since a collection of farm papers of the Shipman family survive, more will be said about them later in this chapter. It is sufficient here to point out that, while Andrew Shipman owned land in Harby, not all his 145 acres were in this village, and his farm also included land on which he was a tenant. William Shipman, who was a Harby resident, worked a farm which steadily increased in size over the three decades of the study, from 74 acres in 1851 to 280 acres in 1881. His own holding in 1874 was 71 acres. His household in each census year included one domestic servant and one farm worker, with an additional farm servant in 1881. By this time too both his adult sons and his two adult daughters were also (if the enumerator described them correctly) engaged in the work of the farm. William Shipman
was born in Stathern, and his family had not been awarded land in Harby's enclosure.

Thomas Lamin was among those who received an award of land at enclosure, but in spite of his inclusion amongst a list of farmers and landowners in a Directory of 1870, the Thomas Lamin of 1871 owned only 23 acres. In 1851 he and his two brothers, James and John, lived in Mill House as millers, with two house servants and a waggoner in the household. In 1852 Thomas Lamin married a widow, Sarah Morley, and by 1871 their son, another Thomas, was helping to farm the 98 acres which his father now held, having relinquished the mill. The household at this time was reduced to one domestic servant only. Ten years later the farm had been divided, since the father worked only 60 acres, while the son grazed livestock on 32 acres. Sarah was by now dead, and the household again included two domestic servants as well as a farm servant. Other members of the Lamin family who owned land were the brother John, who in 1871 described himself as a retired miller, lived in Burden Lane with his mother, and owned one acre, and Henry, possibly another brother, who owned 4 acres, and who in 1871 was running the mill as well as his business as grocer and baker, assisted by his son, two daughters and a servant.

The only other farmer living in Harby who is named on the 1874 Return as owning a substantial area of land was Robert Barke, who owned 61 acres of the 62 which he farmed between 1861 and 1881. Despite owning the land however, the census gives no indication that he was particularly prosperous; in 1871, with five children under eight years old, so too young to be of much assistance, he had no resident servant. The remaining land owners named in 1874 each held less than 20 acres, and there are few signs of prosperity amongst them. Elizabeth Barnes for example, recorded as owner of 11 acres, worked in 1871 as a dairymaid in her brother's household, and in 1875 sued her nephew James Marriott in the County Court for possession of her house and land in Harby. 22. Other owners of small plots farmed them in conjunction with larger rented areas, or
perhaps as an auxiliary to a trade; John Moules, for example, who owned 5 acres, was primarily the proprietor of a threshing machine, while Edmund Hall besides owning 5 of the 45 acres he worked, was a master blacksmith. The three John Haywoods, who owned 25 acres between them, combined farming with the tenancy of the White Hart for the greater part of the period. Only Henry Bonser amongst the smallholders showed any sign of prosperity, employing a groom and a domestic servant in 1871; his prosperity is likely however to have owed as much to his occupation as miller and wharfinger as to the 19 acres of grazing land he owned.

By far the largest landowner living in the village was the rector, the Rev. Octavius Manners Norman, with 510 acres. Not only was his living in the gift of the Duke of Rutland, but his mother was Lady Elizabeth, sister of the fifth Duke, and widow of the late rector of Melton Mowbray; her funeral in 1853 was attended by her seven sons, including the rectors of Harby, Bottesford, and Northwood in Norfolk, and seven daughters and step-daughters. The household at the Rectory in 1871 comprised the rector and his wife, their small son, the rector's mother-in-law, a cook, nurse, lady's maid, housemaid and parlourmaid. As in Nether Broughton, the household at the Rectory was in a different social class from any other in the village. Amongst other landholders only the largest holdings appear to have produced any measurable degree of prosperity.

The principal landowner and Lord of the Manor was the Duke of Rutland, and in addition a Directory of 1877 names as owning a great part of the soil Thomas Hall, John and George Crompton, Samuel Burton, and Miss. Elizabeth Linney; of these only Samuel Burton appears in the censuses of the village. A list of resident farmers who were landowners which appears in a Directory of 1870 coincides closely with the 1874 Return but includes in addition John Stokes and Joseph Stubbs; John Stokes was a cottager's son who was farming 55 acres in 1871, and was still a working grazier.
ten years later. His 1871 household included one 11 year old girl as general servant. Joseph Stubbs had also improved his position, increasing his holding from 19 acres in 1861 to 90 acres by 1871, but he too employed only one general servant. How much of the land they worked either of these men owned, if any, it is impossible to say.

The 1874 Return includes the names of 12 landowners living in Hose, but only four of these owned more than 20 acres. Three of the individuals cannot be identified on the census with any certainty, but their family names were well represented, i.e., Hourd, Lamin, and Shilcock. The Joshua Hourd named as owning 7 acres at Hose was perhaps Joseph, who had taken over the 54 acres which his father had worked about 1860, married in 1861, and by 1871 was working 90 acres with one domestic servant and one farm servant resident at Hose Lodge. By 1881 however, a widower with seven children, his eldest daughter and two sons working with him, his holding had decreased to 40 acres, with no resident servant. Two of the three Shilcocks can be identified with some certainty. Henry Shilcock, owner of 34 acres, had worked as farmer and grazier on 132 acres in each of the census years 1851, '61 and '71. Living alone, he and his wife had employed one resident domestic servant. By 1871 however, when Henry was 73 years old, the servant had been replaced by a young nephew. Ten years later there was again a female general servant living with Henry's widow, Frances, who at 76 years old described herself as a grazier. Of the two William Shilcocks named in the Return, only one appeared on the 1871 census, and it is unclear which. Whether he owned 58 acres or 14, the William of the census was 38 in 1871, living at the Grange, and farming 360 acres. His mother was nominally head of the household, while his sister acted as housekeeper with the aid of two general servants. The land at Hose Grange had been in Shilcock hands since before 1851, when Thomas Shilcock farmed 400 acres there, living with his mother and four resident servants. Like Thomas before him, William remained unmarried, so that when he died at the age
of 45 he left Frances as the only remaining representative of the family in the village.

The Lamins were another family which looked set for extinction in the village in 1881. In 1874 the executors of Peter Lamin owned 18 acres; this probably formed part of the land farmed by widow Esther Lamin. Already widowed in 1851, she worked 63 acres with the help of a son and daughter and two resident servants. By 1871 the holding was reduced to 25 acres, and the household comprised the 80 year old widow, her daughter, her 13 year old grandson and one young girl as general servant. In 1881 only Esther's two daughters, both unmarried and in their sixties, remained in the village, both the other Lamin households which had been there in 1861 having subsequently disappeared.

Three of the Hose smallholders in 1874 were women. Hannah Garrett had been wife to a draper and tailor, William, who by 1861 had acquired in addition a 16 acre grazing farm. The household had always it seems been a large one, including three apprentices as well as a servant in 1851. In 1861 William's sister and niece lived with the family, with one apprentice and a servant. As a widow in 1871 Hannah still gave a home to her husband's niece, who worked as a dressmaker, and also had a lodger, an Officer of the Excise. Despite her 7 acres landholding however, she still could not afford a resident servant either then or in 1881, when, aged 71, she lived alone. Hannah Pears was also a widow, her husband having kept the Black Horse Inn in 1851 and '61. He had also recorded his occupation of 13 acres in 1851, and that he farmed 27 acres in 1861; his widow still worked the 13 acres as a grazier in 1871. She was listed as owning 15 acres in 1874. Despite having had at least 12 children however she seems never to have had a resident servant. Perhaps it is not surprising that by 1881, when her son Thomas returned to the village to take up the licence at the Black Horse once more, Hannah was apparently dead.

Ann Sumner's mother Catherine had held a 26 acre cottager's plot in 1851, employing a house servant and a farm servant. By 1871 Ann, aged 36, had inherited the holding, owning five
of the 30 acres she grazed, but without resident help. By 1881 the holding had passed to her illegitimate son William.

Two of the smallholders had turned from trade to farming. Robert Corner was a blacksmith before acquiring the 24 acre farm, but in spite of owning 18 acres of this he did not keep a resident servant. Thomas Huckerby had been a brewer, and kept the Crown and Anchor beer house. To this he added a cottage plot of 15 acres by 1861, and in 1871 described himself as a farmer. Since he was by now 69 however it seems likely that his son, another Thomas, did most of the work. The household included one general servant, a girl of 12, though it seems unlikely that the ownership of 7 acres recorded in the 1874 Return contributed very much to the family prosperity. Thomas the elder died in 1879, and the son then married a local girl, his daughter being born in 1880. By 1881 he was farming 133 acres, and maintaining one general servant.

William Piggin, owner of 56 acres, appeared only once in the Hose census, describing himself in 1871 simply as landowner. Born in Arnold, Nottinghamshire, he had brought a Nottinghamshire born housekeeper to the village with him, and also employed a 13 year old Long Clawson lad, Edmund Hallam, as a general servant. He appears therefore to have been comfortably off, but what was the source of his money or where his land lay it is impossible to say.

The only substantial landowner resident in Hose according to the 1874 list was Samuel Burton, who owned 151 acres. Born in Nottingham, he first appeared in the Hose census of 1861, farming 120 acres but without resident servants. In 1871, as farmer and landowner of unspecified areas, he employed a domestic servant and a farm servant. He died in 1877, at the early age of 55, and in 1881 his widow Susan, with a reduced holding of 40 acres, lived alone with one female servant.

Hose had no resident clergyman in censuses before 1881, the vicar, Rev. Bradshaw, living in Granby. It seems then that its 2,140 acres were almost entirely owned by non-residents; the 1874 Return accounts for only 390 acres
owned by residents. Most of the plots owned were too small to provide any great improvement in life style or a stable prosperity. Only the two tradesmen, Robert Corner and Thomas Huckerby, seem to have improved their position, and the property they owned was very small. The two largest landowners living in the village (apart from the Shilcock family) had come from outside, and failed to create permanent estates. At least two of the landowning families, Lamins and Shilcocks, appeared to be dying out in the village at this period.

GOADBY MARWOOD.

The village was principally owned by its Lord of the Manor, the Duke of Rutland, the dukes having held the lordship there since 1765. Until 1851 the property belonged to the Sedden family, with Goadby Marwood House occupied by William Sedden and three servants in that year. In May the Leicester Chronicle reported its sale by auction at Melton Mowbray:-

... the freehold estate, mansion and manor of Goadby Marwood ... the property comprised the ancient edifice of Goadby Hall, with offices, stabling, dog-kennels, lawns, plantations etc., also a residence occupied by William Sedden Esq., the entire village of Goadby, several farm-houses, etc., etc., the whole amounting to 1,095½ acres, producing a net rental of £1,832.13.6. The estate was sold for £53,025. It was understood that the Duke of Rutland is the purchaser.

At the same time the advowson and the rectory house with its land were sold for £2,800, and three months later George Bellairs of Narborough made a will in which he bequeathed to his son, Stevenson Gilbert Bellairs...

... all that the perpetual Advowson, Donation Patronage and right of presentation of in and to the Rectory and Parish Church of Goadby Marwood ... together with the Parsonage House outhouses lands and hereditaments I have lately contracted to purchase from the Rev'd Edward Manners the present incumbent for the purpose of presenting my said son ... who is in Holy Orders to the said Rectory and parish Church on the first vacancy thereof.
At the time of the sale, and until his death in 1856, Rev. Edward Manners lived, not in the Rectory, but in Goadby Hall. Rev. Manners was obviously a member of the Duke of Rutland's family, and in the Rectory lived George Norman, brother to the rector of Harby, nephew to the Duke, and son-in-law to Rev. Manners. Mr. Norman is nowhere referred to as a landowner, but his household in 1851 included five servants, and a press report of the same year mentions his gamekeeper living in Stathern. After the death of Edward Manners, Mr. Norman's family moved into the Hall, where he lived as farmer and magistrate for the remainder of the period, describing himself in 1881 as a land agent. The new Rector, Rev. Stevenson Bellairs, meanwhile moved into the Rectory, living there alone with three servants including a groom in 1861. In 1868 he married George Norman's eldest daughter, Florence, and from then on the household continued to expand, including by 1881 a son and two daughters, cook, parlourmaid, housemaid, governess and groom. All this was obviously far beyond the value of Rev. Bellairs' land property of 35 acres. Directories of 1870 and 1877 mention Messrs. Day and Charlton as landowners in the village, but the census gives no clue as to their identity. The executors of R. Day are also included as owning 120 acres in the 1874 Return. The third and final name of a Goadby Marwood resident included on that Return is that of Thomas Rowbottam, who farmed some 200 acres in the area throughout the period, being already active on his grandmother's farm at the age of 20 in 1851. He and his wife had at least seven children, but the household always included four farm workers of varying description, only reduced to three in 1881 when only three children, including two who helped with the work, remained at home. Of his 200 acres Thomas Rowbottam owned but five. There were other farmers of large areas in the village who remained equally stable and apparently prosperous without owning any of their land; the Elson family for example farmed 170 acres throughout the period. As in the larger villages, it seems that an adequate size
of holding irrespective of ownership, was what was likely to bring stability. In a village like this where none of the residents owned extensive property, and where the gentry were well differentiated by lifestyle, social status must have been endowed by different criteria than that of owning property.

CHADWELL and WYCOMB.

The manorial rights belonged to the manor of Rothley, Leics., the Babington family, Chadwell being a chapelry of Rothley and the parish a detached part of East Goscote hundred. At the same time the manor house and about 14 acres of land belonged to Wigston's Hospital, Leicester, but in the 1870s were held on lease at the low rent of £13.4.0 per annum. The curacy at that time was held by the rector of Goadby Marwood.

Nevertheless the major part of the land of both villages was the property of the Duke of Rutland, to whom it had been awarded when the villages were enclosed in 1778. None of the other names mentioned in the enclosure award was included a century later in a list in White's Directory of local landowners, and of the names on that list George Ashbourn, Frederick Newcome and Thomas Marshall are not identifiable as residents, although Frederick Newcome was probably the same man already noted as living in Long Clawson. Also named are Thomas Morris and Catherine Stowe, both of whom lived in Wycomb. Mrs. Stowe, widowed for the second time, was farming 140 acres in 1851, but ten years later the farm had been taken over by her son, William Clarke, apparently with some success as his holding increased to 175 acres by 1881. In 1871 Mrs. Stowe was living on an annuity, sharing her home with a consumptive grandson, Robert, a middle-aged niece who was employed as a companion, and a younger son, Thomas, and his wife. In the census it is Thomas who is described as a landowner, and as farming 404 acres.

There is similarly some confusion about Thomas Morris;
he appears in the censuses of 1851 and '61, farming up to 150 acres, but is omitted from the 1871 census for Wycomb, only to reappear in 1881 with a holding of 284 acres, and with three resident servants. To add to the confusion, an advertisement in the *Leicester Chronicle* in June 1854 offered:

Valuable Estates at Wykeham, nr. Melton Mowbray. Lot I - a leasehold farm, held under Wigston's Hospital in Leicester, comprising a good Farm House, with out-buildings, 93A. 3R. 28v. of very superior arable and pasture land, all in a ring fence and adjoining the house, late the property of Mr. Geo. Marriott, dec'd, and now in the occupation of Thos. Morris. The Farm is held during the lives of two healthy men, both fifty years of age, and during the life of the survivor of them. Annual rent payable to the hospital £10.12.0.

It may be that Thomas Morris purchased the lease on the land he occupied at that time, yet he is listed on the 1874 Return of landowners as living at Eaton, the owner of 150 acres, and indeed is to be found on the 1871 census for Eaton, farming 475 acres with the help of eight employees, two of whom lived in the farmhouse. Despite his return to a less extensive farm at Wycomb, the size of his household there in 1881 implies that he farmed successfully.

The only name of a resident of Wycomb which appears on the 1874 Return of Landowners is that of J. Wood, whose executors held 74 acres. This matches the 74 acres farmed by William Wood in 1861. In 1871 the farm was declared as 80 acres, and, as in both the previous censuses, was farmed by the Wood family. However, when William Wood died, and he was 82 in 1871, it seems that none of his sons took over the farm, as the family does not appear in the 1881 census. The only landowner named as living in Chadwell was Luke Wakeling. He was born in Nether Broughton, and had been a grazier there. Then when he was approaching 60 it seems that he acquired 49 acres in Chadwell and moved there to continue farming. His wife was 12 years his senior, so the domestic servant who completed the household in each of the two later censuses
was perhaps a necessity.

The two villages were almost entirely populated by farm labourers. The half dozen or so farmers all held fairly small plots, most of them being less than 100 acres. Only Thomas Morris and the Stowe/Clarke family seem to have improved their position over the period, though it is impossible to say whether the ownership of at least part of the land they farmed contributed to their success. On the other hand, the disappearance of the Wood family, despite their ownership of 74 acres, seems to confirm that too small a holding, be it owned or rented, did not provide an adequate income to ensure family stability.

* * * * *

The pattern which emerges of land ownership in the villages is in some respects very like that traced by Howell in his study of Wales at a similar period. He noted that it was the possession of a farm, be it as owner or tenant, which bestowed status, and which made farmers a social class distinct from the labourers and cottagers. On the other hand, the holding needed to be of adequate size to produce a profit. Howell quotes from a report on agriculture in Wales, written in 1879:

Small freeholders are probably the worst farmers in the Principality, and live from hand to mouth, a harder life than the labourers. In no sense can their position be favourably compared with that of tenants on an estate where evictions are unknown and where increased rents are seldom heard of.

Of the 38 farms in the villages of this study which remained in the hands of a single family throughout the period, 22 were of more than 100 acres, at least at the time of one of the four censuses, and seven were in each census of less than 50 acres. Of the 89 farmers who appeared in that capacity in only one of the four censuses, at least 36 had holdings of less than 50 acres, while 16 made no record of the size of their holding in the census.
The most stable of the villages was Harby, where 10 (24%) of the 42 farming families listed on the censuses retained their holding throughout. On the other hand, 18 (43%) appeared on only one census. Hose had a high turnover of small plots and a very unstable farming population, with only 6 out of 45 families (13%) retaining a holding for four censuses, and 25 (56%) appearing only once. Nether Broughton, the only village of the group not principally owned by the Duke of Rutland, had a high percentage of stable families, 12 out of 53 (23%), but its concentration of small grazing plots also led to a rapid turnover, with 25 families (47%) appearing as farmers only once. Six families appeared on all four Long Clawson censuses, (14%), but 14 (33%) of the total 42 were listed only once. Four of the 16 farmers in Goadby Marwood retained their holdings (25%), but 7 (44%) appeared there only once. None of the farmers of Chadwell and Wycomb appeared more than three times or less than twice.

Of the 22 larger farms which remained in the nurture of a single family, 11 were at least in part the property of that family. Thus there is no reason to conclude that it was personal ownership which gave the farmers additional stability. As Mingay points out, ownership offered little in financial advantage, for whereas farming the land could be looked to to produce a return on capital investment of 10 per cent or more, purchase of that land saved only 3 or 4 per cent in rent. For most farmers therefore the relationship with the landlord was of crucial importance.

Mills suggests that the development of the village can be attributed to the distribution of its landownership. He builds his theory upon the classification of 'open' and 'close' villages; while the poor law required that rate payers should be responsible for the maintenance of paupers within their own village, it was in the interest of the monopoly landlord to restrict the cottage accommodation in his estate villages to exclude all but essential labour, thus creating a 'close' or closed village. Where there was a diversity of property owners however
the smaller landowner could profit from the opportunity to provide housing in excess of the needs of the village's labour requirement, providing a base for labourers who could walk to other villages where there was a need for extra hands. For Holderness, it was this distinction between labour sub-sufficiency and labour surplus, which made the essential definition between closed and open villages; he warned however that not every village can be included in such a definition. Mills not only hinges his definition upon the ownership of the land, but expands the model by interposing the additional categories of 'absentee landlord townships', either single- or multiple-owned, and 'divided townships', in which a number of owners formed the core of the community. He traces a declining scale of influence or control from the resident landlord of an estate village, through the absentee landlord, down to the total independence of multiple ownership. The estate village was thus by definition unable to expand or develop, while the multiple owned village was encouraged both to expand and to diversify the economic activity within it.

Mills suggests that this pattern was in operation until about 1870; the Union Chargeability Act of 1865, which spread the responsibility for the maintenance of paupers across the area of the Poor Law Union instead of upon the individual village, had invalidated the reason for the creation of closed villages. Certainly by the 1870s, if not earlier, the drift of labour to the towns had removed much of that 'surplus' for which open villages had provided accommodation. We have seen (Table 1) that the villages of this study had all reached their maximum population in 1861; Bingham Wapentake was already in decline by then in terms of population. Mills' model then is barely applicable to the survey of village ownership above, which is based on data provided between 1871 and 1874. With this in mind however, the survey still provides reservations about the validity of Mills' thesis.

In the first place, the seven villages do not fit easily into Mills' classification. The Duke of Rutland, generally
in residence at Belvoir Castle, was neither an absent landlord nor an ever-present village squire. It is difficult to assess the extent to which his presence was felt in the surrounding villages - Belvoir and perhaps Bottesford would have been more aware of it than most. John Wilson's account of life in Long Clawson at the end of the nineteenth century has scarcely a reference to the Duke of Rutland. The Duke was seldom seen in the villages of the Vale, except when riding through with the Hunt, or passing through in his carriage travelling to or from the railway station. Yet for his tenants and their employees much depended upon the level at which he set the rent of his land, or upon the extent of the financial investment he was willing to make in the improvement of his property. His gamekeeper was a familiar figure in the fields, and several of the local incumbents were his appointees or even members of his family. His charity and public works and his political influence reached beyond the immediate circle of his tenants.

Nevertheless in most of the villages of this study of which he was the major landowner, there was a group of other lesser landowners. Goadby Marwood, Chadwell and Wycomb conform generally to the single-owner, estate village model, with George Norman at Goadby Hall representing the Duke; they failed to expand, they lacked amenities or a range of trades, and they were Anglican dominated. (See Chapter 9). Yet the increasing proportion of population which was drawn into them from outside does not support the notion of a policy of exclusion. Labourers and their families were leaving the villages because they had little to offer, and outsiders had to be drawn in to maintain the work force. The economy of a small village could not support the same amenities as its larger neighbours; this is economic reality, not the policy of a restraining landlord.

Nether Broughton, outside the Belvoir estate, was clearly an absentee landlord township. The rector, a landowner in his own right, was the appointee of the Bouverie family. However, although the village thus falls quite high in
Mills' scale of landlordly influence, there is little sign that such influence made itself felt. There is no record of a single visit by the Bouverie family to the village during the thirty years of this study. They had no agent in the village, other than the rector. While other land owners in the village owned very small areas, there are several cases where it seems that long-term tenancy agreements were regarded as providing title to the land. There was a strong non-conformist element in the village (Chapter 9), and it was the only one amongst the group to elect to appoint a School Board following the 1870 Education Act (Chapter 8). It seems then that there was an independent attitude in the village, which did not depend upon land ownership, and which was not unduly overruled by a sense of deference to its absent landlord.

Long Clawson, Harby and Hose fall more uncomfortably into Mills' classification. The overwhelming dominance of the Duke of Rutland as owner of the land should have made them estate villages. Hose, with its handful of smallholders and static population size seems to conform, yet the independence of the villagers is demonstrated by the strength of non-conformity in the village (Chapter 9). Harby and Long Clawson each had a number of lesser landowners, some of them with substantial holdings. In Long Clawson in particular, where William Coleman seems to have assumed the role of squire, and where there was a select middle class of professional people (doctor, vet., and solicitor), one might have expected a continuing expansion of population and economic activity; yet of these larger villages Long Clawson was the one which remained most heavily dependent upon agriculture as an employer and which accordingly saw the greatest loss of population. Harby on the other hand owed most of its expansion of population in the final decade of this study to the introduction of the railway and iron-stone mining, both enterprises promoted by the Duke. (Chapter 7).

Just as I have suggested on an earlier page that landownership was not that which bestowed status or
economic stability amongst lesser landowners and tenant farmers, I would suggest here that, by 1871 at least, it was not merely the ownership of land which directed the development or stagnation of the village. A combination of economic influences and a growing independence among the leaders of the village community, be they landowners or not, were of growing importance. Some of these other influences will be dealt with in later chapters; the relationship between the Duke of Rutland, as major landlord of the Vale of Belvoir, and his tenants, will occupy the remainder of this chapter. 38.

As suggested above, the financial backing of a sympathetic landlord was invaluable to the tenant farmer. Even if it was provided as a loan which the tenant was to repay, a landlord's investment in such improvements as drainage or new buildings was likely to improve the farm's profitability. Tenants had little protection at the period which concerns us for any investment which they might make themselves, for if the tenancy should end they had no right to reclaim the value of such improvements, unless it be by local custom. In 1883 the Agricultural Holdings Act was to secure the value of such 'unexhausted improvements' to the outgoing tenant, a symptom as Moore sees it of the loss of status of landowners which was manifest in the last decades of the century. 39. Moore describes the changing role and relationship of landowners and tenants as 'the social costs of high farming', destroying the existing structure of rural society, and he cites the recognition of tenant right as such a change: 40.

Not only did a tenant right agreement violate the purity of the landlord's rights of ownership, it was a means of formalizing the traditionally informal relationship between landlord and tenant and of placing the two upon a level of contractual equality.

In 1881 the landed gentry still exercised real power in the countryside, as magistrates and as leading members of local
bodies such as Poor Law Unions and Education Committees. In 1884 however the franchise was to be extended to householders in rural areas, and four years later the newly created County Councils took over most of the administrative functions of the quarter sessions. Not only was the public power of the landlords sapped, but in 1880 a Ground Game Act gave tenants the right to kill hares and rabbits on their farms - an intrusion on the privileges of the landowners which they had long and bitterly resisted.41.

Broderick's description of the place of the Squire, or principal landlord, in village society, was published in 1881. (See Appendix III). It shows him as the king-pin round which the community was constructed, its principal stay and ornament. Broderick saw land as being still a desired symbol of social and political power, but recognised that:-42.

What prevents money laid out in land from yielding more than two or three per cent, unless under special conditions, is the fancy price which land commands: what causes land to command a fancy price is the extraordinary desire for the possession of it which now prevails.

Ideas expressed by Tom Paine and others in the late eighteenth century, and put into practice to some extent by Robert Owen in the early nineteenth century, of the redistribution of land to public or communal ownership, found a body of support as the century progressed. John Bronterre O'Brien led the formation of the National Reform League in 1849, to campaign for land nationalisation; in 1869 the Land Tenure Reform Association, supported by J. S. Mill, advocated state purchase of vacant land for redistribution to smallholders and co-operatives, and the movement reached a peak of its support in the early 1880s, with the Land Nationalisation Society formed in 1881 and the English Land Restoration League in 1883, both seeking the ultimate public ownership of land.43. The difficulties of the depression, which ruined many farmers, provided more arguments in support of a redistribution of land.
On many estates it was impossible to find tenants, and land was left idle or taken into the home farm (as on the Berkshire estate of Lord Wantage). In order to keep the tenants they had, landlords were forced to reduce or remit rents. As prices fell, farm profitability was estimated to have dropped by 32 per cent in real terms between 1873/7 and 1893/7, so that income as well as the capital value of land fell for the landlords. They became less and less able to fulfil their traditional role in encouraging and financing agricultural improvements, or in providing charity or support for local endeavours. 'People who had once looked to the landlord as a guide and benefactor now came to see him as a man who took rent, but gave little or nothing in return'. It is against this background that the continuing relative prosperity of the Vale of Belvoir must be seen; the Duke of Rutland's rents fell less than those even in the rest of Leicestershire. The long-term conversion to pasture farming and the investment in improvement which were illustrated in the previous chapter, contributed to the continued integrity of the estate.

Meanwhile farmers were seeking to improve their standard of living. It has been noted that it became no longer acceptable to some farmers to have agricultural labourers living in the farm house with the family. Private schools were patronised by farmers who did not like their children to be educated alongside labourers' children; Mrs. Shipman noted payment of a school bill of £6.6.5 for her son Walter in October 1870, and another of £7.9.4 in April 1873. In 1850 a Miss Shipman had incurred a bill of £18.18.9 for the half year at Miss Walker's Academy in Grantham, which included not only board and instruction, but extras like writing and arithmetic, such sundries as shoe cleaning and hair cutting, and £2.5.0 for dancing lessons with Mr. Dyer. Parlours and pianos and pictures began to be found in farm houses, and the farmer's wife and daughters scorned to work in the dairy. Trollope commented on the social aspirations of some farmers' wives when he described the
assault upon Miss Thorne's drawing room at Ullathorne by Mrs. Lookaloft and her daughters, dressed in their short sleeves and satin.  

For many reasons, then, relationships between the landowning class and their tenants were under stress. Laslett describes a traditional village society in which:-  

... the manor house was the largest building apart from the church, and deference to its occupants the first principle of village life.

The change which took place during the second half of the nineteenth century was explored by F. M. L. Thompson, who commented:-  

... the real heart went out of deference with the passing of the age of Trollope. The principle of inherited authority, which had been on trial throughout the nineteenth century, was at last found wanting by an educated public. At the same time, however, deference had its roots in the relation of a gentleman with his own immediate subordinates, and its weakening was much affected, though not caused, by slow changes in these.

In the early years of the period there can be little doubt that the Duke was regarded with great deference. Born in 1778, and having succeeded to the title at the age of nine, the fifth Duke was a long established figure by 1851. The Leicester Chronicle reported with concern his periods of ill-health, as well as details of his arrivals and departures at Belvoir Castle, and lists of his houseguests. A statue in his honour was erected in Leicester Market Place in 1853. Belvoir Castle, which the fifth Duke and his Duchess had rebuilt and refurbished at great expense (rumoured to be £200,000) when it was burnt down in 1816 and the work had to be started again, was the pride of north Leicestershire. In one day in June 1859 for example, some two thousand people travelled by special train from Nottingham to visit the castle and grounds.
Writing of the Duke's estates in Derbyshire in 1850, Caird reported:—55.

If by any chance one [farm] becomes vacant, there are many competitors for it, the Duke's character as a landlord standing very high with his tenantry ... Where drainage is required, the Duke pays half the expenses, the tenant charging all team work as part of his share ... His Grace makes no charge for repairs or additions to farm buildings, looking upon this outlay as a landlord's investment, which is as requisite to enable the tenant to pay his rent as the possession of the land itself.

There seem to have been no formally drawn-up conditions of tenancy on the estate, the only provisions being briefly listed on the back of the receipt which was issued for payment of rent, as follows:—56.

1st.- THAT the Land is to be managed by you in a good and husbandlike manner, and the Buildings, Fences, Gates, and Gate Posts on the Premises kept in good repair, the Outfall Drains and Ditches properly scoured, and Tunnels made under the Gateways where necessary. And that in the event of your vacating the said Land and Premises, by Notice from your Landlord or otherwise, you will be held liable to pay for any dilapidations occasioned by your fault or neglect in so managing such Land, and keeping such Buildings, Fences, Gates and Gate Posts on the Premises in good repair, and properly scouring such Outfalls and Ditches, and making such Tunnels, where necessary, as aforesaid.

2nd.- That no part of the Premises is to be underlet.

3rd.- That no old Pasture Land will be allowed to be converted into Tillage, without leave in writing.

4th.- That no Hay or Straw is to be sold off the Premises, except for His Grace's use; and then, Manure of equal value must be purchased and used thereon.

5th.- That no Trees growing on the Premises will be permitted to be lopped, topped, or in anywise injured.

6th.- That on your quitting the Premises, all the Manure will be considered as belonging thereto, and will not be suffered to be removed therefrom or allowed for.

7th.- That the Game and right of Sporting over such lands is reserved to His Grace.
Tenancies were on a yearly basis, as was general practice by 1850. There was little legal protection for tenants; even the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1875, which established the period of notice to quit at one year, could be contracted out of by landlords. On the Duke of Rutland's estates 'the mutual confidence and good feeling that exists between the landlord and the tenants ... appear to render any written agreement unnecessary'. Nevertheless, Caird warned in 1878 that:

The good understanding which has hitherto as a rule protected the English farmer under a yearly tenancy, will not for many years longer be able to withstand the inevitable pressure of home and foreign competition. However unpalatable the truth, the relation is and must become one of business, and not merely of mutual confidence.

In March 1851 there was a revision of rents on the Belvoir estate, announced as being intended to redistribute the burden more fairly. It seemed however that very few rents were lowered at all, while many were increased and some even doubled. Farmers talked of resigning their holdings, but still the hope was expressed that the Duke would intervene to prevent the worst hardship. The Leicester Chronicle for the following week carried the explanation that rents would be tied to wheat prices, with a return of 13 per cent to farmers if wheat failed to make 46 shillings a quarter, with the proviso that the rebate must be spent on manure or fertilisers. If wheat prices rose however, so would rents. The Editor commented:

In the new scheme, [the Duke] has shown very little of that old-fashioned sentiment of landlordism, in which generosity was theoretically the principal element.

Following the audit which was held at Belvoir the following July, a report appeared in the Stamford Mercury: It was a remarkable proceeding, and tends to show that the complaint uttered against the illustrious Duke respecting the recent valuations upon his extensive estates were premature, unless indeed the publicity given to them has had a beneficial effect.
Every tenant whose rent has been reduced had returned to him the full extent of that reduction for the past three half years in addition to ten per cent upon the old rental for the same time. This is an example to other landlords. Many of the tenants received back above fifty per cent, and returned to their homes convinced of the thorough goodness of heart of their highminded and benevolent landlord.

We are not told what were the thoughts of those tenants whose rents had not been reduced, but increased! However, the general regard in which the Manners family were held is supported by a report from a few weeks later: 63.

At the rent audit of the Rev. Edward Manners of Goadby Marwood, which was held at the Horse Shoes inn at Waltham on the Wolds ... the tenancy took the opportunity of expressing their attachment to their kind and much respected landlord by presenting to him a very valuable and elaborately embossed snuff-box. The lid is surmounted by the family arms, and the following inscription is engraved in the interior: "Presented to the Rev. Edward Manners, in affectionate remembrance of unvarying, kind, and honourable conduct, and as a token of esteem to a beloved landlord".

When the fifth Duke died in 1857, a tribute to him first published in the Gentleman's Magazine was reproduced as a pamphlet by a Grantham printer. In it the Duke's lying in state was described, and the procession of nearly four thousand visitors, nine-tenths of whom were tenants and their families, who filed past to pay their respects. 'The first five were labourers from Rutland, who walked 26 miles each way for the privilege'. 64. The writer's final tribute was that 'few men have evinced a warmer regard for the interests of the honest and endeavouring farmer'.

Although the generosity of the sixth Duke was often appreciated in the press, be it for the gift of a plot of land to the Wesleyan Methodists at Woolsthorpe or the distribution of calico, flannel and clothing among the poor of Redmile and other villages, he seems not to have inspired the same affection as his father. When the Duchess died at the end of 1869, the report of the
distribution of memorial gifts to the poor in 23 villages was coupled with that of the Christmas party held as usual for the servants at Belvoir.\textsuperscript{65} Already in 1868 the new move towards democracy was showing itself in calls in the press for the creation of elective county councils, and for the appointment of an official Recorder for the county.\textsuperscript{66}

Dealings between tenants and the estate would normally have been conducted by the Duke's agent, in this area Mr. George Norman of Goadby Marwood. Caird commented on the poorness of landlord-tenant relationships in Leicestershire where communications between them were made through agents.\textsuperscript{67} F. M. L. Thompson suggests that this interposition of an agent into the tenant-landlord relationship was one of the reasons for the increasing social distance between them at this period, as 'the roots of deference in a personally administered paternalism were being sapped'.\textsuperscript{68} The effects of this in the Vale of Belvoir may have been lessened somewhat since Mr. Norman was a member of the Duke's family (his cousin); it is interesting that in this part of the estate at least the Duke did not follow the increasingly general move towards the employment of professionally qualified agents, which Thompson describes as virtually complete by the 1870s.\textsuperscript{69}

Something of the Duke's philosophy concerning estate relations is revealed in a letter he sent to workers on his estate at Cheveley, Cambridgeshire, when there was unrest there in 1874: \textsuperscript{70}

\begin{quote}
The relation of the farmer to the labourer must rest on one of two principles - either on that of the mercantile or the confidential. Hitherto it has been on the latter, and I hope you will allow it to remain so. The one treats the labourer as a man whose family and children are to be cared for and protected; the other treats him as a machine out of whom the greatest amount of work is to be obtained at the lowest cost. It may be that the mercantile would be the best principle for the farmer's pocket, though I doubt it; but I am sure no paltry saving of money could compensate for the
loss of kindly feelings and friendly relations existing between the different classes here.

Identifying the agricultural unions as aggravating bad relationships between farmers and labourers, he continued:—

I am strongly of opinion that [membership] is not a good thing, as those who advocate it are generally entire strangers, who do not live among you, and who know little of your position, or wants, or necessities.

His recognition of the importance of personal, face-to-face relationships, is emphasised by Newby, who points out that the Duke's letter failed to quieten the unrest, whereas the presence of a neighbouring landlord, Sir Edward Kerrison, at a labourers' meeting, was successful. In the Vale of Belvoir therefore the presence of the Duke and the Manners family may have been as important as the benevolence of their control in preventing violent unrest.

It is noticeable that the conditions of tenure quoted above make no stipulation about the type or rotation of crops to be grown, other than the preservation of pasture, and there seems to have been little interference in the management of tenant farms. On some other estates the tenant was not given so free a hand; the Duke of Bedford's agent advocated the removal of tenants whose farms failed to achieve a standard in 1880, and the Duke of Portland intervened from time to time when his agent, John Field, suggested crop layouts of which he did not approve.71. Perhaps on the Belvoir estate too advice was given and regarded. In 1866 for example Lord John Manners advocated the cultivation of flax in Leicestershire, offering a prize for the best sample. The difficulty was pointed out that it needed to be grown within ten miles of a factory, and the solution offered that it could be sent by train into Yorkshire.72. The crop returns for 1870 show an area of 6 acres of flax in Long Clawson, which may have been an experiment in response.

The most direct power of the landlord was however in his ability to choose his tenants. Thomas Shipman preserved a letter he received from the Steward's office at Belvoir Castle in 1849, to confirm the news already given to him.
by George Norman that he was not to be given the tenancy of a recently vacated farm at Croxton. Assurances were given of the high estimation in which Mr. Shipman was held, yet 'the reason why you are not fortunate is, that we think we can make an arrangement which will be more beneficial to His Grace's Estate at Croxton'. The Shipman family seem to have been very able and ambitious farmers, acquiring tenancies in several of the villages around Stathern. Thomas Shipman had progressive ideas of farming; as we have seen in a previous chapter, he bought a steam engine and threshing machine in 1853, and bought town manure from Manchester, as well as becoming a member of the Royal Agricultural Society. Certainly on other occasions he and his family were not unacceptable tenants to His Grace; by 1868 they were paying £162 a half-year rent to the Duke, as well as farm rent for land in Stathern to the Heirs of A. Barnardiston Esq., and £220.8.0 to Lord Harborough for land in Whissendine.

Political loyalty was expected of the tenant on a large estate, and even after the introduction of the Ballot Act in 1872 many tenants continued to vote for their landlord's candidate. Moore reports that as late as 1868 the sixth Duke still claimed the undoubted right to nominate candidates whom he considered 'would be most acceptable to the constituents'. He and both his brothers were at some time Members of Parliament, and like their friend Disraeli considered it desirable that the great proprietors should continue to represent the traditional 'landed interest'. The north Leicestershire constituency was so firmly under the influence of the Duke of Rutland that it was uncontested by Liberal candidates. In 1857 however Mr. C. H. Frewen announced his candidacy as an independent Conservative, intending to break the monopoly of Manners nominees. He had little success; at one stage during the campaign he declared his intention to withdraw his candidacy, because 'there is such a paramount influence against me in the Hundred of Framland ... that I have thought it prudent to retire from the contest'. The Editor of the Liberal Leicester Chronicle commented that he needed 'some
better excuse', and went on to say that the election of Lord John Manners would be unacceptable to Liberals only on political grounds, since his services to the people of Leicester had created much respect. 78.

Mr. Frewen did continue to campaign, but his Conservative opponents, Lord John Manners and Mr. Farnham, were elected. He repeated his attempt to contest the second seat (the election of Lord John Manners to one seat was taken as a foregone conclusion) in subsequent elections, but with no better success. During the 1868 campaign, he claimed that 'poor men have been turned out of their land because they dared to vote for me in 1865', and threatened to rid the area of foxes if his rival, former Master of the Quorn Hunt S. W. Clowes, were elected by the foxhunting interest. 79. (See Appendix IX).

Enthusiasm for the Manners family was not unlimited. When the future sixth Duke, as Marquis of Granby, visited Melton in July 1852 to meet his new constituents - 80.

The Marquis' reception was not very enthusiastic; the only demonstration was a few yards of blue calico from the church steeple and a lusty ringing of the bells. It is stated that feelings of delicacy towards the head of the house of Belvoir alone prevented a contest at the present general election.

Although he represented the constituency for many years, Lord John Manners, brother to the sixth Duke, was always a controversial figure. The Protectionist meetings which he and Mr. Packe organised in the county in 1850 were reported in the local press without enthusiasm. 81.

Following the election of 1859 a petition was raised against the campaign of Lord John Manners and Mr. Hartopp, since it was claimed that there had been corruption. Charges of bribery were finally pinned down to 'voters who had devoted their day to going to and returning from the polling-booth' having been given four-shilling refreshment tickets. The Leicester Chronicle was on this occasion effusive in its support of the Conservative candidates: - 82.
We, as Liberals, can feel only a limited interest in this matter one way or the other; though, in all respects, Lord John Manners and Mr. Hartopp are unitedly and separately to be preferred to Mr. Frewen. The House of Commons would not be complete in the inclusiveness of its representative character were not Lord John Manners one of its members - his earnest and manly treatment of some non-political questions, and his literacy and scholarly accomplishments mark him out as a man fit for the legislature; while from Mr. Hartopp we have reason to expect an enlightened and Liberal Conservatism.

In 1863 Lord John's efforts were less well received; with other local Members of Parliament - Mr. Heygate, Viscount Curzon, Mr. Hartopp and Mr. Packe - Lord John Manners voted against a Bill to allow non-conformist burial services, and the predictable comment of the Leicester Chronicle was: 83.

Thus are the wishes of the Non-conformists of the Town and County of Leicester ignored in the House of Commons.

A few days later however Lord John presented to Parliament a petition from the Deanery of Akeley and from the village of Harby appealing against the Bill, so obviously opinion was divided. 84.

An article recently published in the Royal Agricultural Society Journal was reported in the Leicester Chronicle in January 1867. 85. The extent of the Duke's lands are described - 'one-sixteenth of the whole county' - and the 'few, simple, and stringent' terms of the tenancy agreement on the estate (quoted above). The article continues:-

... the Rutland tenants are probably held too well in hand ever to dream of disputing the behest of their lord. As showing the amount of political influence such a territorial magnate can wield, by the agency of a subservient tenantry, we extract the following:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£8 per annum</th>
<th>759 occupiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above £8 and under £10</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; £10 &quot; &quot; £12</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; £12 &quot; &quot; £15</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; £15 &quot; &quot; £20</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; £20 &quot; &quot; £50</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; £50 &quot; &quot; £100</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; £100 &quot; &quot; £200</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; £200 &quot; &quot; £500</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; £500 &quot; &quot; £1000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of 1275
Later that year, the views of the leader writer had polarised:—

As Lord John Manners, though a member of the Government, is not in the Ministry, it would be superfluous to notice him; he is a man of as narrow Tory views as his brother, the Duke of Rutland. It is a misfortune to a free country when conventional rank gives such men a sort of right to a seat in its councils.

Although it was not directed specifically at the influence of the Duke of Rutland, a leader of 1869 strongly stated the grievances of tenant farmers:—

At present the position of the occupier of the land is anomalous and unjust. He is called upon to pay county rates without having any control over their expenditure; he may be summarily ejected from his farm by an arbitrary landlord, and receive no compensation for money expended in the improvement of his land; he must be content to see his growing crops devoured by hares and rabbits without a murmur, or run the risk of a "snub" from the steward, or a notice to quit, if he complains of the injuries he has sustained; he must, if a Dissenter, pay Church-rates and go to Church, or be prepared for an intimation that he must look out for another farm; in fine, he must possess the shadow, not the substance of a man - he must be dependent on another, not a free agent - if he remain in his present social and political condition.

The writer went on to suggest that all these ills could be righted if farmers would become 'alive to their true interests' and vote Liberal. The theme was repeated almost two years later, when a report of a meeting of the County Chamber of Agriculture asked, 'Why is it that in a county where Tory landlords are the rule, and Liberal landlords the exception, we should have "one of the worst tenant rights in England"?' One of the county M.P.s, Mr. Heygate, aroused particular wrath by upholding the right of a landlord to defend the game reserves in which he had invested money against 'unscrupulous' farmers; the writer concluded that, as long as landholders preferred to elect M.P.s 'of Mr. Heygate's stamp to better men and truer
friends, they have only themselves to thank for the injuries and difficulties under which they labour'. 88.

There is no evidence that these views were expressed by residents of the Vale of Belvoir, but the inclusion of a regular Melton Mowbray column in the Leicester Chronicle surely indicates that the paper had its subscribers there, and that the articles were read there. The readership of the local weekly newspapers was mainly among the 'middle class', since the working class preferred sporting papers or those containing sensational fiction. 89. Nevertheless, the abolition of the stamp tax on newspapers in 1855 encouraged the spread of newspaper readership, so that radical political ideas were more widely broadcast.

Finally in 1880 an article was reprinted in the Leicester Chronicle from Reynolds Newspaper in terms which could not be further removed from the deference of references to the Duke and his family in the 1850s. Although no doubt inspired by political opposition, the bitterness of the attack goes further than that, and the fact that it was reprinted locally without comment illustrates a more independent attitude in the county. The article was provoked by the award of a pension of £1,000 per annum to Lord John Manners. 90. It commented:-

Offering a premium in the shape of a pension to a manifest and mischievous imbecility, even though the recipient be brother to the Duke of Rutland, is carrying aristocratic privilege a little too far. Surely then, it is the height of imprudence that under such a condition of things, the brother of a very wealthy duke, who keeps up a princely establishment at Belvoir castle, can afford to entertain royalty, the master of a pack of hounds, etc., should constitute himself a public pauper.

Lord John himself, while regarding the pension as part of the just reward for a career of forty years in public service, probably foresaw that there would be criticism. He wrote to the Duke, his brother, describing the presentation by the Queen of his order of the Bath (C.C.E.), and continued:- 91.
This morning I received information that I am to receive a retiring pension of £1200 a year. In view of my long Parliamentary career, and my large family, I felt I ought to put aside scruple and not decline that addition to my income which the State could give. There was no time to consult you or anybody on the subject - I had to act almost on the spur of the moment.

Two days later, on 22 April 1880, he wrote again:

I was greatly pleased to receive your affectionate letter, and to know that you thought I acted rightly in taking the pension. There is a feeling that I can't help sharing against becoming a State pensioner; but I thought it my duty to consider wife and children in preference.

He had only a younger son's share of the family wealth, and as his biographer reminds us, some personal wealth was necessary even to remain a Member of the House of Commons. Although he was for many years a member of Disraeli's government he never held a highly paid post. Following further press criticism in March 1884, he wrote to his brother again concerning his pension:

Without it, indeed, I must have retired into private life, and even with it I can only struggle on by borrowing money, and selling out from time to time some of Janetta's stock.

Lord John Manners remained an active Member of Parliament until 1888, when he succeeded to the Dukedom of Rutland and moved to the House of Lords. He finally retired from politics in 1895 and took up residence at Belvoir. His biographer writes:

His life at the famous castle on the hill was a survival of feudalism in act ... He himself was in all things a Grand Seigneur. He practised in his age the chivalry whose doctrines he had preached in youth with so fine an eloquence.

While his political devotion could be admired, the form of Conservatism in which he and his brothers believed was becoming out of tune with the age. Moore shows that, as the urban vote became increasingly important, confidence
in the leadership of the landlords weakened. Disraeli himself observed in 1859:

There is no doubt that dissatisfaction, followed by distrust and misrepresentation, did raise in the country an idea that the county representation was an exclusive representation; that it was animated only by one object; that it had a selfish interest always before it, and that it had not that sympathy with the community which we desire in that body to which the privilege of election is entrusted.

The criticism which was expressed in the local press was not merely the conflicting view of rival political parties; it was part of a challenge to the dominance of a great landowner and his family. The presence of the Duke at Belvoir, and his benevolence as a landlord, helped to maintain the loyalty of the tenantry, but the expression of that loyalty in political terms was beginning to be questioned. Thus we see signs of a crumbling away of the deferential society.

To summarise: - the ownership of a small area of land, while it may have given some social status in the village, which we have no way of measuring, gave no additional advantage to the farmer over holding a tenancy. Most owners of small plots held rented land as well. In the Vale of Belvoir there seems to have been greater security in the tenure of a medium to large farm, be it owned or rented, than in a small one.

The majority of farmers were tenants of the great landowners, most of the Duke of Rutland. However, from the villages examined in this study, it seems that the Duke had a monopoly of landownership in few villages, and that by 1871 the categorisation of 'open' and 'close' villages was obsolete. It is neither true to generalise that single ownership precluded expansion of a village, nor that diverse ownership ensured it. There were few owners of land among tradesmen and artisans, so no connection in the area between smallholding and radical politics.
The Duke was renowned as a model landlord, and the relative prosperity of the area as the Depression took hold was largely due to the conversion to pasture which the Belvoir estate had encouraged from the time of enclosure. The Duke and his family were honoured and respected, and support for his political candidates was assured. However, as various social factors changed, the habit of deference and its somewhat exaggerated expression in the local press, became diluted; at the same time, the press was becoming more widely distributed, and therefore more influential, amongst middle-class villagers. The pattern was that summed up by Mingay:

The great depression marked more than a realignment of agricultural resources: it announced the approaching end of parochial paternalism, the end of land's age-old supremacy, the passing of the traditional society.

Beckett, commenting upon the challenge which the aristocracy faced at the end of the nineteenth century, observed that:

What is most remarkable is that their control continued so long, and that when it slipped it did so peacefully, and by agreement with the rest of society, rather than through the upheavals of revolution.

He attributes this easy transition to the wisdom of the aristocracy in the investment of cash and concern with which they developed their estates, and to the way in which the rising middle class had been drawn into an acceptance of many of the standards and attitudes of the upper class. The Duke of Rutland in his dealings with the Vale of Belvoir typified the best of this approach, despite political opinions which might have seemed to preclude his participation in the developing democracy of local government. The growing involvement of the middle class in the management of the village is a theme which will be pursued in later chapters.
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### Table 15. Average Acreage of Landholdings as Declared on Census: Farmers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nether Broughton</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Clawson</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goadby Marwood</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadwell</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wycomb</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harby</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hose</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Average Acreage of Landholdings as Declared on Census: Graziers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nether Broughton</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Clawson</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goadby Marwood</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadwell</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wycomb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harby</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hose</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 16.  MAXIMUM ACREAGE OF LANDHOLDINGS AS DECLARED ON CENSUS: FARMERS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nether Broughton</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Clawson</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goadby Marwood</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadwell</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wycomb</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harsy</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hose</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MAXIMUM ACREAGE OF LANDHOLDINGS AS DECLARED ON CENSUS: GRAZIERS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nether Broughton</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Clawson</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goadby Marwood</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadwell</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wycomb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harsy</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hose</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 6 - MASTER AND SERVANT.

The term servant has largely come to be understood as describing one who performs domestic or personal tasks for an employer, and, in England at least, it has acquired a taint of the menial. In earlier times the word was used to describe someone who worked for a particular master or household, assisting in the essential work of that household or its business. In this way a farm-servant was an employee of a certain farmer, probably boarded in his household, working alongside the family to maintain the farm; the households of craftsmen and tradesmen were also likely to include resident servants working in the craft or trade. As Banks points out, servants in working households had been seen as 'income earners', working in productive tasks which added to the family income, or freeing the wife from household tasks so that she could take her part in more profitable work; except in upper-class households, it was only in the Victorian era that domestic servants became 'income spenders', desired as status symbols of a respectable household. Whereas since the Middle Ages servants had formed part of the 'family' of the master's household, the Victorian consciousness of status and respectability led to the ending of the custom of boarding-in farm or trade servants, and at the same time to a lowered perception of the status of domestic servants; the picture of the maid-of-all-work, working perhaps a seventeen hour day, with minimal time-off, and with restrictions on what she might do in her spare time such as a prohibition on 'followers', perhaps directed by her employer as to which place of worship she might attend, and withal paid only shillings per year, is a familiar one. The diaries of Hannah Gullwick provide a record of the drudgery involved, and Pamela Horn confirms the accuracy of the picture.

However, to the census makers of the nineteenth century the description 'servant' still applied to employees in other fields as well as domestic work, denoting particularly an employee who lived in the employer's household. Thus
the Act of 1867 which governed compliance with an employment contract was entitled the Master and Servant Act. Significantly, a later Act in the same field was the Employers and Workmen Act of 1875, a change of terminology which reflects both the social change away from the equation of employment with service, and a growing concern with industrial employment. This chapter will discuss servants as defined by the census makers, but concentrate upon domestic servants and agricultural servants. Domestic servants are of interest because they demonstrate some aspects of the economic conditions of the villages; farm servants, as the major body of workers in the villages of the Vale of Belvoir, illustrate economic changes and also, as the legislation reveals, changing social concepts of the employer/employee relationship.

In the nation as a whole the demand for domestic servants was increasing throughout our period. By 1851 it was already the second largest occupational group in England and Wales, fewer only than agricultural workers. Predominantly a female occupation, by 1860 there were 900,000 female servants, and by 1888 an estimated 1.5 million. Most of these servants were of course employed in towns, but many of them were drawn from the countryside; of those who left the seven villages there is little trace, but their departure must help to explain the disappearance of so many villagers, noted in Chapter 2, as they reached adulthood. Our concern here must mainly be with servants employed within the villages, although, as will be seen, by no means all of these remained in their home village to work.

The nation's agricultural work-force on the other hand was diminishing throughout the period. The 1851 census showed more than 1.25 million agricultural workers, farm servants and shepherds in England; by 1871 there were 980,178. Put another way, in 1851 one-fifth of the occupied population was employed in agriculture, falling to one-tenth by 1901. The reasons for the drift of population to the towns have already been discussed in
Chapter 2; as the main basis of the national economy came to be supplied by industry, displacing agriculture, employment became concentrated in towns. The increasing possibilities of mechanisation in agriculture at the same time facilitated the continuation of the food growing process with a reduced work force.

In this chapter it is intended to look at the opportunities for work in agriculture for those who remained in (or came to) the seven villages. Although a number of farm employees were described in the census as indoor- or outdoor-servants, the interest here is with the whole category of agricultural workers, the majority of whose relationship to the head of household was described as 'servant'. Whereas the great majority of domestic servants in the villages lived in their employers' households, this was not true of agricultural workers at this time, and the chapter will explore this situation.

The chapter will firstly explore domestic service as a provider of employment, both within the villages and through migration. There will be some discussion of the evidence for the direction of that migration. The motivation for migration leads to consideration of the social status of domestic service, and a local example will be given of a servant whose social status seems to have been unusual.

In a similar examination of farm service it is possible to say a little more about conditions of service and pay. Incentives to migrate are again discussed, including the influence of agricultural unions and the effects of the depression. Following an exploration of the changing custom in the employment of resident farm servants, there will be some discussion of the evidence concerning employment relationships in the area, particularly in the light of the contemporary legislation designed to regulate them. As part of the evidence for change in this area, an account will be given of the gradual abandonment of the Statute Fair as the main means of finding employment in the Melton Mowbray area.
Domestic Servants.

Table 17 shows the incidence of domestic servants in the seven villages, categorised according to their occupational description in the census. The numbers include those listed as kin to the head of the household in which they lived and, in some cases, worked, and also a number of service occupations such as seamstress and washerwoman which are peripheral to domestic service. It will be seen that overall numbers decreased from 181 in 1851 to 147 in 1871, then recovered somewhat to 160 in 1881. Total numbers for each village seem to fluctuate quite widely, but this is in some measure accounted for by enumerators' descriptions; for example, the peaks at Harby in 1851 and Long Clawson in 1861 are largely created by the high number of housekeepers listed, many of whom were members of the family and probably not hired servants.

Many of the more precisely categorised servants, such as parlour maids, governesses or grooms, were obviously employed in households which had some claim to be middle-class; the majority of generally described 'domestic servants' were employed on farms. However, servants in farm houses would often have been required to help in farm tasks, so were sometimes described as 'general servants'. A comparison with Table 18 will show, for example, that in 1871, when Nether Broughton carried its lowest number of domestic servants, there were 10 general servants listed amongst agricultural workers. Similarly in Hose, the decreased number of domestic servants in 1871 and 1881 is balanced by the introduction of general servants on farms, as it is in the returns for Harby in 1861. This interchange is too inconsistent to signify any attempt to diminish the number of employees by diversifying their work-load, and can only be explained as a lack of consistency in description.

As shown in Chapter 2 (Table 6), the proportion of the village population employed in domestic service rose from 6.4 per cent in 1851 to 6.9 per cent in 1881. Despite
falling populations, farmers and other householders still required domestic servants. In Long Clawson, where population fell from 869 in 1851 to 746 in 1881, the number of servants fell by only one to 53 (9 per cent of population). At Goadby Marwood, where population fell from 209 to 155, a high 10 per cent of population was still employed in domestic service in 1881 because of the presence there of the Norman and Bellairs households, just as the Coleman household helped to maintain the number in Long Clawson. Even in Harby however, where the only gentry household was that at the Rectory, the proportion of domestic servants was maintained in 1881 as in 1851 at 7 per cent; this was in spite of the fact that the household of Rev. and Mrs. Octavius Manners Norman in 1881 consisted of cook, parlour maid and housemaid, compared with the seven servants, including a butler, employed by Rev. and Mrs. Hartopp in 1851.

Table 19 shows the number of households which employed resident servants who were not kin; it reveals that, although there was a diminution in 1861 and 1871 in the number of such households which employed domestic servants only, the 1851 level was restored by 1881. The largest part of the reduction in the number of servant-employing households was amongst those who employed both domestic and farm- or trade-servants; while fashion swung against boarding occupational employees (see page 126), resident domestic servants were still a necessity in many households. It may be that the migration of the younger generation left the ageing generation with no alternative but to hire servants; the labour involved in domestic tasks in a Victorian household was too demanding to be undertaken by anyone incapacitated by age or illness.

Very few households employed more than one domestic
servant; taking Harby as an example, in 1851 only Elizabeth Whittle at the Nag's Head could boast four servants, and these included a housekeeper, since Mrs. Whittle was 75 years old, and her 10 year old grand-daughter who was described as parlourmaid. Thomas Lamin, miller and farmer, employed two house servants in 1851, while farmers Jonathan Rosling and Richard Julian each had a housekeeper and another domestic servant; Mr. Rosling was unmarried, while Mr. Julian was 87 years old and blind. Housekeepers worked in the households of John Adcock, Samuel Musson, and John Orson; Mr. Orson, a farmer, and Mr. Musson, joiner and wheelwright, were both unmarried, while Mr. Adcock was a widowed land-proprietor. (Mr. Adcock's housekeeper, Jane Crapp, was still with him in 1861, a most unusually long stay for any employee in the seven villages). Other households which included a solitary domestic servant were those of eight farmers, a grocer, a butcher, a miller, a canal agent and a thrashing machine proprietor. More surprisingly two cottagers had a servant in their households; John and William Boyer, aged 63 and 59 respectively, had perhaps retired to their cottage plots from more prosperous occupations; twenty years later, in 1871, William was still living in the village, blind and widowed, a lodger in the house of an agricultural labourer, and described as an annuitant. Harby thus illustrates a point raised by Higgs, that the middle class were not the only employers of servants, and that a family crisis - widowhood, illness or infirmity - could provide a reason to do so. Nevertheless, where anyone except a family member was brought in to perform domestic tasks, it must be assumed that the employer had sufficient income to pay the low wages involved.8

A few of the domestic servants in Harby in 1851 lived with their own families, but can be assumed to have been working for someone else even though their employers cannot be identified. They include two agricultural labourers' daughters, and a cottager's
wife described as laundress. Another laundress lodged with a cottager, while a gardener from Cumberland was a lodger at the Marquis of Granby. A local girl, Adela Julian, was described as servant to farmer's son Richard Dunsmore, but at the time of the 1851 census had a two month old son, John Henry Duns Julian. Adela became Richard's wife during the next decade, while he settled down to life as an agricultural labourer. They were still together in 1881, having had at least six children. The description 'servant' in 1851 was perhaps therefore a polite one.

The situation in Harby had changed very little by 1881, except that the number of households where there were two resident servants had risen to eight. Only one household other than the Rectory had more than two, even the White Hart and the Nag's Head recording only two each. John Whittle at the Nag's Head rather grandly described his servants as a chamber maid and a kitchen maid. The one farmer with three domestic servants was Francis Orson, since his household included a nurse, presumably to care for his elderly mother. Three other farmers had two servants each, as did a maltster and the newly arrived curate, William Chancellor. Two farmers and a maltster had one servant each, as did a grocer and two widows. Mary Musson, who was 90, had a resident nurse, and so did William Starbuck for his wife and newly born son. A 'porter' or carrier, John Wright, employed a housekeeper to look after his five children since he had recently been widowed, while a cottager and a labourer each described their sisters as housekeepers, a title also given to 14 year old Annie, daughter of agricultural labourer Leonard Gibson.

Catherine Gregg, milliner, included in her household her sister, brother and sister-in-law, and a niece, Martha, who was described as cook. Whether Martha cooked only for her aunts and uncle is not clear. None of the remaining servants in the village lived
with their employers. The two seamstresses were a railway labourer's wife and a daughter of Adela and Richard Dunsmore. A labourer's widow worked as a washerwoman, and another as a charwoman. The latter's daughter, Ellen Norris, was one of the three young women living with parents or grandparents in the village described as domestic servants 'out of employ', suggesting that the depression was perhaps having an effect. Although the number of servants living in the village had decreased by only four since 1851, the number of households which included resident servants had also decreased. Only Long Clawson and Chadwell and Wycomb saw no decrease in the number of servant employing households over the period (Table 19). Table 17 makes it clear that it was a decrease in the number of domestic servants employed on farms which produced the reduction in servants living in some of the villages; Goadby Marwood and Hose had the greatest reduction in servants on farms, and also in servants employed in the village overall, and in each of them there was a noticeable reduction in the number of households employing a combination of domestic and farm- or trade-servants. There is a suggestion therefore that domestic servants as well as farm servants were becoming less acceptable as residents in the farm house; the presence of unemployed servants in the villages in 1881 re-emphasises the pressure that young people were under to seek employment away from the village.

Charwomen, washerwomen and seamstresses obviously lived in their own homes or as boarders, as did gardeners. Larger estates, like Goadby Hall, provided cottages for some of the employees, or perhaps a groom might board with a cottager on the estate; but the great majority of servants lived in their employers' households. Nevertheless, as Table 20 shows, some 60 per cent of domestic servants working in the seven villages had been born either in the village of their
employment, or within five miles of it. This percentage decreased over the period, from 65 per cent in 1851 to 59.6 per cent in 1881. The compensating increase per cent is hardly seen at all in an influx from further afield in Leicestershire and the East Midlands however, rising only from 32 to 34 per cent. This was partly the result of greater mobility of population; many of the newcomers to the area in 1881 were railway workers or quarrymen, drawn in from all over the country for their specialised skills, and no doubt their daughters would have been likely to go into service, though I cannot provide any specific examples. Middle-class families seem to have been more likely to employ servants from some distance, however; when Rev. Philip Deedes married Miss Josephine Parker at St. James', Picadilly, in October 1878, they brought back with them to the Rectory at Nether Broughton a nursemaid from Kent, a lady's nurse from Suffolk, a coachman and a housemaid from Hertfordshire, and a nurse from Staffordshire, to join their Leicestershire cook and parlourmaid. The tendency has been noted elsewhere; for example, Jean Robin noted that gentry houses in Elmdon employed servants from a distance, particularly for 'special responsibility' posts. Several possible reasons for this suggest themselves; there could have been a preference for servants who were known, or whose background was known, to the employer; servants with some experience of the conduct of a large household would have been desirable; and the hierarchical structure of the servant force within a large household would be more easily maintained if the senior positions were filled from outside the village. On the other hand, Higgs suggests that country girls were more sought after as servants by households at a distance from their homes because, taken out of their own environment, they were more 'biddable' than local or town girls, and that their isolation from family and friends was a prerequisite of discipline. This
anxiety to impose discipline is perhaps a sign of more rigid requirements amongst employers, or perhaps of a more independent attitude amongst the servants themselves.

As demonstrated in Chapter 2, a large proportion of young men and women left the seven villages on reaching an age at which they might find work. Many of these young women in particular were likely to go into service; the school log books have occasional entries recording pupils leaving school 'for service'. Of those who left the village to do so there is little later trace. It would seem probable that many of them would move to Nottingham, which was growing rapidly at this time and where middle-class areas like The Park were developing with large servant-employing households. In a study of migration into Nottingham in the period 1851-'71, Susan Maude identifies the movement of women to become domestic servants as 'the most significant component of rural-urban migration' in the area. She notes the high incidence of servants from north and north-east Leicestershire, and suggests that carriers' routes provided lines of communication by which vacancies became known. While placing Melton Mowbray outside such a sphere of influence, she identifies villages between there and Nottingham as within the 'effective carrier hinterland' of Nottingham, referring specifically to Long Clawson.

Taking the Park ward as a major servant-employing area of Nottingham in 1871, Maude identifies some 300 domestic servants. Of these I find 30 whose birthplace was in the Vale of Belvoir area, 14 in Leicestershire villages. Amongst them only Annie Barlow and Mary Wesson, both from Harby, were born within the seven villages. Another native of Harby who lived in the ward was Rebecca Whittle, a widowed lace maker; it is possible that the line of communication with the village through which the situations were 'advertised' was through her. The importance of such
personal links are widely recognised in discussion of the servant employment network; Higgs stresses the importance of personal contacts in servant recruitment, but notes that advertisement and the formation of servant registers were becoming more widespread by 1871 as the previously plentiful supply of country-born servants began to diminish. This rising demand for servants in towns, and the rise in wages which it created, may of course offer an alternative cause for the diminution of servant employment within the villages noted above; rather than a rejection by farmers of servants living in the farm house, it may be that better opportunities elsewhere made servants reluctant to accept such employment. However, without a more complete search through the Nottingham data than has been possible here, we are left with little indication of the destination of migrating servants from the Vale of Belvoir.

It was only when something went wrong that there was likely to be any newspaper comment, as there was in July 1878 when Ann Scarborough was charged at Nottingham with stealing from her employer, Dr. Thompson of Regent Street, The Park, for whom she had worked for about seven months. Mrs. Thompson had found various items - some lace, wine glasses, knives, boots, 30 squares of soap, window blinds and other articles, in the girl's box. The next day she went with a police detective to the girl's mother's house at Hose, and there found some mats, soap and lace which she could identify as her husband's property. Ann Scarborough pleaded guilty, and was sentenced to four months imprisonment. It seems that in moving from a simple cottage to the comfort of a middle-class home she was charmed by the pretty things she saw around her and took them, magpie like.

Although most domestic servants faced a life of drudgery and often exploitation, the move from a labouring background into a middle-class home could
nevertheless give a young girl the experience of a 
quite different way of life; a fortunate few might 
be 'counted as 'one of the family', perhaps on a par 
with the children of the household'. 15. Higgs draws 
a distinction between town girls, who preferred the 
freedom of work in industry to the restrictions of 
domestic service, and country girls, who saw service 
as a route away from parental restrictions and the 
often overcrowded conditions of a labourer's cottage. 
The returning servant, he reminds us, was an object 
of admiration in the village in her town finery. 16. 
The advantages of going into service are summed up 
by Hunt: 17.

Service provided country girls with a 
surrogate home and family ... Servants' 
food and accommodation were in most cases 
far better than what they could have 
expected in their parents' home and there 
were few workers so likely to receive 
medical attention paid for by their 
employers, pay during sickness, and 
regular paid holidays ... Service also 
offered improved prospects in the marriage 
market because servants acquired a modicum 
of middle-class polish, habits of order 
and cleanliness, and savings - all of which 
were much esteemed by the higher ranks of 
working men.

However, Higgs questions the reality of social mobility 
amongst servants, and sees the occupation as one of 
diminishing status during the final quarter of the 
nineteenth century. Nevertheless, he concedes that 
the novelettes of the 1880s, 'in which the poor 
governess always married the duke', might be 
'indicative of how certain groups of women were 
encouraged to think', and suggests that the favourable 
position of those employed in the households of the 
élite always produced competition for such positions. 18. 
W. M. Williams writes of the pride and pleasure with 
which elderly residents of Gosforth spoke of serving 
'proper ladies and gentlemen', seeing no social stigma 
in such service. 19. Indeed, the occupation had its 
own hierarchy; Gathorne-Hardy identifies no less than
33 separate 'species' mentioned in advertisements in a single issue of The Times in 1870. While many little girls being sent away into service must have felt very miserable and frightened, there was some justification for the hope that they might 'do well'.

Reports of a local incident reveal what a privileged position a servant in a gentry household might hold, and the public interest created in the anomalies of the situation. One day in July 1856 Mrs. George Norman walked between the Hall and the Rectory next door to visit her old and failing father, Rev. Edward Manners. She found herself prevented from entering his room by two grooms, Daniel Ecob and Thomas Landers, and by Mary Johnson, her sister's companion. It was claimed that the doctor had given orders that only Miss Johnson and her employer, Miss Ann Manners, should be admitted to the room, and that Mr. Manners did not wish to see his elder daughter, Mrs. Louisa Norman. There was a struggle, during which Mrs. Norman received a blow, and damaged a ring which she was wearing. She then ran out of the house and round to the window of her father's room, jumped in, 'and while she was talking to her father, who is of rather a weak mind and far advanced in years, the defendants entered the room and forcibly ejected her'. At the trial held at Melton Mowbray, George Norman gave evidence of the bruises inflicted on his wife when the groom Landers had hit and nearly stunned her.

The character of Mary Johnson created much interest. The Leicester Chronicle pointed out in its account of the trial that she had taken out a game certificate two years previously, and commented upon the richness of her dress when she appeared in court, with valuable rings on her fingers and carrying a bouquet of flowers. Nevertheless, she was sentenced to one month's hard labour, while Landers was to serve four months. Ecob was discharged.

A month later the Leicester Chronicle described her release from the county gaol:
She emerged from gaol, wearing a fashionable brown hat and feather, with a black lace veil over it, and habited in a flounced muslin dress and black velvet cape. Glancing her eye about her for a few moments ... she at length espied a young man and woman ... these two persons were, it was understood, the servant man and housemaid at Goadby Hall, who had a chaise and pair in attendance to convey her to Melton.

Yet this was not the end of the matter. Miss Johnson apparently had influential friends, who interested the Home Secretary, Sir George Grey, in the case. On 20th. September the Leicester Chronicle reproduced a report from the Lincoln Mercury that the magistrates who had heard the trial, Mr. Bingham, Mr. Frewen and Mr. Beasley, had 'been imperatively called upon by the Home Office to give explanations of their treatment of the case'. However in the following week's issue the story was withdrawn; it seems that the Home Secretary had requested a copy of the evidence as he was bound to do having received a petition regarding the matter, but that he had written to the magistrates confirming his satisfaction with the conduct of the case. By December the affair still had not been forgotten; the inhabitants of Goadby, having collected about £30, made a public presentation to Mrs. Norman of a silver tea-pot, 'thus testifying that they believed this lady to be in the right'.

Edward Manners died at Christmas, and the house and living passed to the new incumbent, Stevenson Bellairs. Ann Manners and her companion must have finally left the district; it is hard to imagine that there would have been a home for them with her brother-in-law. At last the matter could be forgotten; yet it leaves a picture of a servant far removed from the swingeing toil of Esther Waters or the self-effacement of Jane Eyre. The interest aroused by the dress and behaviour of Mary Johnson indicates how conscious people were of the social boundaries between servants and their employers, and how sensational it was to overstep them.
With Mary Johnson representing the apex of servant status, there was a wide range of servants employed in the seven villages, through the 'special responsibility' servants of the gentry and clergy, to housekeepers, domestic and general servants to farmers and tradesmen, down to nurse girls and errand boys. Many of the servants of local origin were very young, servants of 14, 15 or 16 years old being very common on farms. Some were as young as 9, such as Joseph Cross who was described as domestic servant on James Doubleday's farm at Long Clawson in 1861, or Sarah Fillingham, one of four servants at Shilcock's Mill in the same village and year. As well as being inclined to bring in servants from outside the area however, the more prosperous households tended to employ slightly older servants; most of Dr. Swain's servants during the period for example were aged 20 or more. It seems that work on a local farm may have been a first step before moving further away to work in the town or perhaps a more prosperous household.

There is no reason to suppose that domestic service per se was seen as socially demeaning in the villages. It gave useful employment to many of those who were too young to seek other employment further afield, and many of those who were ready to move away almost certainly found their way via domestic service. The source of employment was particularly valuable for young women, for whom, as we shall see, there was very little work in agriculture at this time. Because there was a hierarchy amongst servants, the more ambitious could hope to improve their position as they gained experience, and though we have no way of following the careers of village girls there is no reason to suppose that a few of them at least might not have done so; after all, the strangers brought in to positions of responsibility within the village were themselves native to other areas.

Although both the number of servants employed and the number of households employing them were reduced over the period in the seven villages, the reduction follows the decrease in population, and the proportion of the
employment available in the villages which domestic service supplied remained almost unchanged. (See Table 6, Chapter 2). While many servants were employed in households where some crisis made their presence essential, it is noticeable that in 1881 it was farmers' households which had reduced their servant employment. Several possible reasons for this have been suggested: - economic restraints caused by the depression; growing reluctance to share the home with non-family members; growing competition to employ available servants in the towns. For only a few households in the villages (notably some of the clergy families) were servants an obvious mark of class status. The main interest in the occupation lies in the opportunity it presented for young people to find work away from the village, thus helping to prevent the widespread unemployment and misery which the growing number of inhabitants would otherwise have faced.

Farm Servants.

In England and Wales the agricultural labour force reached its highest number in 1851; in censuses thereafter it was shown to diminish both as a percentage of the work force and in numerical terms. Table 18 illustrates the numerical decline in farm employees in the seven villages in the four censuses 1851 - 1881, a decline echoed in all but two of the individual villages. However, as shown in Table 6, agricultural workers as a percentage of population in the seven villages rose overall in the period, showing a decline only in Long Clawson. It remained by far the largest income-earning group, with the presence of lace manufacture or railway builders seemingly making very little difference.

Farm servants and agricultural labourers are virtually indistinguishable; traditionally farms had housed a number of workers with the farmer and his family, and such living-in workers would be termed 'farm-' or 'indoor-servants'. However, by 1851 the largest number of farm labourers who lived in
separate households away from the farm house; they were employed mainly by the day for specific tasks, and being free to work for any employer they were not strictly speaking farm servants, but are included here to give a more complete picture. Some agricultural labourers were even resident in the farmer's household, so again there is a question as to the accuracy of census terminology.

The general rate of pay in the 1850s was 2s. per day, which for a six day week accumulated to £2.6.0 per month. Extra could be earned for some jobs however; in August 1861 William Stapleford was paid 3s.9d. for '1 day in clover' on the Shipman farm at Stathern, and 4s.6d. for a day 'Wheat Sheaving and Tackle Oiling'. On the other hand, six and a half days breaking manure in February 1867 brought Thomas Fowkes only 11s., presumably because the winter dearth of employment depressed the rate. In the summer, and especially at harvest times, outsiders might be brought in; in August 1858 Mr. Shipman paid two Nottingham men £1.7.0 for tying up oats, and in 1860 at Stathern two labourers' wives were paid 10s. each for ten days haymaking, while R. Shannon's boy earned 11s. for bird scaring for three weeks and four days at 5s. per week.26

Harvest expenses were a considerable item for the farmer. There is a detailed account of the cost of the harvest on the Shipman farm at Croxton Kerrial in 1843, which included over a five-week period £2.2.6 paid to two Irishmen, and £20 to four unnamed labourers. For sheaving one man was paid £4.2.9, while two men barley mowing received only £1 between them. The total cost was £44.9.3. By 1851 the cost had risen to £48.10.1½, but in 1857 at the Whissendine farm was only £31.8.0. It was in 1853 that Thomas Shipman bought his steam engine, which probably helped to reduce harvesting expenses, and would certainly have reduced the amount of casual labour employed. It included a threshing attachment, so would have put an end to the expense recorded in 1843 of threshing at 2s. per day which continued from mid-January through February and March.27.
Farmers were encouraged to invest in machinery in the 1850s, not only to reduce labour costs, but because labour was already becoming scarce. The changes affecting the 1852 harvest were described in the Leicester Chronicle:

The extent to which emigration is now going on is beginning to be felt in the Midland Counties. We have heard of one farmer who wanted forty hands to get in his harvest, but who could only obtain four. Many of the Irish reapers who used to visit the midlands at this season having migrated, the number who now come in search of employment is much less than usual, and these obtaining improved wages are enabled to travel by railway instead of travelling on foot. The fare from Liverpool to Leicester or Nottingham, in the cattle carriages, being only 5s. each person, scarcely a single reaper is to be now seen tramping on the turnpike roads.

In 1854 labour was reported to be plentiful for harvesting in the Vale of Belvoir, and labourers described as 'well employed' at 12s. per week. Not until 1865 was there another report of shortage of labour, when by mid-August the constant showery weather was making farmers anxious to snatch the harvest in as rapidly as possible. The threat of cattle plague must have added to their unease.

By 1872 the fear of shortage of labour on the land was giving strength to the movement to form trade unions of agricultural workers. A successful meeting in Leicester in March, called by Charles Houghton of the Loyal Agricultural Labourers' United Reliance, was followed a fortnight later by a meeting in the Oddfellows' Hall at Melton Mowbray. The speaker called for wages of 2s.6d. per day, and asked how a man could be expected to survive and maintain a family on 9s. per week. A number of members were enrolled, and a committee formed, but the meeting was spoilt by the immoderate language of the speaker, a Mr. Edson; his abuse of farmers was so extreme that the chairman and a large part of the audience left the hall.

In fact the labourers' wages record of the Shipman farm at Stathern shows that in the autumn of 1871 wages were already at 2s.3d. per day, and a group of five Irishmen were even paid £1 for a day's work. By the end of 1873
the rate stood at 2s. 8d. per day, though this apparently moderated to 2s. 4d. by the end of the decade. Even without taking into consideration the fall in food prices which added to the real value of their wages, it seems that agricultural labourers in the Vale of Belvoir were noticeably better off by the late '70s than they had been. In March 1875 a money order office and savings bank was opened at Long Clawson, a sure sign of increased prosperity if there was money to save.

On the other hand, while the father of a family might be earning more, there were growing restraints on the ability of his family to supplement that income. The Victorian ideal of womanhood discouraged the employment of women in the fields; the labourer's wife who had been perhaps a domestic servant would have felt it beneath her to do field work. If, as suggested in Chapter 2, we may assume that the agricultural labourers' wives listed in the census did no more than occasional field work, the number of women employed for agricultural work was very small; the censuses for Long Clawson for example, apart from the occasional general servant show only a dairywoman and a milk girl in 1851, two dairywomen in 1861, and again one in 1881. Snell suggests that the exclusion of women from many farming tasks was part of a specialisation which was occurring from the late eighteenth century, thus pre-dating the Victorian concept of femininity. He also suggests however that the employment of women was likely to be more widespread in areas of pasture farming, an idea which is not borne out in the censuses of these Vale of Belvoir villages. The occasional work which women had performed, in the harvest or preparing the ground by weeding or stone picking, does not appear in the census, and was gradually to be taken over by machinery.

At the same time the restraints upon the employment of children were increasing as minimum standards of education were required. (See Chapter 8). While the removal of women's and children's labour added to the effect of migration, making male labour more sought after and so
better paid, there may well have been a stage at which rising wages failed to meet the losses in family income. Casual wages paid at harvest time were in any case being seen as less attractive, failing to entice back to the village the men who had gone to work in towns; even the number of members of the farmers' own families who remained at home was decreasing.\footnote{35}

The pressure for higher wages fell heavily on farmers as the depression began to take effect. One, writing for the \textit{Leicester Chronicle} in March 1876, sounded the note of alarm:\footnote{36}

\begin{quote}
The prospects for the better of the farmer are fast diminishing. The labourers are demanding more wages, and unless their demands are complied with the land will have to go untilded; and seed will neither be got in nor harvest reaped, unless our hands are put again into our pockets to meet the additional rise, which is everywhere the order of the day. ... It cannot be doubted that ere long another class will come to the front, and assert their rights, by impressing more strongly upon Government than they have hitherto done, their title to a voice in choosing candidates who will represent their masters as well as themselves. I refer to the agricultural labourers, who, when they have the power given to them by the franchise, will join in strong force with their employers, and choose only those who, when placed in office, will do their best to rectify and make sound such laws as shall improve the cultivation of the soil, and make it bring forth more bountifully the fruits of the earth which could not fail to benefit all alike. ... It is a mistake to think that things can be carried on in the old high-handed way. The penny post, and the press have done much to enlighten and brighten the ideas of our rural population, and have caused them to think and act for themselves as well as to work.
\end{quote}

By the end of that year the depression was reported to have forced wages down in the area, but in 1878 shortage of labour for the harvest meant that wages maintained 21s. to 23s. per week.\footnote{37} Many farmers kept on the bare minimum of labour through the winter, then when the harvest was ready joined the rush for hands and had to pay very high wages.\footnote{38} Nevertheless,
the labourer was little better off; as James Caird commented in that year:\textsuperscript{39}.

... our agriculture is no longer the means of finding employment for surplus labour, but is now being developed on the principle of obtaining the largest produce at the least cost.

Despite higher wages, employment of farm labourers remained seasonal and intermittent, a problem which affected day-labourers more than those true 'farm servants' who either lived in the farmer's household or performed specific skilled duties. Skilled workers like dairymaids or shepherds had more possibilities of finding work in another place, and their skills made them valuable to farmers. Thomas Shipman at Stathern paid his shepherd, James Wesson, £4 for a half-year in 1864, while 'helping with the cow on Sunday' was rewarded with an extra 2s. 40. Specific tasks with the animals brought bonus payments, like the £1 paid for dipping sheep at Whissendine in 1867, or the fee payable to the groom when a mare was serviced: 'To serve Mares this Season at £1 each mare, and 2s. 6d. the groom'.\textsuperscript{41}

The period saw a continuing change away from the custom of boarding farm workers in the farm house. Taking Long Clawson as an example, 13 farms employed 22 resident farm workers in 1851, seven of those households including more than one indoor servant. All but five of these employees were described as having a specific job other than labouring, nine being waggoners, three cowherds and three shepherds, one groom and a ploughboy. By 1871 only one waggoner and a shepherd were described in specific terms, and by 1881 only one dairymaid. Indoor servants, it seems, were becoming more likely to be required to perform any task which the general running of the farm called for. Only 10 farms in Long Clawson in 1881 included a farm servant in the household, and only one of these had more than one. On Thomas Newcome's farm the farm servant was described in his relationship to the head of the household as a lodger, not as a servant. Whereas the agricultural workers living away
From the farm house in 1851 were almost entirely labourers, with only one carter and five ploughboys specified in Long Clawson, by 1881 they included two shepherds and a waggoner, as well as 10 day boys. While there was only a small reduction in the number of households which included resident farm servants only (Table 19), the number which included a combination of domestic and farm- or trade-servants halved, which suggests that it was the larger, perhaps more prosperous families which cut back on the number of resident helpers. Resident trade servants were similarly reduced; excluding apprentices and kin, there were 10 of them in the seven villages in 1851, in Harby two miller's journeymen and a miller's servant, a journeyman brickmaker, and a clerk and a porter with a wharfinger; in Hose, a tailor's improver, and in Long Clawson a journeyman baker, a baker's boy and an assistant grocer. In 1881 this was reduced to four - a servant grocer, a servant butcher and a journeyman miller in Long Clawson, and a journeyman tailor in Nether Broughton. While the custom of housing employees with the family was clearly on the decline, it was slow to disappear in the villages. Until more or larger cottages were available it must often have provided the only solution, despite the growing sense of restraint which changing class consciousness and a greater desire for privacy must have made apparent.

It is probable that for many farm servants and their employers relationships were usually quite amicable. John Wilson's account of old servants weeping when the Coleman estate was sold in 1900 suggests a warm human relationship. There is a lack of evidence of workers remaining with a single farmer for extended periods, but the ten-year census span is probably too great for it to be likely to be found. Many labourers' families remained in the same village throughout the period, even if skilled men were less likely to do so. Servants were generally hired during the last quarter of the year for a twelve month period, and no doubt for most the engagement was seen as an obligation; Francis Kilvert
probably recorded the normal attitude when he described a Welsh farm-servant girl of the time who, although urged by friends to leave a farm where she was not happy, protested 'But I have always finished my time if I could. I never liked to break my time'. Nevertheless, the agreement was not always kept, and a substantial proportion of the disputes at the Petty Sessions which the press reported were those in which a farm servant, or sometimes a farmer, had failed to meet his obligations. To give a few random examples:

1 Sep. 1855. Joseph Brex, labourer of Nether Broughton, charged by Thomas Drake, farmer, with absconding from his service. Ordered to return, with £1 abatement of wages.

11 Aug. 1866. Ann Bennett, servant in husbandry to Mrs. Rowbotham, Goadby Marwood, charged by her mistress with absconding from her service. Ordered to return, and to pay 12s. costs.

18 Aug. 1866. Thomas Little, servant, Long Clawson, charged by Thomas Robinson, farmer, with absconding from his service. Allowed to arrange out of court.

31 Dec. 1872. Christopher Gale, labourer, Barroughly, charged by William Cropper, farmer, Nether Broughton, with refusing to enter his service. Sentenced to 14 days hard labour, and to return to his service.

24 July, 1875. Lucy Ann Patchett, servant, late of Goadby Marwood, charged by Thomas Rowbotham with absconding from her service. Ordered to return to service, and if not, a warrant to be issued for her apprehension.

The services of someone ordered to return under such circumstances must have been of dubious value. However, it is clear that the employer was not always without fault. In December 1857, James Musson, farmer of Long Clawson [Hose?] was charged with refusing to pay wages to his servants Thomas Green and Edward Kemm, and was ordered to do so. In February 1875, John Rouse of Hose obtained an order to return to work against his servant John Tomlin, with 1s. compensation and costs.
A month later he charged Tomlin again with a similar offence, and also Arthur Riley, another labourer from Twyford; this time his case was dismissed, as was the opposing case put by Riley that Rouse had assaulted him. 46.

Another case of assault against a farmer was brought by farm servant William Manchester in 1857, against Henry Watson of Goadby Marwood, but this perhaps ended amicably as they were allowed to settle out of court. 47.

The most fully reported case of the type was that brought in the County Court by Robert Jalland, an iron-stone labourer's son from Nether Broughton, against Mr. Brown, his employer. As a lad of 11 he one day spilt some whey, at which Mr. Brown hit him with a stick and sent him home. His father took him back to the farm, but the farmer refused to employ him. Despite Mr. Brown's contention that the boy had broken his contract by leaving, the court found for Jalland, awarding him £2.16.0 defaulted wages and all costs. 48.

The legislation governing contractual relationships between employers and employees changed twice during the period which concerns us. Until 1867 a servant who broke his contract was liable to punishment as a criminal, with imprisonment and hard labour for a term of up to three months, while a master who failed to pay wages due could only be brought to court by a civil action in the County Court. Simon comments that this procedure, while not expensive, was not likely to be familiar to a workman; even if he took the case to court it would be very difficult for him to prove a breach of contract or substantiate a claim for damages as there was seldom a written contract and the master's account of the agreement would be more readily accepted. Further, the employer frequently challenged such a claim for wages by citing some fault of disobedience or breach of contract on the part of the servant. The Act of 1823 (4 Geo. IV. c.34) under which most charges of breach of contract were made provided for the arrest of servants accused of failure to enter on service, absence before completion of the agreed term, neglect or misconduct. The
Offending servant, as well as a term of imprisonment, could be discharged from service, or, alternatively, be required to work out his term with the master on completion of his sentence. 49.

The Master and Servant Act, 1867 (30 and 31 Vic. c.141) is described by Simon as a 'half-hearted' measure; in theory it was intended to apply to masters as well as servants, but it preserved the punitive element of fines and damages or imprisonment, and reduced the number of convictions by only 10 per cent. The one positive element was that it permitted both the master and servant involved to speak on their own behalf.

The Employers and Workman Act 1875 (38 and 39 Vic. c.90) removed the criminal implication of breach of contract, and hence the threat of imprisonment, leaving a defaulting employee subject only to civil action, just as his master was. Henceforward, an employee could only be faced with criminal charges if he caused damage to property (Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act, 1876. 38 and 39 Vic. c.86). Whereas prosecutions relating to servants, apprentices and masters in England and Wales had reached 14,353 in 1875, they dropped to about half that number by 1890, and rapidly thereafter, with only 53 cases in 1901. 50.

The cases reported from the seven villages ceased after March 1876, in which month John Wright, farmer of Nether Broughton, charged his servant Ann Briggs with absenting herself from service. 51. The only incident I have found later than that was the case brought in the County Court in 1879, when Emma Tinsley of Colston Bassett sued Wallis Rouse of Hose for disputed wages and was awarded £3.2.6 and costs. She had claimed £6, the wages due for a year's domestic service to which she was contracted, but which was terminated by mutual consent when the parties quarrelled. 52.

The reduction in cases might be due to a variety of causes. In the first place, it was more of an effort to take a case to the County Court than to the local magistrate. Secondly, as the number of resident servants decreased so did the constraints which such a relationship
imposed. The amount of hiring by yearly contract probably diminished. And as the agricultural labour force shrank in face of alternative opportunities in industry and elsewhere the relationship between farmers and their workers had to take on a more mutually acceptable character, taking account of the greater independence of the employees. What farmers had gradually to realise was 'that grudgingly given work at a grudging wage was grudgingly undertaken'.

It must have been cases such as those quoted above which led to the suggestion that both servants and masters should be required to present certificates of good character at hiring fairs. Dunbabin quotes the response of the *North British Agriculturalist* in March 1866:

> There would be superior and inferiors as to social position as long as the world lasted, and it would be reversing the law of nature for masters, who are superiors, to bring certificates to servants.

The *Leicester Chronicle*, following the Melton Martinmas Fair in 1859, suggested merely the need for 'some mode of introduction whereby employers might secure the kind of servants they require, and servants the description of occupation for which they are most suited'. The inefficiency of the statutes and hiring fairs was only one of the reasons for the campaign against them in the second half of the nineteenth century. Victorian respectability was affronted by the lewd and raucous behaviour which seem to have been common. At the request of Mr. H. F. Coleman, J.P., the *Leicester Chronicle* in November 1858 reproduced a letter from *The Times* commenting on the evils of statutes in terms of 'the Saturnalia of the pagan world and the lascivious rites of heathen temples'. The editorial comment called on the County Magistrates to find some remedy for the situation.

It seems that the statutes were no longer performing their primary function; Melton Statutes in 1851 were reported as producing a 'very trifling' amount of hiring, and at Long Clawson Statutes 'the hiring was nothing satisfactory'. The report of Melton Statutes in 1855...
confirms the picture of a day out on which the business of hiring had become secondary: -58.

This great holiday and hiring day, when so many of the agricultural population in this neighbourhood meet together for a day's pleasure, and to look out for new employees for the forthcoming year, was held on Friday last. The night before augured anything but a cheerful gathering, for the rain descended in almost pitiless quantity; but the morning dawned cheerfully, and the day proved one of unwonted brightness, and although the number of swains and lasses was not so great as otherwise it would have been, yet many found their way here to partake of the day's festivities, to commingle in the dance, and to join in the revel and the song. The attractions were many, but all of a low kind. Amongst the latter may be mentioned the exhibition of an African savage.

The report continues with details of three robberies committed at the fair, thus completing the slide from idyllic revelry to disreputable carnival. By 1859, -59.

... the statute for the hiring of servants, or more properly speaking for their amusement and gratification ... compared with former years was only thinly attended. The stall-keepers complained of business, and the light-fingered gentry had but a poor harvest, as far as we can learn. The whole affair seems dwindling away, and we prophecy will soon be a thing of the past.

In April 1862 the Leicester Chronicle carried an announcement under the headline 'Statutes Superseized'. 60.

A society has lately been formed in Melton which is called 'General Servants Amelioration Society', having for its president the Duke of Rutland, and its object affording to farmers and others greater facilities in the hiring of servants, so as to get rid of the present pernicious system, so demoralizing to the servants and so unsatisfactory to employers. Register Offices are to be opened at Bottesforid, Buckminster, Clawson, Melton, Rearsey, Waltham, and Wymondham.

As so often happens, the move seems to have produced a reaction in favour of the threatened fair, and Melton Statutes that November were reported as better attended than in recent years. Some of the extra
attendance may have been encouraged by increased police supervision, which ensured that only one pocket-picking was reported. By the following year however the fair was much reduced, and very little hiring was done as the register offices were becoming well established. In 1864 the Statute was held as usual, but:

... we cannot say for the hiring of servants, as to our knowledge nothing was done in this department. It appears to have dwindled down to a holiday for the lads and lasses of the district, who were not here in numbers equal to former years. The most prominent feature in the amusements was a steam roundabout, and right merrily did it go.

In 1870:

... there appeared to be neither employers nor servants present worth naming. The occasion seemed to be taken advantage of by servants of a low type to manifest their bad qualities, and by itinerant dealers to infest the town.

At Melton Martinmas Market a few weeks later more masters and servants were occupied in the business of hiring, but 'We are sorry to add there was a great deal of drunkenness amongst servants and others through the day'. In October 1872 the decision was taken to suspend Melton Statutes, as they no longer served their purpose. However, the tradition of hiring at fairs was not lost, and in 1880 it was reported that a certain amount had taken place at the Martinmas Market, although its main purpose was to provide relaxation. Where hiring by the year had once provided a very desirable security, now that there was no longer a glut of labour, farm workers benefitted from the growing possibility of seeking and taking work where it was most to their advantage. The liberty was one which Joseph Arch stressed as the labourers' right when he gave evidence to the Richmond Commission in 1882. The loss of the statute fairs is sometimes cited as one of the deprivations imposed upon the villages by the advance of the industrial society; if Melton Mowbray was typical, however, it seems that the villagers themselves spontaneously withdrew their support from an event which had become
on more business-like lines, so the relationship between the farmer and his employees was shedding its former character and was becoming one of a more commercial nature.

The process of change was slow, but with the passing of the old economic ties went, too, a rich complex of human relationships.

Kussmaul notes the effect which the abandonment of the statutes had on migration between villages; whereas fairs and the system of yearly hiring had encouraged frequent migration between villages, and even within the region in which the fairs might be advertised, such local mobility was reduced once that system was changed. Table 20 confirms that the number of farm workers drawn from local villages decreased in the seven villages as the period progressed, but shows that the number of those drawn from further afield increased. The trend which emerges therefore is of local labourers leaving the area, possibly to find work in towns, failing to support the local hiring fairs which thus became obsolete, and forcing farmers to advertise more widely for workers to take their place.

This more widespread mobility, encouraged by improved transport and better education, was remarked by Kebbel as beneficial. The new tendency, he wrote, was:

... to circulate the population, and to infuse new blood into rural communities. The carter or ploughman who takes a place at some distance from his native village chooses a wife among strangers, and settles down there, perhaps, for the rest of his life. At all events, he has done better physiologically than if he had remained at home and married a relation. And the love of change, and desire to see more of his little world than is open to him in one village, which prompts the young rustic to take service at a distance rather than in his native place, is far from being censurable in itself.

However, Kebbel also noted in 1870 the widespread complaint of farmers that labourers were no longer willing, or able, to work as hard as once they had. They demanded the help of machinery and showed a
'determination not to "slave to death" '. Keble was at first inclined to dismiss the grumbles as 'the regular agricultural growl', but when his book was revised in 1887 added a footnote: 70. The heart of the agricultural labourer has "waxed fat with plenty"; and the inferiority of his work is only part of the rebellion against his general position which the last few years have witnessed. While such views may have been coloured by a rosy nostalgia, they demonstrate a growing social division, a 'them and us' attitude which, as Laslett and others have shown, did not exist in the more closely integrated village society of the eighteenth century. 71. As Kussmaul points out, the ending of the living-in farm servant system itself contributed to the growing social distance between farmers and their employees, since many such servants had been themselves the children of farmers, learning the business in the traditional way away from the family home. 72. The brief appearance of the agricultural unions in Leicestershire, while not producing militant support, helped to spread new democratic ideas at a time when economic conditions offered an improvement in standards of living. The change in employment contract law of 1875 gave farm workers a new legal status, and greater liberty to find work which was congenial. The rejection of the statutes as a mode of hiring was only one aspect of a much wider process, and the influx of fiercely independent railway navvies into the Vale of Belvoir during the 1870s provided an example of men who were willing and able to seek work where it paid best. The word service has come to suggest a form of bondage, with one of its definitions being 'what employee or subordinate is bound to'. Such a definition of work became unacceptable during the Victorian period, and the gradual rejection of the system of indoor service in the Vale of Belvoir came from the servants as well as from their masters.
Footnotes to Chapter 6.


For changing concepts of service, see J. Gathorne-Hardy, *The Rise and Fall of the British Nanny.* Hodder and Stoughton, 1972. p. 34


Note however that these figures include those employed in domestic tasks in hotels and other commercial establishments.


7. Higgs has drawn attention to the large number included in census summaries who were described as holding servant occupations within their own families, most of whom would not have been paid employees. E. Higgs, *Domestic servants and households in Victorian England,* *Social History, 8,* 1963. p. 201


11. e.g. Waltham school log book, 3 June, 1864. Leicester Record Office, E/LB/343/1.


20. J. Gathorne-Hardy, *op. cit.* p. 67

There quoted - *The Times,* 10 January, 1870.

22. **Leicester Chronicle**, 30 August, 1856.
23. " " 20 September, 1856.
24. " " 27 September, 1856.
25. " " 13 December, 1856.

26. Shipman farm papers, Leicester County Record Office, DE 814/12.

27. *ibid.*, DE 814/33, 29, 10, 12.

29. " " 26 August, 1854, 4 November, 1854.
30. " " 19 August, 1865.
31. " " 2, 16 and 23 March, 1872.


33. **Leicester Chronicle**, 27 February, 1875.


36. **Leicester Chronicle**, 11 March, 1876.
37. " " 2 December, 1876, 18 August, 1878.


40. Shipman farm papers, *ibid.*, DE 814/12.

41. *ibid.*, DE 814/12, 33.

42. J. Wilson, *Long Clawson.* (unpublished manuscript). p. 80

44. *Leicester Chronicle*, Dates as shown in text.

45. " " 5 December, 1857.

46. " " 12 February, 1875, 13 March, 1875.

47. " " 5 September, 1857.

48. " " 20 July, 1878.


52. " " 15 November, 1879.


55. *Leicester Chronicle*, 3 December, 1859.

56. " " 27 November, 1858.

57. " " 11 November, 1851.

58. " " 3 November, 1855.

59. " " 29 October, 1859.

60. " " 26 April, 1862.

61. " " 29 November, 1862.

62. " " 31 October, 1863.

63. " " 5 November, 1864.

64. " " 5 November, 1870, 3 December, 1870.

65. " " 16 October, 1872, 14 December, 1880.


70. *Ibid.* pp. 12, 15


see also,


72. A. Kussmaul, *op. cit.* p. 121
### TABLE 17. NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES IN VARIOUS CATEGORIES OF DOMESTIC SERVICE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Nether B'ton.</th>
<th>Long Clawson</th>
<th>Goosby M'wood</th>
<th>Chawwell &amp; Mycock</th>
<th>Harley</th>
<th>Rose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dom. svt.-farm</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parlour maid</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House maid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse maid/girl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housekeeper</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident nurse</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Companion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governess</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coachman</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groom</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash-woman</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charwoman</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seamstress</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1861 |               |              |              |                   |       |      |
| Dom. svt.-farm | 2 | 13 | - | - | 1 | 12 |
| Dom. svt.-gnl. | 7 | 26 | - | 1 | 8 | 5 |
| Kitchen maid | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| House maid | 2 | - | 1 | - | - | - |
| Nurse maid/girl | - | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | - |
| Cook | 1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Housekeeper | 3 | - | 10 | - | - | 6 |
| Governess | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Butler | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Coachman | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Groom | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Wash-woman | 2 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Charwoman | 3 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Seamstress | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total | 19 | 58 | 13 | 3 | 28 | 20 |

| 1871 |               |              |              |                   |       |      |
| Dom. svt.-farm | 2 | 17 | 5 | - | 1 | 12 |
| Dom. svt.-gnl. | 7 | 12 | - | 4 | - | 1 |
| Kitchen maid | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| House maid | 1 | - | 4 | 1 | - | - |
| Nurse maid/girl | - | - | 2 | - | - | - |
| Cook | 1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Lady's maid | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Housekeeper | 3 | - | - | - | - | 2 |
| Resident nurse | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| Companion | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Governess | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Gentlemen's svt. | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| Coachman | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| Groom | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| Gardener | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| Wash-woman | 2 | - | 1 | - | - | - |
| Charwoman | 1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total | 17 | 18 | 13 | 3 | 48 | 15 |

<p>| 1881 |               |              |              |                   |       |      |
| Dom. svt.-farm | 12 | 13 | 1 | - | 5 | 1 |
| Dom. svt.-gnl. | 11 | 10 | - | - | 2 | 3 |
| Kitchen maid | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Chamber maid | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Parlour maid | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| House maid | 2 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Nurse maid | 2 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Cook | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Housekeeper | 1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Residence nurse | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Coachman | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Groom | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Gardener | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Wash-woman | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Charwoman | 1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total | 12 | 18 | 6 | 8 | 11 | 15 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Setter B'ton</th>
<th>Long Clawson</th>
<th>Goosby M'wood</th>
<th>Chadwell &amp; Wycomb</th>
<th>Nercy</th>
<th>Rose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag. lab.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm svt.-indoor</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm svt.-outdoor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waggoner</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm boy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowhand</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy worker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailiff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General svt.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag. lab.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm svt.-indoor</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm svt.-outdoor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waggoner</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm boy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowhand</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy worker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailiff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General svt.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag. lab.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm svt.-indoor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm svt.-outdoor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waggoner</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm boy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowhand</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy worker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailiff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General svt.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag. lab.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm svt.-indoor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm svt.-outdoor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waggoner</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm boy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowhand</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy worker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailiff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General svt.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 19. Number of Households Employing Resident Non-Kin Servants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic svnts.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm servants.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General svnts.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any combination.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total.</td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>117</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic svnts.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm servants.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General svnts.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any combination.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total.</td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>112</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic svnts.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm servants.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General svnts.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any combination.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total.</td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic svnts.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm servants.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General svnts.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any combination.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total.</td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>98</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 20. Provenance of Farm Workers: Number of Employees to Show Place of Birth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Born in village of residence</th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Born within five miles</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born elsewhere in Leicestershire</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born elsewhere in East Midlands</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born further afield</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 21. Provenance of Domestic Servants: Number of Employees to Show Place of Birth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Born in village of residence</th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Born within five miles</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born elsewhere in Leicestershire</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born elsewhere in East Midlands</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born further afield</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 7 - TRANSPORT.

On 21 August 1851 the *Leicester Chronicle* reported the final run of the Melton to Grantham mail coach, itself the last remnant of the Birmingham to Yarmouth Royal Mail. Despite an earlier appeal in the *Stamford Mercury* for support for this daily service, which it described as 'more invigorating than a pent up railway carriage', the speed, comfort and reliability of the new rail service had made obsolete a mode of transport which had itself been revolutionary. Also overtaken by the development of the railway was the canal network, unable to compete in economic terms, while by 1864 the administration of the turnpike trusts was recognised by a Parliamentary Committee as inadequate to deal with the development of roads as a feeder service to the railways; within thirty years the work of the trusts, and the maintenance of even minor roads, was to pass to the newly created local authorities.

The social and economic consequences of the transport revolution reached every corner of the land. Trade was stimulated by the greater ease of distribution, and local specialisation could be developed as a larger market became available. Travel for pleasure became a possibility for classes other than the very wealthy, while migration for work became more inviting. Life in the villages became less isolated; for example, a day trip from Harby to Nottingham to visit the new arboretum became possible, or even into Derbyshire to attend the band festival at Matlock. To some commentators the changes seem destructive; Professor Mingay, for example, writes:

> The independence and self-sufficiency of the past, never complete but very real, declined. Country communities became mere satellites of the towns, increasingly reliant on urban sources for their goods and services.

Peter Mathias on the other hand had no doubt that the changes were constructive:
The importance of the coming of the railways as a service for the economy as a whole lies in the fact that they enabled economic activity in all other sections of the economy to expand. Writing in 1887, Kebbel commented on the improved diet of labourers since the abolition of tolls had made it possible for vans to carry a wide range of groceries to the villages at a cheaper price than the village stores could offer. In compensation those stores were themselves able to carry a wider range of foods than ever before - 'tinned meats, soups, sardines, and other delicacies of the same description'. Many factors were combining to widen the horizons of village life, for the community as for the individual, and easier, cheaper and faster transport was one of those factors.

This chapter will explore the routes of communication which were available to the villages, and the changes which were seen in the mid-Victorian period. It will chronicle the short useful life of the Grantham canal, and discuss the impact which its closure made on employment in the affected villages. Turning to the railways, it will tell of the building of the lines in and around the Vale of Belvoir, with particular attention to the line which crossed the Vale from north to south, crossing the Belvoir estate. The role played by the Duke of Rutland in the planning of this line is explored, and the impact on the area both of the construction gangs, and of the line when completed. The exploitation of the iron-stone deposits in the area was dependent upon the opening of the railway, so a review of its importance as an employer follows an account of the employment provided in the area by the railway company.

The chapter will then discuss the problem of maintaining the roads, and describe difficulties faced by Melton Mowbray Highway Board following the dissolution of the turnpike trusts. This, finally, leads to a discussion of the part played by the carrier network in the area and the service which it provided both before and after the building of the railway line.
The Grantham Canal.

The Grantham Canal, linking that town to the Trent at Nottingham along a meandering route across the Vale of Belvoir, was opened in 1797. It cost £118,500, and along its 33 miles rose almost 140 feet towards Grantham via 18 locks. It was welcomed in Grantham and the villages along the route as bringing cheaper coal and timber, as well as fertilisers and manure, and it also opened new markets at the western end for Lincolnshire grain and malt. Several villages including Long Clawson and Harby were close enough to have quays, although Long Clawson quay is in fact some two miles outside the village. The villages would have profited from the cheaper supplies of fuel, as well as building materials and foodstuffs. Harby wharf was particularly important; its range of granaries, noted in Brigg's Directory of 1861, are still to be seen, while not only wharfinger Samuel Furmidge but also two boat owners, Messrs. Gregg and Smart, are there listed. The census for 1851 shows as many as 12 Harby men employed in various capacities on the canal. (Table 22). Long Clawson census shows no entries of canal-based occupations, though possibly the one boat owner and a boatman who appear in the Hose census of 1861 operated from Long Clawson wharf, since it was nearer Hose than Long Clawson. John Wilson remembered, or recounted the memory of, activity at Long Clawson wharf, with the unloading of coal and the dispatch of wheat and farm produce. He also recalls that Mr. Goodson had malt kilns near the quay, and that there were osier beds in use there.

In July 1850 the railway line from Nottingham to Grantham, running through Saxondale and Bottesford, was opened; the Grantham canal was therefore already obsolete by 1851. However, although it had been intended that the canal shares would be bought out by the Nottingham, Vale of Belvoir and Grantham Railway Company, the proposal did not meet with the agreement of the Great Northern Railway, with whom it proposed to merge. Only after the case had
been pursued through the courts to the House of Lords was the transfer conceded, and the £45 or £50 per share purchase price agreed in January 1855. In 1861 the Great Northern Railway took over, and trade on the canal was from then on discouraged. From its peak in 1841, when annual takings were over £13,000 tolls fell to £242 in 1905, and the canal was finally abandoned in 1936.

The cheapness of rail transport was one reason for its rapid absorption of former canal trade. Railways were also more reliable; in January 1855, for example, canal traffic was held up because lack of rain had lowered the level of water in Leicestershire canals. The slowness of canal transport was its greatest disadvantage; not until June 1862 was steam power applied to canal boats, shortening journey times considerably. Fears that the swell would wash away the embankment were calmed by the Leicester Chronicle, which declared that wear-and-tear would be less than that caused by horses. The reporter commented that a suggestion made seven years earlier to employ steam power had been rejected, but that 'Now, the thing ridiculed promises to be in some measure the means of salvation to canal property'. It was already too late to save the Grantham Canal; the seven boatmen in Harby in 1851 dwindled to three by 1871, and none ten years after that. By 1881 only one canal labourer was recorded as living in any of the seven villages.

As Table 23 shows, the canal had given employment to local men; Samuel Gregg for example, born in Harby, was a boatman and proprietor there at the time of the 1851 and 1861 censuses, with his son Samuel working as a boatman in 1851. By 1871 the father had retired, and another son, Thomas, had taken over the boat. In 1881 Thomas was still in the village, but was employed as a grazier. George Wesson, the Parish clerk, had two daughters married to Harby born canal men; Edith was the wife of Henry Manchester, boatman, while Elizabeth's husband was John Watchorn, described as canal labourer in 1861 and '71,
but who returned to agricultural labouring before 1881. Henry Manchester left the village before 1881. Thomas Manchester, boatman in 1851, also makes no appearance in subsequent censuses, while Thomas Watchorn and Robert Wesson, both canal labourers in 1861, had become agricultural labourers by 1871. Francis Starbuck, another native of Harby, was described as a boatman in 1851, as porter in a corn warehouse (presumably on the quay) in 1861, boatman again in 1871, and as a chimney sweep in 1881. In that year however another Starbuck, William, was described as canal labourer. Three who appeared in the 1851 census as canal labourers, but not in later censuses, were William Musson of Long Clawson, Henry Wilson of Sutton, Notts., (both lodgers at the White Hart), and Harby born George Hull. Similarly William Smart, son of a Harby cottager, worked as a boatman in 1851, but by 1861, despite the Directory entry referred to above, described himself only as a cottager.

Two of the three wharfingers in Harby came from further afield. Edward Wright, born in Long Clawson, was Grantham canal agent and wharfinger in 1851, but died before 1861. Samuel Furmidge from Redmile was a wharfinger in 1861 and '71, and died in 1875. Henry Bonser, of Langar, Notts., does not appear in the computer census readings as a wharfinger, as he listed that occupation in 1851, '61 and '71 as secondary to that of miller; he also worked a grazing farm of 19 acres. By 1881 his son William continued with the farm only. John Wilson, a boat owner in the Hose census of 1861, was born in Gedling, Notts., while his boating servant came from Matlock, Derbys. John Wilson was 65 in 1861, so probably did not survive until 1871, and as his enterprise disappeared, so did his servant.

It appears then that much of the investment in canal based business was brought to the villages from outside, and by the second half of the nineteenth century did not prove profitable enough to invite continuation once the originator died. Unskilled jobs on the canal were
generally filled by local men, who either left the village or returned to agricultural work when canal work ended. The numbers employed on the canal were not large enough for their disappearance to make a major impact, and for most transport needs the railway was soon to provide a replacement.

Railways.

The first railway line to Melton Mowbray was built in 1846, connecting the town via Syston to the main Midland Railway between Rugby, Leicester, Nottingham and Derby. Beyond Melton the line was to run to Stamford and Peterborough, but because of the opposition of Lord Harborough, who objected to trains running across his park, and feared the competition with the Oakham canal of which he was a proprietor, a deviation had to be made at Saxby, delaying the opening of the line until May 1848.13.

In 1850 the Ambergate, Nottingham, Boston and Eastern Junction Railway opened a line between Nottingham and Grantham, running through Bottesford. The Vale of Belvoir therefore had a railway running north and south of it, but with the villages in between still too far away to be readily accessible. There seems little doubt that the railways were welcomed. The Stamford Mercury commented on the hope that Grantham's trade would be improved now that its competitiveness was restored once more. In June 1851 it reported: -14.

Several of the inhabitants of Melton have availed themselves of the cheap trips to visit the great wonder of the whole civilised world in London, and have returned with such extreme delight and satisfaction, and with accounts so extremely encouraging, as to induce many who would have been content at home, to follow their example.

In 1852 the Nottingham to Grantham line was taken over by the Great Northern Railway, becoming part of the new Nottingham to King's Cross route. The Great Northern was
noted for the high standard of its rolling stock. 'All its third-class coaches were enclosed and fitted with wooden bench seats, while its second class coaches even had cushions'.\(^{15}\). To attract customers it introduced day return tickets at three-quarters of the two-way single fare. The Midland Railway on the other hand was thought to be expensive, being urged by the *Stamford Mercury* in 1850 to reduce fares to encourage more people to travel. An experimental price reduction was dismissed as 'too trifling to show good results'.\(^{16}\). By August 1858 however the financial status of the Midland Railway was reported to be 'far more satisfactory than most of its contemporaries, which are in a lamentable plight, with dividends wasting away and in one case reduced to nothing'.\(^{17}\). The leader writer of the *Leicester Chronicle* called for:  

... a moderate tariff all over the country, with a little more attention to the comfort and accommodation of passengers.

He suggested that railway directors might learn from the example of French and Belgian railways in considerations of passenger convenience and comfort, and called for greater co-operation between railway companies instead of counter-productive rivalries. The convenience of the public was not always a primary consideration in the construction of railway lines, while the topology of the area to be crossed, or the hostility of a landowner were factors which had to be considered. At a meeting of the Midland Railway shareholders in 1862 a speaker deprecated the opening of new lines designed to serve private interests - 'either to benefit the estates of noblemen - even dukes were not above that sort of thing - or to promote the interests of cotton lords'.\(^{18}\). As we shall see, the attitude of the Duke of Rutland changed when a railway across his land was seen to offer financial advantage. Meanwhile, visitors, like the Prince of Wales when he joined the Belvoir Hunt for a few days in March 1873, had to travel by train to Grantham and then on to Belvoir Castle by carriage.\(^{19}\).
Several proposals were made for lines to cross the Belvoir estate. In 1861 a line between Melton and Grantham was projected.20. Some gentlemen have this week been actively engaged in procuring signatures to a memorial to be presented to his Grace the Duke of Rutland, earnestly entreating him to concur in the project, or at all events, to withhold any opposition he may personally have to its passing through his estates. However, this line was not built. Nearly four years later, in November 1865, the Midland Railway published its intention to apply for Parliamentary approval for a line between Nottingham Midland station and Melton station on the Syston to Peterborough line. The long list of parishes through which it was intended to pass perhaps allowed for all eventualities, as it is difficult to work out a coherent route from it; it did however include Upper and Nether Broughton and Long Clawson.21. Although a Midland line through Widmerpool was eventually built it was long delayed, not receiving House of Lords approval until 1872, and not open to passenger traffic until February 1880.

Meanwhile, in March 1872 a meeting was held in Melton Mowbray to discuss a different proposal.22. The Great Northern Railway were considering a line from Newark to Melton, to link with the Nottingham to Grantham line at Bottesford, and eventually to extend southward towards Leicester. The idea was welcomed; traffic on the existing line through Melton had been increasing, but the circuitous route to Nottingham in particular, with delays at Trent Junction, made delivery of goods very unpredictable. The new line would reduce the distance travelled and eliminate most of the delays. The new line, although only 13½ miles long from Melton to Bottesford, would cross an area which previously had very poor access to the main lines, cutting across the Vale of Belvoir via Plungar, Harby and Stathern, and Scalford. (See Map II). The report continued: -

The Duke of Rutland was a great promoter of this line, and it would pass through a
country containing valuable iron stone, the working of which would be very beneficial to the town and neighbourhood, and a fortune to those landowners upon whose property it is found.

On 6th June representatives from Harby were amongst those present at the meeting of a Select Committee to consider the proposal. Almost every voice was in its favour, welcoming an alternative to the 'expensive and over-stretched' Midland line. The evidence of John Green, the Duke of Rutland's steward, was revealing:

... So far as Belvoir is concerned, it is at a distance most remarkable in the present day from any railway station. The project of a railway has been thought of for some years, but until last year the Duke of Rutland was not favourable to any such project ... In 1863 there was a proposal to make a railway, but the unwillingness of the Duke and other causes prevented its being carried out, though the district was desirous that something of the sort should be done.

The steward then quoted a letter which the Duke had sent to Colonel Packe, the chairman of the Great Northern Railway, saying that it was written as a consequence of the reports which had reached the Duke of the inhabitants' desire to have a line in the district.

Dear Sir, - It is likely that the Duke of Rutland will open a field of ironstone in the neighbourhood of Waltham. This, of course, would be of no use without a railway. It has been several times mooted that a railway between Grantham and Melton would be constructed, and if this field is opened, it would add very materially to the traffic. The Duke's scruples as to a railway for Melton and Grantham have been removed by the consideration that it would be beneficial to the district, and he desires me to communicate this to you with a view of ascertaining if the Great Northern Company would be likely to undertake the construction of the line.

The initial response of the Great Northern Company was a clear rejection, and the Duke then approached the Midland Railway. Shown plans of their proposals, he commented:
As far as the line from Nottingham to Saxby is concerned, it does not appear to concern me at all. It touches my property very little, if anything... It is not the kind of accommodation that the district requires.

A group of individuals who supported the Duke of Rutland's proposals then prepared plans for a line from Newark through Melton Mowbray to Leicester, and sought a bill for its construction. Hearing of this, the Midland Railway then presented its proposals, supplemented by a branch line to Waltham, but they came too late.

The extent to which the Duke stood to benefit from a line across his estate is made clear by the steward's description of the area to be served:

We might have worked the Waltham Ironstone fields long ago if we had had accommodation. When it is opened out there will be plenty of demand for it. Besides, there is limestone in several parts of the estate, which the proposed Midland line would not accommodate at all. When you get through the range of hills that borders the Vale of Belvoir, a magnificent limestone extends all the way, and the supply is inexhaustible. There are also valuable beds of gypsum, the demand for which is very great. There is no less than 1700 acres of timber on the Duke's estate, and last year sales amounted to 1245 tons. If we could send that by rail instead of carting it, it would be better. Last year we had 70 tons of bark, all of which had to be carted to Newark, at a cost of about 10s. a ton.

He also spoke of the tourist traffic, saying that up to 1000 people in a day visited Belvoir on the days on which it was open to the public, and all of these had to make their way as best they could from Bottesford or Grantham station. Speaking on behalf of the Duke, whose interests, the Committee was assured, were 'very much the interests of the district', the steward expressed satisfaction that the proposed line was the best possible.

Six weeks later a House of Lords Committee heard submissions on the bill to proceed with the railway, and were assured once more of the Duke of Rutland's support for it. His only reservation was to stipulate that in certain specified areas the fences to the railway...
should be no more than three feet high so that they would not be an obstruction to the Hunt. The richness of the ironstone deposit was described, as well as the variety of agricultural produce which needed to be transported from the area. Mr. William Hickson, farmer, miller and maltster of Bottesford, reported:

Corn is brought from Stathern, Harby, Barkstone, Redmile, and so on, and farmers deliver it generally in their own wagons. The farmers prefer delivering it to the canal to carting it from those villages to Bottesford on account of the distance, but if this line were made it would remedy that difficulty.

The only opposition to the line, other than that of the rival Midland Railway, came from Mr. Hartopp, who objected to it passing through a paddock near his house at Scraptoft. Evidence was presented that it would nowhere be closer than 350 yards from the house, and that trains would be visible only from the drawing room, and then never for more than 30 seconds if they were travelling at 30 m.p.h. A land agent from Leicester expressed the view that the value of the property would in fact be enhanced by the presence of the line. Approval was given for the Newark to Melton part of the line, but it seems that the Midland Railway Company's arguments that the line was superfluous had some influence, as the continuation of the line to Leicester was not allowed. Hopes were expressed that this would be changed in the following year.

The civil engineer to the line, Mr. John Fraser, described it to the House of Lords Committee:

... The line runs on the surface to Redmile, that is from two and a half to three miles from Belvoir Castle. It is a very flat line at that point; it there passes over the Nottingham and Grantham line, rising on a gradient of 1 in 164. Passes by the villages of Barston, Plungar, Harby and Hose, running parallel with the canal for some distance, rises at a gradient of 1 in 100 to the summit at Stathern; enters a tunnel passing through an escarpment of the hill, the tunnel being about 1,584 yards in length; and from the point which is the summit of the line, it descends towards Melton on a gradient of
... and there it terminates at the cattle market ... there would be stations at Bottesford, Redmile, and Stathern, which will accommodate a number of villages. Then there is one at the summit of the line near to the point where the branch to the iron-field would be - the next is at Melton.

By mid 1875 work was in progress on both new lines to Melton. On the Midland line to Nottingham -

A bridge just having been completed over the canal, near Sysonby, many people go and witness the progress of the work from Melton, the tunnel, etc., being objects of great interest.

The following January there was great activity in Melton Mowbray, as two new lines and their construction crews converged on the town. A village of wooden huts and stables was built to the north of the town, 'and materials of all descriptions for carrying out the work are constantly arriving'.

The presence of the navvies was not altogether welcome in the area. The number of cases reported to be heard at the Petty Sessions increased noticeably about this time. In August 1876 for example, three navvies, John Marshall and John and Stephen Smith, were sentenced to 21 days hard labour for stealing peas growing on John East's land at Nether Broughton. On the same day William Allmark, a miner at Hose tunnel, was sent to prison for six months for threatening to cut his wife's throat. There were charges of drunkenness, as for example in September 1876, when no fewer than five navvies were fined on one day. Many were also charged with poaching; one fully reported exploit took place between Waltham and Croxton Kerrial, where a group of the Duke of Rutland's gamekeepers pounced on half a dozen navvies with nets and dogs; in the fight which followed one of the gamekeepers was shot at, but the shot went astray and hit a dog. The poachers escaped for the moment, but the keepers called the police at Waltham, and together they went to the railway huts at Scalford -

... and there they found a party of four, one of whom was just dressing wounds that
had only recently been made in one of the fellows' heads. The constable took them into custody. They also found six large nets, a double-barrelled gun with one barrel discharged, two snap-dogs, three hares, and five rabbits recently killed, the whole of which were taken possession of ... the prisoners are said to be desperate looking fellows.

Well-meaning local people made attempts to provide some sort of calming influence for the navvies. In March 1876 there was a movement in Melton to offer them religious instruction, 'as the need for some such efforts has become painfully apparent'. A year later the Wolverton Club and Coffee Room was opened there by Lady Wolverton, to provide dinners to which the men might bring their own beer. Spirits were not allowed, and beer only with dinner. Smoking was permitted only after 6 p.m., while gambling and games of chance were prohibited. There is no report of the success of these ventures, but the police courts remained unusually busy while the railway work continued, and not until June 1880 did they return to normal:

... not only is one court a fortnight found, as aforetime, sufficient, but the number of cases at that court has of late not been numerous. During the progress of the new lines, misdemeanours of one kind or another were of daily occurrence.

Among the villages exposed to this lawless invasion were Long Clawson, Harby and Hose. For example, Thomas Jackson, a Long Clawson butcher, was robbed of 5½ lbs. of mutton at Hose in August 1878, by Agnes Needham 'of Hose Tunnell'. In March of that year P.C. Constantine of Long Clawson was attacked by a group of navvies working at Hose tunnel, and 'brutally kicked and knocked about'. Although he managed to get handcuffs on one of his assailants the others got him away. The construction of the railway lines brought another kind of violence as well, with accidents and deaths. In August 1875 the Leicester Chronicle reported that a man working in the tunnel on the Nottingham to Melton line had had his fingers crushed so badly that they needed amputation. Another navvy working on the Great Northern line died from hydrophobia having been
bitten by a dog. However the worst disaster was the explosion in Hose tunnel in November 1876, when two men died and others were badly injured. One of the injured, a man named Longman, was accused of having had his candle too close to the gunpowder charge, and the inquest called for greater supervision when blasting was to take place, as well as the use of cartridges and lamps instead of loose gunpowder and candles. 

At last, in the autumn of 1879, the new Great Northern line from Melton was complete and ready for passenger traffic. The first passenger train from Melton carried 123 people, some travelling from mere curiosity and some on business, and many of them going through to Nottingham. The fare on the new line was so low that the Midland Railway had to halve the charge to travel by their old route to Nottingham to remain competitive. The Leicester Chronicle greeted the new line with enthusiasm, and described the new station at Melton. 

... a perfect model of convenience and comfort, being fitted up in the most elaborate and modern style. It possesses a platform which for width, length, and appearance, is one of the most imposing of the kind to be found in any of the small towns of the kingdom.

Redmile station, intended for use by the Duke of Rutland and his guests, was similarly elaborate, with a tower and a flagpole, a covered porch for carriages, and lavishly furnished and decorated reception rooms. The other stations were simpler in style, but were inconveniently far from the villages which they were intended to serve; the station for Harby and Stathern had a particularly long driveway, while that for Long Clawson and Hose was two miles from either village.

Despite the original refusal of a bill to build the line south of Melton, a joint line with the London North Western Railway was constructed running through Market Harborough to join the London line at Welham Junction. The line was to carry four passenger trains a day from Nottingham to Market Harborough, as well as cattle
trucks, and milk and other farm produce to London. As
the ironstone field around Scalford was opened up, branch
lines connected the area with the iron furnaces at
Holwell, the Holwell Iron Company taking its part in
promoting the line in 1885, and then in 1887 to furnaces
at Eaton. However the rival Midland line from
Melton to Nottingham opened to passengers in February 1880,
and to express trains four months later; where passenger
traffic was concerned therefore the Northern Railway
Melton to Nottingham line was never heavily used.

It seems clear that, once the construction was
finished and the navvies had left the district, the
Vale of Belvoir villages saw few changes with the
introduction of the railway. Goods moved more freely
and speedily than before, and the canal lost most of its
traffic. Occasional trips to Nottingham or Melton, or
even further afield, for recreation or shopping, became
easier. In the seven villages the sound of distant trains
can hardly have disturbed the peace. As in the country
as a whole, the regularity of the railway would have
helped to instill a consciousness of time-keeping unknown
to past generations. Already in 1878 a difficulty
was recorded at Melton County Court; to enable those
involved in cases to return to Leicester on the mid-day
train the court opened at 10 a.m., but it was found
that some people were then unable to reach the court in
time for the hearings. If they missed that train, they
had a five hour wait for the next. It was agreed that
the Midland Railway directors should be approached
about the infrequency of the service. The pace of
life was becoming faster, when a business visit to
another town could be expected to occupy only half a day.

The railway did introduce an element of new population,
particularly in Nether Broughton, Harby and Hose (Table
24 and 25), in numbers which more than compensated for
the loss of canal workers. Hose particularly benefitted,
with a Station Master, 19 labourers and three other
railway employees living in the village in 1881. Many
of the railway labourers living in the villages were local men, some of them the sons of agricultural labourers, but almost none of them appeared as employed in the village in 1871. Others came from further afield, and some of these lived in lodgings; four men, from Buckinghamshire, Lincolnshire and Somerset, lodged in the house of Jane Hastings, a grocer in Hose. The more skilled railway employees tended to come from far afield; the Station Master at Hose for example was Lincolnshire born, as was his wife, although their children had been born in Herefordshire. The signalman and his wife came from Cambridgeshire, and the porter from Framilode in Gloucestershire, while the timekeeper came from Worcestershire and his wife from Birmingham. Of the 77 railway employees and their wives living in the seven villages in 1881, 35 had come from outside Leicestershire. Those railway labourers who were married however had almost all married local girls, and this must have helped the railway community to integrate into village life.

The railway also brought new opportunities for employment in the ironstone quarries which it enabled to be worked. Already in 1881, before the branch lines to the furnaces were built, there were 19 quarrymen living in Long Clawson and 10 in Nether Broughton. Although 11 of the quarry workers had come into the area from outside the county, more than half the total (21:19) had been born in or within five miles of the village in which they lived in 1881. (Table 26 and 27). Of those whose occupations in 1871 can be traced, all but one had been agricultural labourers, the exception being Alfred Tinsley, who although the son of an agricultural labourer had described himself as a hawker. Some of the outsiders had perhaps first arrived in the district as railway navvies and decided to stay; Isaac Jones was mine foreman at Hose tunnel at the time of the explosion there. Coming from Lancashire he married a Long Clawson woman, and in 1881, when he worked as an ironstone miner, they lodged with
lace-hand Esther Shilcock. Ironstone miners tended to be young - eleven of the 19 in Long Clawson were aged under 30, and many of them found local wives. There is no indication that the quarrymen formed a separate shack settlement like that described by Raphael Samuel, and although one or two of the older ones had records of a riotous youth, there is no indication in the period 1879-'81 that they formed a disruptive community. The employment offered by the ironstone quarries, both for the additional money it brought to the villages, and as an alternative to agricultural work, must have been beneficial, while the young miners found a welcome among the young women of the villages, and, it is to be hoped, their families.

Roads.

While the railway offered faster and cheaper travel, the roads in the district became ever more inadequate. With freight traffic increasingly moving by rail, the loss of tolls made turnpikes uneconomic, and the turnpike trusts were unable to maintain them. Of the three turnpikes which met at Melton, two, the Leicester and Nottingham roads, had already had their turnpike trusts dissolved by 1875, and that of the Grantham turnpike expired in November of that year. Legislation of 1835 and 1862, which had allowed for local Highway Boards to be set up to maintain erstwhile turnpikes, was strengthened in 1878, making highway districts coincident with sanitary districts, and giving the county authority power to compel a local highway authority to maintain a highway within its district. Meeting in April 1875, the Melton Mowbray Highway Board had its attention drawn by Mr. Garner to the disgraceful condition of the roads.

During the winter females coming to Melton by road were often over boot tops in mud, and often did not know how to avoid being up to ankles in mud. Even to people in carriages the existence of such enormous quantities of mud on the road had become intolerable. Now that the road had become dry, the clouds of silt and dust were such
that he had seen persons on horseback obliged to cover their faces. Indeed the road was unfit for travelling on, whether persons rode or walked. He knew also the enormous deposit of road grit and silt in the grass fields by the sides of the roads was seriously injuring the cattle in the fields; and this was worthy of consideration.

Mr. Garner pointed out that the problem had been before the Board for the last two years, and it was time they instructed the surveyor to repair the highways. Mr. Wright of Burton Lazars seconded the motion, saying that in his village the road was bad enough to upset a wagon, 'and if something were not done to remedy it they would certainly be indicted'.

The problem persisted because no-one at this stage accepted responsibility for the upkeep of the former turnpikes. The Melton Mowbray Highway Board refused to recognise these roads as highways, while the village residents opposed raising funds to repair roads which, they felt, most benefitted Melton. Mr. Whitchurch had written to Whitehall for guidance, and received an assurance that the roads were indeed highways, and that the Highway Board could be sued for neglect of them, but the Board shelved the issue once more, supported by Mr. Frewen, who promised £50 towards the costs if a lawsuit should be brought.

In December Mr. Whitchurch sued the Highway Board for repairs to the highway at Burton Lazars, and a surveyor from the Leicester Board was appointed to report on whether his claims were justified. At a Board meeting a week later Mr. Frewen was still maintaining that the road was not in a bad state, but was met by Mr. Wright, who said that 'Mr. Frewen had already led them into a lot of trouble, and would, if he had his way, lead them into a great deal more'. At last the Board decided that it must undertake the repair of the Nottingham and Grantham turnpikes, and the clerk sent word to the Bench so that legal proceedings were dropped.

Shortly after this, the Melton Highway Board sent a letter to the government, asking for a change in the law. It seemed to them unjust that a village which lay outside
the district of a highway board should find itself liable for the entire cost of repairs to a former turnpike running through it, while areas which lay within a highway district were liable for only a share of the cost. The reply was apparently unfavourable, as in January 1876 the Melton Board passed a resolution to dissolve itself in protest against the inequity of the system. The chairman promptly resigned, seeing the Board as making themselves a laughing stock, and within a week the Board had agreed to suspend the dissolution until after the approaching election, 'to give parishioners an opportunity of expressing their will'.

A list of 1875 showed many villages within Melton Highway District which incurred an excess of expenditure over revenue in the maintenance of the highway running through them. (Appendix V). In October for example the Surveyor had been instructed to repair a bridge between Nether Broughton and Long Clawson, 'it having become so dangerous as to cause a recent accident'. The construction of the new railway lines caused a deal of damage to the roads in some places, and £262 had already been spent on consequent repairs by the end of March 1875. Several alterations to the road had to be approved by the Board before the Melton to Bottesford line could be built, and in January 1877 the Great Northern Railway and its partner the London North Western Railway companies were sued by Melton Mowbray Highway Board for repairs to damaged roads at Hose. When the railway builders declared their intention to apply for an extension of the time limit on the construction of the Melton to Bottesford line, it is not surprising therefore that it was opposed by the Highway Board. Even after the line was in operation, in July 1879, the Board was in dispute with Messrs. Bell and Co., the builders of Scalford and Hose station, over damage to the roads there. Thereafter however the Board settled down to a calmer routine, undertaking the repair of storm damage to roads and bridges, and considering applications like that of Mr. Shipman to straighten the boundary of his new house at Hose, putting a new fence to enclose an extra 4
or 5 feet. Thus the villages profitted not only from a more accessible railway, but from better maintained roads.

John Wilson recalled the 'great wooden-axled waggons' drawn by teams of four or six horses, which carried the grain from Long Clawson to Nottingham overnight in his youth. Some grain too, he tells us, travelled on the canal. By 1881 the railway offered an alternative route. However, the improved roads were not without traffic. Carrier services had long been an active and vital link with the nearby towns, and the larger villages of the Vale each had direct services into Melton for the market on Tuesdays, and into Nottingham on Wednesdays and Saturdays, all of which continued after the coming of the railways. Goadby Marwood, though it did not have its own carrier, was included on the route of two carriers who travelled between Melton and Nottingham via Eastwell and Eaton; a Directory of 1861 listed three carriers who served Goadby Marwood from Melton, suggesting how important the custom of the Manners and Norman families there must have been.

Some idea of the variety of errands which the carrier might be asked to perform is given by the bill which William Starbuck, carrier of Harby, submitted to the executors of the late Rev. Brooks of Colston Bassett for services rendered in January 1888.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 4</td>
<td>Bread Meat and Soda Box.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parcel from Holgate and Bread.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Meat, Bread, Fish 10d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apples 2s, Carriage 4d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Meat Bread and Pycletts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Box from Skinners Mead and Soda Box and Bread.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Pycletts 3d, Car. and Bread.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1 parcel from Holgate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Meat Hamper and Bread.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Meat and Bread.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S. V. Holgate was a 'Dispensing and Operative Chemist' in Long Row, Nottingham. Other Nottingham traders who presented their bills to the executors, and whose goods had doubtless been delivered by carrier, included a Furnishing and General Ironmonger (50 firelighters a month at 1s.3d.), and three stationers and booksellers, including E. Sisson of Albert Street. The carrier also noted that he had delivered
several cheques to the Bank in Nottingham.

The carrier's service remained cheap enough for poorer villagers to make occasional use of them too. Maude draws attention to a horse-drawn bus service which operated between Long Clawson and Nottingham in the 1850s and suggests 'that there was a demand for routes to rural areas to enable links between migrants and their home communities to be maintained, and that actual movement from rural areas was made easier'. She goes on to discount the railway as a factor in short-range migration, as it was too expensive for labourers. As railway travel became cheaper towards the end of the century this became less true, but nevertheless it took a long time for the demand for carriers' services to disappear.

The building of the local railway had then brought change to the villages of the Vale of Belvoir. In the thirty years which concern us, the canal had greatly diminished in importance, and rail transport of goods largely replaced it. For passengers the railway was more accessible, and much cheaper than formerly. Greater speed had begun its process of shrinking the world, so that journeys for pleasure or to pursue work were more easily contemplated. The roads, having become almost impassable towards the end of the turnpike era, were better surfaced and repaired once the Highway Boards began to function efficiently. With the passing of tolls, goods could move about the countryside less expensively, yet the competition of the railways did not mean the immediate end of the old carriers' services. While some jobs were lost, new employment opportunities were created, and with the opening of the ironstone quarries came a new source of prosperity for the area. If population figures are taken as a measure of the prosperity of the village, it is noteworthy that the three villages of the detailed study whose populations did not decline over the period as a whole - Nether Broughton, Harby and Hose - were those which received the new railway workers, while Long Clawson's decline would have been greater than it was without
the new work provided by the ironstone quarries.

As always, change brought good and bad, and judgement must have depended very much on individual circumstances. While villagers had little part to play in decisions which controlled the canal, the railway or the ironstone quarries, it seems they suffered no long term ill effects from them once the initial impact had been absorbed. In the transfer of control of the roads from the turnpike trusts, the villagers gained a representative voice on the Highway Board; while members of the Board and those who elected them had at heart the concerns of the middle and upper classes, the improvements in road maintenance which they carried out must have been appreciated by all road users.
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### TABLE 22. INCIDENCE OF CANAL WORKERS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HARBY.</th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boat owner/master</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal agent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharfinger</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharfinger's son</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boatman</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal labourer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal worker's wife</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HUCE.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boat owner/master</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boatman</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 23. PROVENANCE OF CANAL WORKERS: TO SHOW PLACE OF BIRTH.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Born in village of residence</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born within 5 miles</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born elsewhere in Leicestershire</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born elsewhere in East Midlands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born further afield</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway labourer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signalman</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timekeeper</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platelayer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine fitter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station master</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway Worker's wife</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 25. PROVENANCE OF RAILWAY WORKERS: TO SHOW PLACE OF BIRTH.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Railway labourer</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signalman</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timekeeper</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platelayer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine fitter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station master</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway worker's wife</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 26. INCIDENCE OF IRON-STONE WORKERS - none before 1881 census.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1881</th>
<th>Nether Broughton</th>
<th>Long Clawson</th>
<th>Goadby Marwood</th>
<th>Harby</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarrymen</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron-stone workers' wives</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 27. PROVENANCE OF IRON-STONE WORKERS: TO SHOW PLACE OF BIRTH.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1881</th>
<th>Place of birth.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarrymen</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron-stone workers' wives</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Legislation designed to provide elementary education for all was perhaps the most noticeable change to affect the villages during the nineteenth century. The predominant view in the early part of the century was Benthamite, rejecting interference by government in the behaviour of the individual; education therefore was provided as a voluntary charitable enterprise, or as a commercial venture. According to the abilities of the teacher that education might or might not be valuable. To many people, teachers included, knowledge of anything beyond the most basic reading skills and possibly some arithmetic was socially dangerous; Hannah Moore would not teach working-class children to write in case it gave them ideas above their station. As the century progressed however, and the problems of poverty became more keenly felt, many people came to see education as an instrument of social control. The National Society from its foundation in 1811, like the British and Foreign School Society after 1810, had as its stated object that religion 'should be made the foundation of national education, and should be the first and chief thing taught to the poor'.¹ Literacy was almost incidental.

In many areas, particularly in towns where the need was most urgently recognised, these two societies were seen as successfully providing popular education, so successfully in fact that various efforts in Parliament to procure state aid for education between 1816 and 1832 were rejected. Only in 1833, after the passing of the 1832 Reform Bill, was state aid made available to the two societies for the building of new schools. The very existence of two Societies, the Anglican National Society and the non-sectarian but effectively non-conformist British Society, reflects the determination of many to maintain sectarian divisions in education, which of course made state provision impossible.

Nevertheless, as the perception of the value of popular
education rose, government became ever more involved, with a growing provision of grant and increased control over the conditions on which that grant would be distributed, including after 1839 inspection by government inspectors. As a reaction to the manifestations of Chartism, the 1840s saw the opening of many new schools by the National Society, and an admission of the inadequacy of the bible-based education which the society had until then provided. Although a more secular approach was encouraged however, lessons remained based on 'improving' principles, aimed at "inculcating a firm, truthful religious habit of mind and feeling" in working class children. In this way the upper and middle classes hoped to use elementary education as a means of ensuring a docile and resigned working class.

In 1856 a Board of Education was created, with its own Minister, and in 1858 the Duke of Newcastle's Commission began the investigation on which it was to report in 1861. From this sprang the Revised Code, which made the grant dependent upon each child making a minimum number of attendances, and passing graded examinations in reading, writing and arithmetic. Voluntary subscriptions and the collection of school fees were to continue, but the earnings of the teacher, governed by the amount of the grant, would reflect the school's success. Government involvement seems to have become more acceptable with familiarity, for by 1870 it was possible to introduce the Education Act which provided for the creation of rate-supported School Boards to build schools where voluntary provision was inadequate. While Nonconformists welcomed the opportunity to create Board schools which were not under the control of Anglican clergy, most country parishes, dominated by the Church of England squire and parson, kept their voluntary schools. The main impact of the 1870 Act, aimed primarily at towns, was therefore felt only in those villages where new schools opened as a result of it.

Providing schools was one matter; persuading parents to
send their children to them was another. The Newcastle Commission reported that in specimen agricultural areas less than half the population aged between 3 and 15 were even on the school books, and that some children left school at 9 years of age. The principle of compulsory education was still not acceptable; it was considered that parents must be free to send their children to school, or to work, or to keep them at home, as they wished. As will be illustrated in this chapter, the country child was particularly likely to find himself sent out to work at a very early age, and the first moves to legislate for his continuing education came in 1873, when laws were framed to forbid the employment on the land of children under 8 by anyone other than a parent or guardian. Children aged 8 to 10 might only be employed if they had completed 250 attendances at school in the year, or aged 10 to 12, 150 attendances. A pass in the Grade IV examination allowed exemption from the rule.

With no enforcing machinery the rule was widely disregarded, since many local authorities neglected to frame supporting bye-laws until compelled to do so by Mundella's Act of 1880. By the time of the final census which concerns us, then, legislation had ensured that a school was accessible to every child, and that there were at least some means of encouraging regular attendance.

This chapter will explore the provision of education within the Vale of Belvoir area, and the attitudes of village parents towards it. While the early part of the chapter dealing with the provision of schools and teachers is drawn from censuses and trade directories, and largely concentrates upon the seven selected villages, the later and greater part is based upon school log books from a wider range of local schools, including some in the Nottinghamshire area of the Vale as well as some in Leicestershire. Through the schoolmasters' eyes we see the problems which they faced, of unpunctuality and inconsistent attendance, of bad behaviour and poor attainment. We can examine the relationships between the schoolmaster and the parents, or with those who...
influenced the running of the school such as the rector or the school managers. Some log books contain reports of reactions in the village to the legislation of 1870 and 1873, and of the first efforts by Attendance Officers to constrain parents to send their children to school. There are some indications of the content of the syllabus, and some reports of lighter moments of festivity. 7.

Most village families appear to have sent children to school at least spasmodically. As Hurt points out, the fact that they did so and paid for the privilege both in school pence and in the lost potential earnings of the child, shows that parents recognised that education was of value. 8. The spread of cheap newspapers, the penny post and the wish to correspond with migrant kin, all gave literacy a new relevance to daily life, while the impulse of evangelical religion stressed the importance of an ability to read the bible. What was not widely understood however was that education requires a sustained effort; the spasmodic attendance of some of the children made learning difficult not only for themselves but for their classmates, as the system had no provision for children to advance at their own pace. There was in addition an element of parents who were apathetic about their children's education, and the Newcastle Commission identified yet another group for whom the 'money value' of the child's labour outweighed any worth of education. 9. As Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth observed in 1847, as long as the results of education were poor, it was no wonder 'that the working classes should attach no value to an education so meagre and worthless'. 10. Or as J. S. Hurt has expressed it:- 11.

Those who were most culturally and economically circumscribed had the least likelihood of realising that the schools might offer their children a means of escape into a materially better life. ... For the poorest even the restricted objective of compulsory instruction in the three Rs after 1870 must have seemed an imposition forced upon them by their social superiors that was unrelated to their immediate physical needs and daily lives.
If legislation was to become effective, it was essential that the co-operation of parents should be ensured.

The first question we ask must be - to what extent did provision of schools in the Vale of Belvoir improve during the nineteenth century? Simon's investigation into Leicestershire Charity Schools in the eighteenth century led him to the conclusion that there was a great paucity of provision. He quotes an S.P.C.K. return of 1718 which reports on the existence of an unendowed school at Harby, and another small one at Nether Broughton. Long Clawson, which had been given a small endowment of 20s. in 1679, received a gift of £21 from the Duke of Rutland in 1730 to build a school-house, at the same time that he provided the small school-house in the churchyard at Bottesford. Long Clawson was further supported by the endowment of £40 left by Anthony Wadd, gentleman, on his death in 1758, and further endowments later in the century.

An increase to £30,000 a year in the amount made available in government grants towards school building from 1839 perhaps helped to stimulate the spurt of new school openings in the Vale in the following decade or so. An infant school was built at Plungar in 1839, and in the same year the Duke of Rutland contributed a site and timber to build at Redmile. In 1845 the rector of Stathern provided a National School, and in the same year the National School on the south side of Hose church was built. The National School at Nether Broughton was also built in 1845, and extended in 1847 by the rector. The vicar of Barkstone increased the endowment in 1849 for the newly extended free school there, which had provided education for poor children from Barkstone and Plungar since 1814, and also in 1849 a new school-house was provided at Long Clawson. 1855 saw the replacement of the school at Bottesford by a newly built one, again on land provided by the Duke. In 1860 £860 in grants and public subscription was raised to build a National School at Harby, of which £140 was personally contributed by the rector, and a year later the rector of Goadby Marwood supplied a parish school at a cost of £350, while local
subscribers, including the Duke of Rutland, erected another at Scalford. A local gentleman, Mr. H. C. Bingham, supplied a school for AbKettleby and Holwell in 1863, by which year the National School at Waltham was in operation, providing for children from Chadwell and Wycomb. In 1871 the old school at Redmile was replaced by a new building, and 1874 saw the replacement of an earlier National School at Eaton. In 1875 Hose school was enlarged by means of a rate supplemented by a gift from the Duke of Rutland, who also undertook the building of new parish schools in Eastwell in 1876, at a cost of £400.\textsuperscript{14}.

On the Nottingham side of the border, by 1881 there were National Schools in Orston, Granby, Langar, Cropwell Butler, Colston Bassett, Kinoulton and Hickling. Whatton had a Church of England school largely supported by Mrs. Dickenson Hall, while Cropwell Bishop had a Board school. At Upper Broughton a School Board had also been formed in 1876, and a handsome new school constructed on the road towards Nether Broughton, to be shared by children from the two villages. The cost of this school and the master's house, including the ground on which they stood, is quoted as £2,000.\textsuperscript{15}.

Great strides had therefore been made in the provision of schools in the Vale of Belvoir during the nineteenth century, much of it before the 1870 Act, and dominated by Church of England schools. As well there would always have been a certain amount of private teaching of one kind and another. In his investigation as an assistant Commissioner for the Newcastle Commission, the Rev. Thomas Hedley reported in 1861 as follows, his specimen agricultural districts having included Poor Law Unions in Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire: \textsuperscript{16}.

The teaching in private schools is often superior in the subjects of writing and cyphering, but in point of accommodation, discipline, and everything else these schools are very inferior.

However, in dame's schools he found:

The mistresses are almost always wanting in qualifications for the office; often,
indeed, they cannot write; they very seldom profess to teach writing and cyphering. The reading in dames' schools is often tolerably good. Whilst they are preparatory to national schools, they do some good in the service of education.

The directories refer to a private boarding school kept by Mrs. Elizabeth Musson in the Hose area in 1863, and in Long Clawson in 1876. Mrs. Hannah Curtis kept a boarding school in Bottesford around 1863, while the John Featherstone academy at Weir House, Hickling was apparently flourishing in 1867. References to a dame school by the master of Upper Broughton school in his log book for 1881 may refer to the infants' school which Wright's Directory for 1879 lists, kept by Miss Sarah Dakin. Another dame school in Harby bequeathed its pupils to the National School in December, 1882, and was referred to in the log book as 'Mrs. Stokes' school'. In the 1881 census, Mrs. Stokes, wife of the village tin-man and brazier, is not described as a school-mistress; however she appears to be the niece of Martha Goodson, an agricultural labourer's wife who had run a school since before 1851. By 1871 Martha's daughter Hannah was helping with the school and Mrs. Stokes lived in the household, but by 1881, when Martha was 70, both Goodson ladies seem to have dropped their connection with the school. This identification of Mrs. Stokes suggests that other school dames may also have omitted their occupation from the census.

Table 28 shows the census entries for school teachers of various kinds throughout the period in the seven villages. Nether Broughton village school had a resident mistress in 1851 and 1861. The 'village school teacher' listed in 1871 was Jane Sansome, whom the Post Office Directory, 1876, identifies as in charge of the school. She was buried in Nether Broughton churchyard in 1876, aged 33 years. After 1879 Nether Broughton shared the Board school at Upper Broughton, so there was no village school teacher there in 1881. The young pupil teachers, aged 15 and 16 in 1851 and 1881, both lived in the village with their parents. The two additional schoolmistresses were from Nottingham and Leicester.
who had set themselves up in partnership as 'Instructors of Youth'. Miss Anne Bennett and Miss Frances Hopkins had only one boarder when the census was taken, and it seems their venture was short-lived.

Long Clawson could boast that it was the only one of the seven villages to keep the same schoolmaster throughout the period. Charles Watchorn ran the school with the help of his wife until she died sometime in the '60s, after which he hired assistant teachers; Betty Marson in 1871 acted as his housekeeper as well as teaching, whereas Eliza Felce in 1881 described herself only as 'assistant mistress' although sharing the master's household. Also listed in 1881 in the village were Sarah Griffiths, a 28 year old schoolmistress who lodged in a gardener's cottage, and John Waite, a 22 year old schoolmaster living on his father's farm; it seems unlikely that there were as many as four teachers employed in the village school, but there is no identifiable private school in the village in 1881. In 1851 John Featherstone and his wife still had their school, with boarders, at Long Clawson, before moving to Hickling before the 1861 census. Elizabeth Musson, referred to above as keeper of a boarding school appears in the Long Clawson census for 1871.

Goadby Marwood had a dame school in 1851, kept by a 78 year old widow, Mary Winterton, but since she entered this as secondary to her work as a cottager it does not appear in the census table. The parish school was built in 1861, so the absence of a schoolmistress in the census for that year probably means that the building was not yet completed. The young pupil teacher who lived with his father in the village must have travelled to another village to work. 1871 and 1881 censuses both list young schoolmistresses, 18 or 19 years old, lodging with estate workers.

Martha Goodson's school in Harby has already been mentioned; in 1851 she had a rival, or perhaps elder partner, in Elizabeth Knapp, like Mrs. Goodson the wife of an agricultural labourer. The succession of masters
at the village school will become familiar in the account of the school log book which follows. Only William Chandler in 1851 described his wife as schoolmistress on the census, while only in 1881 did pupil teachers appear as resident, one being Alice Oliffe, the daughter of the schoolmaster, and the other Florence Matthews who boarded in his household.

Hose in 1851 had not only the mistress of the National School, Sarah Osborne, but another schoolmistress, Elizabeth Spiby, and a farmer, William Hourd, who listed schoolmaster as his secondary occupation. In 1861 the schoolmistress was Sarah Stubbs, wife of an agricultural labourer, while Elizabeth Musson who was later to move to Long Clawson was living as the second wife of a retired farmer, and described as a governess living in a 'cottage and Ladies Seminary'. By 1871 John Wilson was installed as schoolmaster, assisted by his wife and daughter Abigail. Also resident in the village was Frances Corner, 53 year old schoolmistress, to whose function in the village I have no clue. In 1881 the only schoolmistress in Hose was Mary Wilford, the wife of a grazier, although Maria Smith, a 'professor' of languages, had retired to the village by the early age of 47.

Thus it can be seen that the number of school teachers in several of the villages diminished over the period, mainly as the newly provided village schools ousted the private and dame schools. At the same time, as professional qualifications became more important, teachers tended to be drawn from further afield; of the 1851 village school teachers, only William and Emma Chandler in Harby had come from outside the East Midlands, having been born respectively in London and Oxford. Charles Watchorn at Long Clawson was a native of Corby, while his wife was born in Nether Broughton. Sarah Holwell (Nether Broughton) and Sarah Osborne (Hose) hailed from Melton Mowbray and Leicester. By 1861 Sarah Burroughs at Nether Broughton, from Wymeswold, and Sarah Stubbs at Hose, from Melton, had been joined by Henry Major at Harby, from
Kent. In 1871 the village school teachers' birthplaces were as follows:- Jane Sansome (Nether Broughton), Epperstone, Notts; Emily Briscoe (Goadby Marwood), Shropshire; Walter Dyer (Harby), Hereford; and John Wilson (Hose), Normanton, Leics. In 1881 the list reads:- Sarah Griffiths (Long Clawson), Bristol; Alice Barker (Goadby Marwood), Harlaxton, Lincs.; Jonathan Oliffe (Harby), Kent; and Mary Wilford (Hose), Monmouthshire. Pupil teachers tended to be locally born, though not invariably so, but the indication from the log books is that once qualified they sought posts at a distance; D. P. Bass, for example, having completed his period of training at Redmile school, was offered a post as assistant master at Blackburn, but preferred to accept that at Hanley, North Staffs. Thus increased education was one factor influencing the mobility of the village population.

It is clear that there was a choice of schools to which village children might be sent. A school like John Featherstone's academy might have appealed to the more prosperous farmers, who were ambitious for their children or who did not wish them to associate with the less respectable children of labourers. We have already seen in Chapter 5 (page 148) that the Shipman family sent children to a private school in Grantham, paying extra for lessons in arithmetic and geography as well as dancing. For less prosperous parents the dame schools at least took children off their hands, though they were unlikely to learn much in them. Other alternatives were the Sunday schools and the evening classes, both of which offered some education while leaving children free to work during the day. At least one child was listed in the village censuses as a 'Sunday scholar', and Sunday school treats provided a welcome break from school which was recorded in the log books, so we know that they existed in the villages though we have no evidence of what was taught in them. Schoolmasters in these villages only referred to their night schools to record
that students were leaving the area, or that the class was to be abandoned as support faded away; it would have taken a determined scholar indeed to persevere with evening classes in the summer when farm work was plentiful.\textsuperscript{19} Apart from the fact that some of the village schoolmasters attempted to supply such classes we know no more of them; it must be borne in mind however that there were opportunities to learn outside the village school for those who felt the need, and that the reports of poor attendance or poor attainment at school are not necessarily the end of the story. For the majority of children in the village nevertheless the elementary school provided the greater part of their education, and it is these schools with which this chapter is primarily concerned.

The type and amount of information provided in the log books varies widely according to the personality of the school teacher; Mary Collingwood at Branstone gave a particularly dry account of attendances and half-holidays, whereas other teachers have left vivid comments on the life of the school and the community. To some teachers the log book was a vehicle for expressing the frustrations of dealing with antagonistic parents and unco-operative committees; to some it supplied a channel for self-justification and vituperation when things got out of control.\textsuperscript{20}

To almost all, the problem of discipline was of great concern. It is to be remembered that good order in the school was one of the conditions for the grant award; the emphasis placed on this is exemplified in the Inspector's Report on Cropwell Butler school in 1866:- '

... the intelligent answering in Scripture and the orderly quiet of the children in a very crowded room, shew the skill with which the Master discharged his duties'.\textsuperscript{21} The initial comments of Edward Anthony when he opened the newly built school at Redmile in
June 1872 show what the problems must have been:- 'I found the children very wild and unmanageable through not being used to control but by Friday they were much better'. His means of control is revealed by an entry for the following October:- 'Order on the whole satisfactory but preserved by making an example of some of the elder talkative ones by causing them to stand apart and take no share in the lessons of the class for half an hour or longer. Less and less stick (on the hands) is required. I seldom, if ever, hit them elsewhere'. From time to time it seems that beatings were well deserved; Mr. Anthony recorded in March 1873 the exploits of 'Joseph Scoffins, a thoroughly immoral boy ... [who] was boasting in school this week of having broken the leg of a duck belonging to Mrs. Bissel and then tying a brick round its neck and drowning it'. As a master however he was not without his gentler side, expressing much concern before the annual Inspection that the children would not respond well to brusqueness, but were 'very shy and want gentle means to get anything from them in the shape of verbal answers'.

Not every teacher could command attention. Mr. Anthony was followed at Redmile by George Milner, whose long entries betray severe lapses in discipline. He complained repeatedly of the shortcomings of his pupil teacher, who 'has little or no control over his class, many of the children not taking the slightest notice of him. This want of influence on the part of the Pupil Teacher is the cause of much confusion and disorder at times. There is also but little tact and management about him, and when spoken to he sulks and is unpleasant; he has also a nasty habit of bawling when teaching which causes a great noise'. However, much of the indiscipline of which Milner complained cannot be laid to the pupil teacher's charge. He described boys running in the lanes 'like wild animals'; in May 1875 he wrote:- 'The first lesson in both morning and afternoon are
often nearly lost through the children coming in so unpunctually and the noise which they make'. Mr. Milner did not last long in the school, making his final entry without any reference to his departure in February 1876. With a new master, the Inspector was able to report in June 1877 that 'The children are in excellent order ... it is only fair to the present master to state that he has not yet had time to remedy the defective teaching of his predecessor'. As for the offending pupil teacher, he was the D. P. Bass who was placed first in the diocesan examination at the end of his training period, and whose ability to choose his employment has already been mentioned.

Even for the most efficient of masters however there were problems of discipline beside those of classroom behaviour. There is mention of two boys punished for smoking in Waltham in 1870; of rough play leading to tumbles and even a broken leg; of a girl sent home from Waltham school in 1867 for arriving in a forbidden crinoline, and of quarreling between the boys of Chadwell and Wycomb as they walked home from Waltham in 1865. Also from Waltham comes the account of G. Kellam, who took his father's dinner to the fields and there drank beer till he was too ill to return to school. Truancies were frequent, and must have been particularly tempting to children who walked between villages to get to school, like the group of four boys from Goadby Marwood who failed to get to school in Waltham one day in March 1872. Bad language seems to have been a problem; J. Gregg and I. Musson were punished for 'speaking bad words' at Harby school in 1865, and Lizzie Brooks, aged 7, was sent home in 1871 for 'using foul and disgusting language'. Even James Woodcock, the pupil teacher at Harby in 1865, had complaints made by parents about 'imprudent words' he used in front of the children, and was reprimanded by the management committee. There is a passing reference to 'writing on the wall' at Harby, but in Waltham the offence was not allowed to be passed
over so quietly. On December 8, 1863, 'Some obscene words were written on the girls bonnet room door at dinner time; suspicion fell on Thomas Tinkler - but the charge could not be brought home. Lectured the first class well on the Criminal nature of the action - and the larger girls for allowing it to remain for a moment'.

Lies were regarded as particularly heinous, usually of course because they were used to cover up other offences. Thirteen year old Sarah Freck 'told a falsehood for the purpose of leaving school with M. E. Shipman', and a week earlier that same Mary Ellen Shipman had 'told ... a direct falsehood to evade lessons'. Schoolmaster Francis Hawkins at Harby in 1870 dealt with the offence by talking to the children concerned. Henry Major seven years earlier was perhaps more effective when he forbade a boy called Morrison from having his dinner in the schoolroom any more after the lad had stolen a half-penny from the master's desk, and lied to cover himself.

Schools were of course plagued by the occasional 'bad penny'. Such a one was Tom Watchorn, who caused endless problems to the master at Harby. The first mention of him is in 1872, when Walter Dyer sent him home for playing truant. Later in the year he was under suspicion of having stolen a groat which was found in his possession, and did not endear himself to Mr. Dyer by claiming, as one of the older boys reported, that 'the fourpence was in the 'Mester's' hand all the time'. This led to enquiries by the rector as to whether he might be sent to a Reformatory, to which Tom's response, understandably enough, was to play truant again. Early in 1874 Tom was punished for conspiring with his younger brother John to persuade John Haywood to spend his 6d. school money. The younger Watthorn, the master noted, was only six years old, while Thomas 'is the pest of the school, and I have repeatedly desired that he should be expelled'. Only a few weeks later he was in trouble again, having
persuaded John and their two little brothers to play truant. Challenged the next day, Tom claimed that his mother had kept him at home because he had a bad foot. The master 'wished him to take his Boot and Stocking off and there was nothing at all the matter - but the boy had made some marks with his thumb-nail. He told several other lies'. There are several more records of punishments for telling lies, and the arrival of a new schoolmaster, Jonathan Oliffe, in 1875 made no difference. Within a month of arriving in Harby, Mr. Oliffe was severely lecturing Thomas Watchorn on the enormity of spending a penny he had found in school while knowing to whom it belonged. In February 1877 Thomas was again accused of stealing and lying, having presented his school money a penny short, and explained that it was all his mother had. However, 'the master knowing the character of the young gentleman only too well sent to ascertain the truth from his parents when as might have been expected, he had appropriated the penny to his own use and told no end of lies in the barging'. (sic.) The following month Thomas Watchorn was expelled from school - 'He seems given up to everything that is bad, low and filthy. His conduct at last had become intolerable'. In April he was readmitted on trial, but responded by playing truant again. There is no further mention of him, but he was probably by then of an age to leave school anyway. Yet poor Tom was not all bad; in 1875 he received the prize for having made the highest number of attendances in the previous year.22.

Yet another reference to Tom Watchorn was made in October 1873, when he was one of the children sent home for being dirty and untidy. Walter Dyer was not the only schoolmaster in the area to have problems with this - Edwin Ball at Waltham also sent children home to wash, including Ann Eccle whose head he reported as 'swarming with vermin' in December 1864. Mr. Dyer however seems to have conducted quite a campaign, for there was a whole series of such incidents. Only a few weeks after
arriving in Harby, he sent to enquire why Kate Dunsmore was not at school, to be told that she 'had caught cold from washing her feet', which must have told him something about attitudes to cleanliness in the village. In October 1873 'Mrs. Watchorn brought Tom back and denied that he was dirty either today or on Friday last, when I punished him and threatened to summon me if I ever beat him again'. Two days later, 'Mrs. Whittaker came this afternoon to complain of my beating her little girl for having a dirty neck this morning. She said she could not pretend to keep her clean. I referred her to Rule IV (that no complaints are to be made to the Master) when she said she would as soon talk to Mr. Norman [the rector] as to me, for when she was talking to Mr. Norman she was talking to a gentleman, but when she was talking to me she was talking to a Fool'.

On this occasion however the rector failed to support the schoolmaster, who reported in the school log a week later: - 'Rev. Norman expressed his disapproval (in writing) of my conduct in punishing the aforesaid children at all; he states as his opinion that no child should be punished for being dirty when it is the fault of the parent. My own opinion is that I have a perfect right to punish a dirty child - I cannot punish the Parents. I protest against being so publicly snubbed for trying to promote cleanliness amongst the children'.

There will be more to report of schoolmasters' difficulties in relations with managers later, but meanwhile I wish to concentrate on their relations with the community of parents. These were not always good, since many parents demonstrated their resentment at the disciplining of their children by the schoolmaster. For example, Mrs. Chester kept her daughter Harriet at home from Waltham school in June 1871 as a protest against the master's wife having punished her. In October 1878 a mother at Cropwell Bishop was so annoyed that her daughter had been sent home because the father was ill with fever which it was thought might be contagious,
that she came to school to collect her books, declaring she would not let her come again. William Palmer, the new master at Upper Broughton, had some difficulty in July 1877 in dealing with farmer's son Thomas Wright 'for manifesting to a high degree a spirit of insubordination', since his father 'seemed fully to side with the boy'. In a similar incident in Long Clawson in January 1876, 'David Cartwright's Uncle came to the School and in an insolent manner demanded what their boy had done that he had had a stripe. The boy had been very careless and disobedient, in his reading and writing, and untruthful in the remark he made on his reading passage. The man became very abusive and the lad only having been at school ten days and not belonging to the Parish the master told him to take his books and go home. So he did'.

Sometimes parents resented messengers being sent from school; when Henry Major sent in July 1864 to ask whether Samuel Moulds had had his mother's consent to leave school one afternoon, Mrs. Moulds returned the message that the schoolmaster should come and see her himself if he wanted to know. Walter Dyer at Harby seemed particularly to provoke parents' wrath; enquiring about the cause of absence of Mary Ann Sumner in March 1871 he was told by a parent who, it seems, did not recognise the monitor's ability to teach, that when the master could spare a while to teach her herself, she would be sent. A few days later Mrs. Coy came to the school, 'full of abuse' to collect her daughter Mary Alice, who had been kept in with a group of offenders, while in June, William Wesson's stepfather replied to an enquiry about cause of absence that 'he did not choose to tell me'.

In December 1874 Dyer was faced by farmer Robert Goodson, who came to protest at the treatment meted out to his son Philip. 'His father came to tell me that if I punished him again he knew what he should do, and that if he had been Phil. I should not have done it'. Dyer's usual response to parental interference was to suspend the child, and then somewhat sourly comment that he or
she had been sent to the dame school.

In February 1873 the master at Redmile, Edward Anthony, was confronted by Mr. Stevenson, who was a manager of the school as well as the parent of one William who had been caned. Mr. Stevenson 'taunted and insulted me in every conceivable way having thoroughly lost his temper. I kept cool and firm and finally agreed to give his son a trial without the slightest corporal punishment; and if we could not agree to send him home'. One of the most colourful incidents was described by Mr. Wilson at Upper Broughton in January 1879. 'On Wednesday the boys Hourd and Elinor were driven out of Slack's yard by Mr. Garton a member of Board and ordered off to school - and on Thursday for the first time the cane was used. They each received 1 hander - the women their mothers came down to school and were very abusive and in the evening Hourd's father used filthy and bad language in front of my house. I deemed it wise to visit Mr. Garton, and he with myself visited the women and proved their statements from falsehood'.

Schoolmasters were in an uncomfortable position, as it must have been difficult for them in a small community to draw the line between disciplining their pupils and interfering in the life of the village. A comment by Edwin Ball at Waltham in 1863 bordered on such interference:- 'In going up the village last evening after dark I found it all alive with servant boys and girls - and among them school-girls, at the public house doorways - Ordered all girls to be in before dark'.

In April 1872 Walter Dyer 'Addressed a complaint to the Committee of the nuisance created around the house by the assembling of young men and women in the evening indulging in low conversation and bad language. The offenders have been cautioned by myself and the district policeman but without effect'. His unpopularity in some quarters is also illustrated by the following incident from October 1871.

'School work interrupted by the violent conduct of
Sarah Dunsmore and her two sisters, who brought a flock of idle girls with them to 'call' the 'Mester'. Sarah Dunsmore stated that she was come to see that I did not 'bet' her sisters (E.J. and Kate) who were kept late for the purpose ... Sarah Dunsmore deliberately refused to leave the premises when first requested, and then ordered to do so. Sarah Dunsmore regaled us in the evening (7 to 8.30) with some choice specimens of London-Street-Arabic, together with a list of my personal imperfections - according to her personal opinion of me, which, I may add, was by no means a favourable one'.

From time to time the schoolmaster made himself useful in the village. At Harby, Thora Saunders was asked in February 1868 to teach Samuel Moulds to measure timber, and in July 1870 his successor, Francis Hawkins, helped Mr. Lamin to measure and divide a piece of land. Attempts to be helpful did not always succeed however; in October 1853 Richard Munn, apprentice to wheelwright John Harby of Clawson, had his apprenticeship cancelled 'in consequence of the indentures having been defectively drawn by a schoolmaster who, not being also a lawyer, knew nothing of the necessity for such documents being "legally signed, sealed, and delivered"'.

Pamela Horn comments on the isolation felt by village school teachers, and quotes the comments of a government inspector:

> By the mid-nineteenth century fewer teachers were finding they had anything in common with the labourers and artisans who lived alongside them, and yet their efforts to associate with the better-off members of rural society were ... often rebuffed by those who saw them still as members of an inferior breed.

Dr. Horn suggests that the problem was particularly acute for teachers who remained in their home areas, but the migration of teachers from distant places or from large towns must surely have created fresh problems. Several of the teachers who came into this area, for example, were quite unfamiliar with local customs, and it was
with great reluctance that some of them gave the customary holidays for village feasts or for such local gatherings as Croxton Races. Mr. Wilson at Upper Broughton commented '... what a blessing to the County generally if all the feasts could be abolished or otherwise held in one week or that one holiday would answer throughout the County - but this is far too much to expect and so we must make the best of that which is radically bad'. This was hardly a view which would endear him to the villagers.

Several of the schoolmasters revealed in the log books a frustration at the inadequacy of the support they received from the school managers. The use of the schoolroom for other purposes was a particular irritation. Apart from occasional use for election meetings, the schoolroom is reported in Harby in 1874 as having been regularly used for church services, and the first lesson on Monday mornings was consequently lost while the room was put straight. At Upper Broughton the School Board held its meetings in the class room, leading Mr. Palmer to complain that teaching 117 children in one room meanwhile was 'very inconvenient in hot weather'.

Managers were not always quick to respond to Inspectors' comments on shortcomings in buildings or equipment. The new school at Branstone in 1871 was severely criticised as being badly lit and ventilated, and badly equipped with old-fashioned desks fastened to the wall. A year later the stone floor had still not been replaced, and the managers were threatened with a reduction in grant in consequence. The school at Hickling seems to have been opened without a lavatory being provided, and one Inspector pointed out the omission a year later. George Milner at Redmile in 1874 complained that children had no slates or pencils, which led to confusion in the classroom, and called for the managers to supply them, a request echoed by the Inspector. A year later, Milner was still complaining: 'In reference to the Managers, little or no interest seems to be taken in the school -
not more than one during eighteen months has entered the school to look at it and for six weeks not one has been in ... The school is also badly furnished with materials suitable for getting the children on with their work, no paper, pens, chalk or other materials which are absolutely necessary - with the exception of a few sheets of paper which the Diocesan Inspector requires and almost insisted upon having - has been got during the whole year; and the reading books for the first standard are so mutiliated that it is difficult to make a reading lesson out of them. More Blackboards are wanted and the desk accommodation is not sufficient'.

Another schoolmaster who used the log book to express criticism of the School Board was Mr. Wilson at Upper Broughton; he also complained of lack of interest on their part, and, in great frustration at their inability to deal with absenteeism, accused them of considering only the expense of such measures. In September 1882 the following entry appeared: - 'The Attention of the School Board having been directed to numerous entries made by the School Master in this book, reflecting on this Board and the School Attendance Officer, it was unanimously resolved that the Clerk be instructed to make an entry in the Log Book stating that in the opinion of the Board the entries in question are in contravention of Article 37 of the code: that the Board are further of opinion that many of the statements are grossly inaccurate and that the reflections on the members of the Board and its officers made by the School Master in such entries are most unjustifiable and that Mr. Wilson is deserving of the gravest censure ... The Clerk was further instructed to summon a special meeting of the Board for Friday next at 2 o'clock to take into consideration the question of terminating Mr. Wilson's engagement with the Board'.

One more indignant comment is worth quoting. In February 1866, Edwin Ball noted in Waltham school log: - 'Received a note from Rev. G. E. Gillett complaining of
waste of ink - A pint and a half bottle lasted 5 weeks and 9 days. More than 80 children write daily - and 18 inkstands expose a surface 1 inch in diameter to Evaporation and dust'.

Relations with the managers were not always bad however; in 1869 the managers at Waltham responded quickly to the Inspector's criticism of desks 'obsolete in shape and singularly awkward to use', and Mr. Ball was delighted with the replacements. Similarly at Harby in 1874 the Inspector's suggestion that the infants' desks and benches might be replaced with more comfortable seats with backs, and on a platform 'gallery' as was then the fashion, was performed within three months. The establishment of an Infant Class had been one of the first needs noted by Walter Dyer on joining the school, in which he was supported by the H.M.I., so it was with great satisfaction that he recorded the existence of a 'well organised and well taught infant class' when he left the school in July 1875.

It is noticeable that in these villages it was the masters of Board schools who had the greatest problems with the management of the school. Democratically elected School Boards may have been very conscious of the charge to the rates for the running of the school, so even more inclined to be careful of expenditure than the managers of voluntary schools. They would also have had less experience, and perhaps less confidence in the teachers who were their employees.

Management committees seem to have had various ideas of what was sufficient staffing in schools. Waltham seems to have done particularly well, since it had an assistant master as early as 1868, and in 1879 could boast three pupil teachers. Harby, with an attendance of about 60, usually had a pupil teacher, whereas Redmile had only one pupil teacher with about 100 pupils. Granby managers were being urged to obtain some teaching help in 1876 when standards had fallen very low. The school at Upper Proughton opened with two teachers and 137 pupils
and apart from the use of monitors does not seem to have improved on that ratio. It is interesting to note that monitors were sometimes paid; Mary Gibson earned 1s. per week at Harby in 1873. Elsewhere the school pence for the monitor were refunded.

The schoolmaster's wife usually gave the statutory sewing lessons, or else a woman from the village was drawn in if the master was unmarried or his wife 'indisposed', a substitution which was not always easy to accomplish. The newly opened school at Cropwell Butler was unable to provide sewing lessons for the first three months of its existence in 1878. The schoolmaster's wife might also stand in for her husband if he were away from school for a day on business. When Henry Major's wife fell ill in 1866 and had to withdraw from school activities, he felt unable to continue and resigned, although only 28 years old. Teaching was certainly not considered an easy occupation; the pupil teacher at Hickling was ill for some months in 1881, and Dr. Swain's opinion was that she was 'suffering from mental exhaustion and nervous debility brought on by her work'.

Several of the schoolmasters expressed their dissatisfaction with the salary they received. The 1861 Commissioners' Report had noted a wide range of teachers' salaries, some of which recognised the 'superior intelligence and attainments of schoolmasters, others so low, perhaps only £40 a year, as to make a teacher feel under-rated'.

Village teachers were much less well paid than their town based colleagues; a Nottingham head-master in 1875 might have expected to receive £110 - £130 per annum, plus one-third of the grant, while a head-mistress was paid £70 - £80, plus a quarter of the grant. In a large village nearby the teacher received only £70 and a fraction of the grant.

William Palmer resigned his post at Upper Broughton only 14 months after the opening of the school 'owing to the refusal of Board to augment my salary'. His successor, Mr. Wilson, whose dispute with the Board has
already been mentioned, made some bitter remarks about the dependence of his salary upon the level of grant awarded; in September 1879 he complained, 'This day the Board met although my agreement specified payment upon Grant earned yet payment was only made upon my consent to share deduction - another illustration of the reward which hard and honest work receives - during the last year the Board did not appoint efficient help and for this cause the Grant has been reduced this year - this scarcely encourages anyone to perform'.

Arrangements at Harby were more amicably settled; Henry Major reported with some satisfaction in November 1864 that he had been given tenure with three months' notice, 'pay to be £60 per annum plus three-quarters of Government Grant'. The following summer and autumn there was some difficulty, when the pupil teacher, Richard Watson, decided to abandon his teaching career, and 'in consideration of low state of school funds to make an abatement of his claim on Government Grant and to accept an addition of £5 from Harby School Committee in liquidation of all claims'. Some months later the Committee met to discuss a letter from the Privy Council informing them that this arrangement was illegal, and that a further £5 was due to Richard Watson. Poor Henry Major had to agree to accept a reduction of £5 from his share of the grant with a promise from the Committee that they would restore the full amount 'if the state of the school funds will allow it'.

Seven years later, in February 1872, Walter Dyer wrote to the chairman of the School Committee, pointing out that when appointed he had been led to believe that his salary would consist of £30 plus the school pence (based on a figure of £31 in 1870) plus three-quarters of the grant, estimated to produce a minimum of £80 in all. In fact, a much reduced grant meant that his salary would only be £70. Mr. Dyer pointed out that 'the above deficit is owing to no fault whatever of my own; but is solely owing to the demoralised condition of the School'. He requested a revision of this 'extremely faulty' arrangement,
particularly on the grounds that 'the recent tendency of Teachers' Salaries has been upward to the extent of 25 per cent'.

Other dissatisfactions with their terms of employment could arise for teachers. The master of newly built Redmile school, Edward Anthony, resigned after two years because the church warden refused to allow him to practise on the church organ, despite the rector's promise and declared wish.

For the most part the clergy provided the schoolmasters' greatest support, not only acting as chairman of the Committee or Board, but backing the teachers' efforts to make improvements or to obtain the co-operation of the villagers. The rector and the ladies of his household were the most frequent visitors at the school, sitting in on object lessons, inspecting the needlework, even taking lessons in scripture, reading or dictation on a fairly regular basis. When pupils were suspended for bad behaviour, it was often at the word of the rector that they were allowed to return. If there were letters to be written to the government department, it was the rector who wrote. The generosity of some incumbents in providing funds for school building has already been noted; the Rev. Manners Norman agreed to contribute up to £10 a year to make up the deficiency in salary of which Walter Dyer had complained. Several of the schools were the proud possessors of harmoniums, some of them no doubt contributed, like that at Redmile in 1877, by the local rector. In this it seems that little had changed, since Assistant Commissioner Hedley had commented in 1861 that 'whatever efficiency and life there is in our rural schools, I should attribute it almost wholly to the influence and exertions of the parochial clergy'.
Even in villages where schools already existed, the 1870 Education Act meant that the management and funding of the school was brought into fresh consideration. At Upper and Nether Broughton it seems that in the years following the Act it was decided to abandon the old voluntary schools, and to build the joint Board School; there was a long-standing good relationship between Anglicans and Wesleyans in Nether Broughton, which may have influenced the decision, although Anglicans were to dominate the School Board. At Harby on the other hand, a meeting of the managers in November 1870 decided to put the matter to the ratepayers, and they, at a meeting in the schoolroom one evening, unanimously resolved to continue the system of voluntary subscriptions, instead of establishing a School Board and raising funds by means of a rate. In spite of strong Nonconformist support in the area this seems to have been the usual response, since, as has been shown, the majority by 1881 were still National Schools and not Board Schools. The master of Harby in 1870 gives a list of the members of the school committee; it comprised the Rector, Rev. Norman; Messrs. Orson, Whittle, Shipman, and the Haywoods, father and son, all farmers; also Mr. Jackson who was a butcher as well as a farmer, Mr. Bonser, miller and wharfinger, and Messrs. Lamin and Freck, who may have been farmers or possibly a miller and a grocer. All of these would have been concerned to avoid a compulsory rate, since it would no doubt have fallen heavily on themselves. A meeting of ratepayers at Bedmilie in November 1878 similarly elected for a voluntary subscription rather than a rate. Her Majesty's Inspector J. R. Blakiston reported in 1875 that there were still only 14 rural School Boards in the whole of Leicestershire, and little likelihood of more being created in the immediate future. He explained:
This is due to a widespread dread of the indefinite costliness of School Boards, added to a mistaken alarm at their supposed ungodliness. In villages already supplied with efficient Schools, boards for the purpose of compelling attendance thereat would be gladly welcomed, could managers feel sure of what they ought by this time to know, that their religious teaching would not be interfered with.

Parents were required to pay school fees and although these were only a few pence per week children were sometimes kept at home because the school pence could not be found. The scale set by the managers at Redmile in August 1877 was an increase of a penny per head - 4d. for the first child in a family, 3d. for the second, 2d. for the third, and a penny each thereafter. In October this was changed again to 3d. for each of the first three, and 2d. each thereafter, but some families still complained of inability to pay and kept their children at home. At Hickling that same term the charge was fixed at 2d. per week for labourers' children under 7, 3d. for those over 7, and 6d. per week for other classes, except where there were more than two in a family when the additional ones would pay 3d. This raised much opposition, with children being sent to Upper Broughton school because parents could or would not pay on this scale. The master, Mr. Wilkinson, commented: 'The children or rather the parents may be said to be out on strike'. After only a few weeks the Board reconsidered, conceding that no child under 7 should pay more than 3d., and allowing certain named families to be charged as labourers.

At Long Clawson, where the school was traditionally provided free on the strength of its endowment, a letter was sent to certain parents in December 1882, explaining that free schooling was only offered in the endowment to children whose parents possessed less than £60 per annum.
property. In future those who failed to qualify were to be charged 6d. per week. Two weeks later however the rector, Rev. Mitchell, informed the schoolmaster that the charged parents objected, so the children were to be allowed to come free, and refunds were given to the two little girls, Mary Miller and Edith Stubbs, whose fathers had already paid. Of the families affected, it is possible to identify those of Arthur Brown, grazier, John Miller, grocer and baker, and Roger Mann, master carpenter, all in occupations in which they might have been expected to contribute willingly towards an education for their children.

At several of the schools it is recorded that parents were asked to contribute an annual sum in the autumn to provide fuel for the fires in school. At Redmile in 1879 this rose as high as 9d. for each child. To produce such a sum was obviously not easy, and led to some children being kept at home. At Long Clawson in April of the same year Charles Watchorn recorded, 'No more fires - No coal. No money', but so cold did it remain that ten days later the master asked parents to send one penny each to buy a few cwt.s. of coal, 'which many of them have done'. However, the two Marriott children stayed away from school for three months that winter, since their parents were unable to find money for coal, and only returned when the magistrate before whom their father was summoned to appear expressed the opinion that they should not be required to pay.

Heating the classrooms created practical problems. At Redmile one boy was paid 6d. a week to light the fire and provide his own sticks. There are several log book entries concerning fires having to be put out because they were smoking so badly. At Cropwell Butler in January 1881 it was so cold in the classroom that the moisture froze on the slates as the children wiped them clean.

Arrangements for school holidays were largely left to the discretion of the schoolmaster. The religious festivals such as Good Friday and Ascension Day were usually, but
not always, holidays. By about 1870 it seems to have been becoming normal to give a week at Easter, but a similar break at Christmas was by no means certain. Harby school children went twice to church on December 25, 1866. At Granby in 1872 the children were given an extra half-hour break each noon during Christmas week instead of a holiday. Jonathan Oliffe at Harby found that only 20 to 30 children attended school on December 24, 1875, so yielded to a request to close the school. At Hickling in 1877 the school actually reassembled from its week of holiday on December 24.

The major holiday was the Harvest holiday, when most children were needed to work in the fields. This had of course to be flexible. Four or five weeks were usually allowed, whenever it seemed appropriate; Waltham log records: 'Broke up suddenly this morning' on September 2, 1867. If the season was very bad the holiday might have to be extended; after a seven week break in Harby in 1879, a year notoriously wet, many children were still missing from school when it reopened on October 18, kept gleaning in the fields. A week of holiday was also generally given for the village feast, despite the misgivings of some teachers. Mr. Wilson at Upper Broughton in 1878 recorded: 'The coming week is Upper Broughton Feast - and I hear that many have an idea that a holiday will be given - no authority for this report'. The week turned out to be very wet, so, with the clergyman's advice, Mr. Wilson closed the school after all 'to prevent children from taking a holiday'. The following year he attempted to reduce the feast holiday to one day, but many children stayed away for the whole week. Redmile school closed for a week within a month of its opening in 1872 'by command of managers owing to its being Redmile Feast and their feeling sure that no children would attend'.

One-day and half-day holidays were fairly frequently allowed for events such as the Sunday School feast or a choir festival. At Harby, school was dismissed on Shrove Tuesday at the ringing of the Pancake Bell. An event
like the visit of the Prince of Wales to Belvoir Castle in March 1873 meant a holiday for the children, though Redmile school opened the following Saturday to compensate for the lost day. By the end of the '70s however the number of such minor holidays seems to have decreased, and even the traditional holiday for Croxton Races was no longer given, though frequently taken. Only 20 pupils presented themselves at Harby school on April 7, 1876; 'the majority absented themselves for the purpose of witnessing the carriages and traps going through the village on the way to Croxton Races', so Mr. Oliffe gave in and closed the school for the day.

Absenteeism was the most trying of the schoolmasters' problems. It made it very difficult to make any progress with a class if a substantial proportion of the children frequently missed lessons, or were absent from school for long periods. What is more, as has already been noted, the schoolmaster's salary was directly affected by the government grant, which itself was partially determined by the number of attendances and the scholastic progress of the pupils. Jonathan Oliffe's comments at the end of his second year at Harby (1877) typify the schoolmasters' view. 'The following analysis of last years attendance shows how well it merits the qualification of 'disgraceful'. The number of children on the Books was found to be 90 and only 44 eligible for presentation so that 46 or rather more than half did not attend school half their time and of the presentibles (sic.) many of them did not make 300 attendances. I would ask then, is it possible for a Master to present his Scholars as efficient and up to the required Standard under such unfavourable conditions? ... Compulsory attendance is the only remedy for such a deplorable state of things and the sooner it is applied the better'.

Much of the absenteeism, be it playing truant or taking unauthorised holidays, was against a background of indifference on the part of parents. Francis Hawkins
commented of Harby school in 1870, 'Not two weeks alike in those who profess to attend school, and those whose names are on the register'. Mr. Wilson at Upper Broughton wrote: - 'Parents keep their children at home for most trivial causes and then when they are retained to do extra work they send insulting messages or notes'. Rose Whittle's mother (Mrs. Baguley) replied to an enquiry that 'she will keep Rose at home when she wants her, and it does not signify to Mr. Dyer'. Hose, Granby and Stathern Feasts, Waltham Fair, Melton Fair, all drew the children from surrounding villages; even Nottingham Goose Fair was sometimes blamed for low school attendances. Boys went fishing in the canal, or skating on it in winter; children stayed away to go to marriages, funerals, sales and cricket matches, or to follow the hunt. Bad weather could keep children at home - with some reason; when the 'foreigners' from Chadwell and Wycomb arrived soaked to the skin at Waltham in January 1872, it took the whole morning to dry them.

Most dreaded by the teachers were absences on the day of Her Majesty's Inspector's visit. Walter Dyer reflected ruefully in 1875 that Keziah Wesson, Elizabeth Smith and Philip Goodson had all been absent on examination day although qualified for entry - 'certain loss to the Grant of £1.10.0'. Messages were sent to remind parents of the day's importance. In July 1880 the day saw a fearful storm which flooded the road between Upper and Nether Broughton, in places knee-deep, and children were brought to the school by parents in carts.

More destructive than such scattered occurrences however were the often prolonged absences of children who were set to work. George Milner at Redmile stated the problem in April 1874: - '... the fine weather which has prevailed has caused many of the children to be out at work ... those who attend regularly make good progress whilst those who are irregular advance very little indeed'. His predecessor, Edward Anthony, had noted in 1872, 'For a mixed school there is a remarkable paucity of boys, especially amongst the elder children, to be accounted
for I think by their going so early to farm work'.
Attendance reached its maximum in the winter months; as
the weather improved in March boys were out 'dropping
beans'; in May there was field work and weeding to be
done, in June or July the hay harvest. In July turnips
were 'singled' or thinned-out and peas picked; in
September the grain harvest and in October potato raising.
Girls were also sometimes at work in the fields; Rose
Whittle asked for a week off in April 1871 to tend sheep
at Harby; but more frequently the log books record girls
as kept at home to nurse the younger children. Ada
Chamberlin returned to Waltham school in 1864 after an
absence of six months 'on account of home affairs', while
12 year old Hannah Marsden left school finally in 1877 to
nurse. There is one mention of a girl, Annie Greaves,
being employed by her parents in lace making; in the
school year ending June 1881 she had made only 156
attendances, and had been continuously absent for eight
weeks. Her younger sister Gertrude had also been absent
for several weeks, and had attended 260 times out of a
possible 324. In Hickling a boy, William Jeffrey, was
kept at home in January 1880 to help his mother 'spot'
lace. Many parents seem to have been quite unaware, or
unconcerned, at the damage they were inflicting on their
children's education. Walter Dyer describes two encounters
he had on one day in June 1871: 'Mr. Gibson came to ask
if the full charge (6d.) would be made if his son came
only part of the week. Told him it would. Mrs. Coy came
to tell me I should not punish her boy, and to take him
away. She wished to argue with me as to the propriety
of her keeping him away when she could 'addle' a shilling -
I directed her to go to Mr. Norman - and gave her to
understand that if she took her boy away I would not
re-admit him. She persisted in doing so'.

Even very small children were kept away in spring and
early summer to collect the wild flowers - violets,
cowslips for wine making, and coltsfoot, possibly, as
Richard Jefferies reminds us, for smoking in place of
tobacco. 31. Jonathan Oliffe commented in 1876, 'Many of the children have been kept from school during the week or a part of it for the purpose of assisting their parents in gathering cowslips and thus it is that days and weeks are muddled and frittered away and the children's education neglected'. The parents' lack of concern was echoed by the children. William Parkin at Cropwell Bishop observed in 1878, 'Many children under age are at work or wandering about the streets, and say they are not coming until compelled'. Even when the parents wished to send their children to school, there were some employers who insisted on keeping them in the fields; there is a record of such a dispute at Waltham in 1875 when the two Barnett brothers were kept at work against their father's wishes, and then returned to school with his promise that it would not happen again. Such an attitude on the part of the employers had been commented on by the Newcastle Commission, and obviously there were employers as well as parents who were unimpressed by the legislation of 1873.32.

The Agricultural Children's Act, which sought to impose a minimum age, or failing that, minimum educational standards, upon the employment of children in agriculture, depended heavily upon the resolution of local authorities to carry it out. The earliest reaction recorded in the school log books I have seen, was at Redmile, where in November 1875 a placard was posted outside the school by the police 'to the effect that they had received notice to put [the Act] into operation'. The immediate reaction was good, and ten days later a much increased attendance was recorded. A year later however the sergeant of police was collecting the names of children without the required education certificate, so the initial impact seems to have worn off. In June 1877 a School Attendance Committee Enquiry Officer had been appointed for the Grantham Union, a Mr. Barnacle, and in August the rector, the parish Poor Law Guardian, and the schoolmaster, Mr. Leigh, had been nominated as a local committee to assist in enforcing the Act. Mr. Barnacle however 'said that the Committee would
do nothing to enforce attendance until harvest time is over'. By October attendance was still poor, and a meeting of ratepayers agreed to adopt bye-laws to compel school attendance in the parish. The following month saw the Attendance Officer give notice of impending summonses, and children were reported as attending with greater regularity. However, glancing ahead to November 1879, one finds the entry 'On one or two days more than a hundred children present, and on others only 75 or 80. Some are potato-gathering and some are nutting'.

At Harby the Rev. Norman published the provisions of the Agricultural Children's Act in the parish Almanac in October 1873, but with what results we have seen. In October 1877 an Attendance Officer began his work, with a similar initial response to that at Redmile. Mr. Oliffe recorded optimistically 'Harby School wears quite an altered appearance, the average attendance having increased by quite two thirds. This is the beginning of good things'. By May 1878 however he was complaining that the Committee at Melton had not yet done their duty in carrying out the compulsory Act, and in June 1879 the fathers of Kate Freck and Eliza Isam were fined by the magistrates at Belvoir, which produced 'an wholesome effect' on school attendance in the village. Not until May 1882 were bye-laws adopted however, and the following month Mr. Bond was fined 5s. for not keeping his children regularly at school, 'the effect being that the attendance during the week has been better than it has been for some considerable time past'.

The Attendance Officer for Upper Broughton was not appointed until 1879, but no sooner was he appointed than he sent word to say he had had a fall and hurt his foot so could not attend to his duties. A month later he wrote to the schoolmaster to say that the weather and the roads were too bad for him to travel; as Mr. Wilson commented: - '... if so, what can he say to Parents for absence!! '. His first visits in the village were made in March, 'but little good seems to attend his visits - our average is remarkably low and I pointed out to him several cases
where a gross violation of Rule has been met with and especially the family of Goodburn and Sharp, who constantly abstain from coming to school and yet are not eligible for employment they are employed both by their parents and others - and still they are not punished - the Attendance Officer lives so far off'.

A School Board meeting in April 1879 confirmed that it was the parents' knowledge that no enforcing bye-laws existed which encouraged them to be so dismissive of the Attendance Officer's warnings, and when school broke-up for the harvest holiday in September 'the children [were] warned that the Bye Laws are now in force and advised to attend to them so that no trouble may follow'.

During the following year several families were picked out as being particularly remiss - the Creaves, Elliotts, Paynes and Hourds had children at work contrary to the Act, and repeated reports to the Attendance Officer had no effect. At the end of November Mr. Wilson recorded:- 'Attendance Officer called on Friday and took down a number of names - this appears a perfect farce - he calls here takes up my time in giving names - walks round, enters cause of absence - which in many cases is not the true cause ... for two years or nearly so - no action has been taken by the Board, because it is expensive - the people laugh behind the man's back - burn the notices and send their children to work if they think they will'.

In March 1881 the Attendance Officer was brought before the Board charged with being intoxicated and various other inefficiencies. He was presumably given notice, for a note in July records that he had left. It must be remembered that Mr. Wilson, whose record reveals this story of gross inefficiency, was later dismissed for unjustifiable criticism of the Board in his log book, so that his version of events should be treated with some caution. However, it is difficult to see that the facts can be much distorted, and the schoolmaster's account is confirmed by the Inspector's report for 1881:- '... It is also to be regretted that more effectual means are not
taken to enforce the more regular attendance of many of the children'.

Despite legislation, and the efforts of local authorities to enforce it, there were still parents in the villages who by the end of the period, were reluctant to keep their children in school. One loophole in the law was provided by the exemption of children who had to travel more than two miles to school. Parents from Upper Broughton sent their children all the way to Long Clawson school so that they could be kept at home with impunity. The master of Waltham school records his refusal to accept two boys from Freeby who 'had been reported to the Attendance Officer for irregular attendance, and had left Freeby school in revenge'. At some schools the fees for children coming from outside were increased above those for children from the immediate village. Under Mr. Major 39 children from Hose and other outside villages had been admitted to Harby school; by 1875 under Mr. Dyer that was reduced to eight.

Having seen what the log books say about school attendance, it is interesting to compare the numbers of children who were described on the census as 'scholars'. Table 29 sets out those entries, alongside the figures for all aged 0 - 15, and the entries as 'infant', i.e. aged 0 - 4. While recognising that few children between the ages of 12 and 15 were likely to be still at school, the scholars are then shown as a percentage of those aged between 4 and 15. It may be seen that almost without exception the percentage of scholars increased over the period, and that for the most part the greatest growth followed the provision of a new school. The decline at Goadby Marwood is presumably a reflection of the very small number involved, while that at Hose in 1881 is perhaps the result of the possible absence of a teacher at that time. The steady growth at Harby may be seen as the effect of a series of able and conscientious schoolmasters, while the sharp increase at Nether Broughton towards the end of the period complements the decision to provide a joint Board School. The growing willingness of
parents to record their children on the census as scholars probably reflects the majority attitude. Most of the village children were attending school by the end of the period. While casual absences remained a problem, it was only a few problem families whose children were persistently absent, or who were illegally sent to work. The legal enforcement which proved necessary to bring these problem children into school was resisted, here as elsewhere. But the acceptance of the habit of regular school attendance was beginning to be formed.

Once in school, how did the child pass his time? There are hints in the log books about the content of the education given, though subject headings do little to indicate the content of a lesson. Naturally, with the requirements of the Revised Code in mind, the main emphasis was on the '3 Rs'; a good legible handwriting was much valued and, we are told, hard to find. (Most of the schoolmasters could provide a good example in this, although some of them were inclined to be rather lax in grammar and punctuation in the privacy of the log book). Children wrote on slates until fairly proficient, when they might progress to exercise books if these were provided. Sets of reading books received very hard use; George Milner's comment on worn-out readers has already been quoted. Mr. Anthony at Redmile complained in March 1873 that the books he had ordered had not arrived, and that the children could make little progress reading the same books again and again. Jonathan Oliffe was delighted to report that at Harby in 1880 'A complete set of new books has been purchased for the school. This school is now provided with two complete sets viz. the Royal Readers and the Public School Series'. Much stress was laid on the ability to read aloud, and Inspectors were critical of classes which read in a sing-song manner, not apparently understanding what they read. The difficulty of using monitors to teach reading is revealed by an entry in the Waltham log for June 1864, when a
monitor was found 'telling a child word by word throughout a reading lesson, without the child looking in the book'. Grammar was not generally taught, so that children at Harby in 1873 were unable in dictation to distinguish between 'is' and 'his', 'were' and 'where', and 'there' and 'their'.

Dictation formed an important element of both class work and the examination, and it was considered important that numbers should be understood aurally as well as on the page. When Walter Dyer first arrived at Harby in 1871 he was disturbed to find 'Of thirty-four children present ... only three who could write numbers correctly from dictation up to millions'. A month later he 'dictated a sum in Simple Addition (to hundreds) to 2nd. and 3rd. classes; out of 27 children only six right - and this after a month's drilling at putting down numbers'. All the basic rules of arithmetic were taught, and the older children were expected to deal with 'problems' using those rules. Only at Redmile is there mention of anything beyond basics, and here two boys in Standard VI in 1879 were working hard at Algebra and Euclid, along with other 'Specific Subjects' for examination. Specific subjects were those which the teacher might add to the syllabus and so increase the grant payable; geography was the most common, history and English Literature also being taught in some schools. Geography seems to have been mainly a matter of learning by heart the principal towns, rivers and mountains of Britain, or possibly of a continent. Two maps purchased for Hickling school in 1878 were, significantly, of Nottinghamshire and the Holy Land, reflecting the emphasis on knowledge of one's own country and on the background to scripture lessons. Scripture formed a major part of the syllabus, often, as has been noted, backed up by lessons from the clergyman. Children in National Schools were tested in the Catechism, and on their memory of the text for the previous Sunday's sermon. Lessons were by no means confined to those parts of the Bible now considered suitable for children; at Cropwell
Butler the elder children were given lessons on the Book of Revelation, while the smaller ones were given a gallery lesson on the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. National Schools were subjected to a Diocesan inspection as well as that of H.M.I., and the schedule for this as it was set out in 1865 appears in the Harby log.

The Examination is to consist of 2 papers one in the morning; one in the afternoon. Morning paper to consist of Scripture and Liturgy: The afternoon paper to consist of Catechism and Arithmetic.

The Scripture Examination to consist of Genesis and Matthew and biblical questions arising out of those books. The Examination on the Liturgy to consist of simple questions on the service, Morning and Evening Prayer. The Examination in Arithmetic to consist of questions on the first four rules and practice and proportion.

Prizes were to be awarded, and a card presented to each successful entrant stating that he or she had entered and been approved.

The Code required that girls should be taught sewing, and some schools included knitting or even crochet in these lessons. Singing was highly regarded as a group activity, and the Inspector was furnished with a list of songs to be sung at the time of his visit. The list for Hickling in 1877 was:

1. The Bells
2. Scenes of Home
3. Love at Home
4. Let it Pass
5. Never Say Fail
6. Strive to Learn
7. Put Your Shoulder to the Wheel.

It seems that the moral content was as important as the music.

Most of the teachers attempted to broaden the content of their lessons by introducing 'object lessons' built round a particular theme. Examples mentioned in the log books include 'colour' and 'heat'. At Harby in 1864 a visitor, Mr. Turner, exhibited to the children a model of a French Ribbon loom. Edward Anthony at Redmile had a very progressive approach: 'To illustrate the lesson on
Geology set them to work amongst a large heap of stones in the school yard to pick out all the best of the stones with fossil remains embedded in them. They found a splendid collection which I have arranged in one of the school windows. The children are evidently on the look out for anything to shew me which they think bears at all upon what they learn in school. This I like to see'. This was the splendid teacher who shortly after left the school as he was not allowed to practise on the church organ. Attempts to broaden the set syllabus were not always approved; the Inspector of Waltham school in 1877, while praising the school for its unusually high attainments at the same time questioned 'whether a more limited range of subjects might not secure greater accuracy in the general results'.

Several of the teachers arriving in the area for the first time were appalled at the backwardness of the children. At Granby only 13 out of 64 children could even write their own name; at Hickling of 78 children all were 'fearfully backward not more than four being equal to Standard I'. At Redmile even many of the bigger children could not write on slates or paper. All these were new schools, however, where it may be assumed there had been little opportunity for children to learn before. Even established schools however occasionally received new pupils who were terribly backward - such was the description of George Herrick when he joined Harby school in 1865. The son of a cattle dealer, he would then have been about 13 years old. In 1871 Walter Dyer admitted William Moulds, who at 11 years of age 'neither knows a letter or a figure' and had to be put with the infants. Twelve year old George James from Broughton did not know the alphabet when he was admitted to Hickling school in 1877, and Rebecca Carrington was admitted to Cropwell Butler school at the age of 18 in 1866. In 1873 Walter Ball at Waltham re-admitted Charles Lock, aged 19 years, and 'resolved to adopt such a course of lessons with him as to fit him for an easy clerkship'. Such a range of
ages and abilities seldom upset the schoolmasters; only Walter Dyer in 1873 complained: 'The boy Gibson admitted yesterday is so utterly stupid that my opinion is that he ought not to remain. I cannot get him into anything like working order. He is a great hindrance to the other children'. It was Mr. Dyer who suggested that inability to spell might be a natural disability, complaining that the Barkes children were always the worst. Mr. Oliffe obviously read this entry, confirming two years later, 'The Barkes family are as notorious as ever for bad spelling and reading'. Mr. Oliffe was not very impressed at first by the natural abilities of Harby children, commenting after a month at the school, 'The master is experiencing much difficulty in teaching by intuition. Quickness of perception is very latent indeed if possessed at all in the majority of pupils'.

School was not all work however, and the log books record some very happy days which must have been highlights for the children. Several schools had their own Drum and Fife bands, which played at concerts and travelled around the area. In August 1872 Mr. Ball took the Waltham Band as far as Matlock. It was also Mr. Ball who went with his boys one January day to run after the hounds, taking some two and a half hours out of the middle of the school day.

Some schools provided a school treat for the children, usually following the pattern described at Redmile in June 1879: 'Tea and plum cake at school, then games in a field til 8.30'. The Rector, Managers and friends of the school subscribed to the expenses of the entertainment. Redmile children seem to have been particularly fortunate; in January 1873 they were treated to a grand Christmas Tree. 'Two handsome presents of clothing and two toys were given to each child in addition to a \( \frac{1}{2} \) lb. lump of cake'. Elsewhere presents to the children took the form of an orange. On another notable evening at Redmile the rector entertained the children with a magic-lantern show, keeping them amused for nearly two hours with about a hundred slides.
The school expedition as we know it was a rare event indeed. At this time even the Sunday School treat usually took the form of a 'tea' - the excursion to the seaside by train had not yet been introduced. However a large party from Harby were taken to view the interior of Belvoir Castle in July 1865, and the most enterprising trip we have recorded was also from Harby, in July 1876. 'Between 60 and 70 of the school children left the village on Thursday morning in vans for the purpose of paying a visit to the Arboretum at Nottingham they likewise visited the Railway Station and other objects of interest in the town; perhaps it will not be too much to say, that the majority of them at least never spent a more happy day we returned home safely about half past nine o'clock thoroughly satisfied and tired with the days proceedings'.

The picture of the village school which emerges from the log books is not an unhappy one. Despite the evil reputation of the Revised Code, which is seen as repressive and stunting of imagination, many of the schoolmasters displayed a lively interest in the children, and at least they had the advantage of knowing each of them and their family background individually. The standardisation of the examination system, although it is criticised as encouraging too narrow a curriculum, helped to ensure that children were learning something of value. The moralistic content of lessons, while it might seem educationally dubious today, was an inevitable result of the ethos of social control from which the provision of popular education sprang. While social discipline was considered a highly important part of education, many of the teachers made great efforts to ensure that the children were given a breadth of experience at school which took their education beyond that range of useful subjects which the Code and some parents demanded.

By far the greatest difficulty as a barrier to scholastic attainment for the pupils was the attitude
to regular attendance. Although strides were taken towards the end of the period to enforce regularity, it was not to be expected that this would be achieved without opposition. The poorest families stood to lose financially, not only in payment of school pence, but in the lost earnings of the children. At the same time they failed to see the opportunities for a better life which education could make available. The school-master, the clergyman, the Schools Inspector, all belonged to a different social milieu than themselves, and efforts at compulsion only emphasised the impression that education was being imposed upon them. The rejection in most of the villages of the opportunity to open democratically administered Board Schools, and the retention of the National schools, strengthened the sense of imposition, with the Diocesan Inspection in such schools emphasising the dominance in them of the Church of England, with all its social and class connotations.

Bowen traces the determination of the Church of England to retain its dominant position in the provision of popular education, thus preventing its secularisation, and ensuring that, with church schools at least, an element of religious instruction would be preserved. He comments upon the church's recognition of 'the desperate need for universal elementary education' in a rapidly changing society, and on the way in which the mythical pact between parson and squire to keep the people ignorant and poor was replaced in the second half of the nineteenth century by a new spirit of service, cultivated through the educational policies of the Church, which seemed to be giving both clergymen and the members of that new class who now shared privilege with the squires a new zeal to rid the nation of both ignorance and poverty.

As we have seen, the problems of ignorance and poverty fuelled one another, with ignorance making it more difficult for the poor man to escape his situation, while
poverty kept his children away from school. Unfortunately, just as the privileged classes were unable to understand and counter poverty, they failed to grasp the reasons for apathy, or even hostility, towards education. It was thought that the teaching of morality would restore that social tranquility which the Industrial Revolution seemed to have upset; instead it helped to mark education as a method of social control, to be resisted by the poor man who valued his liberty, instead of something to be welcomed and above all, used. If it had been possible to replace the voluntary schools with a totally State provided system in 1870, there would still have been resentment at the exercise of authority; but at least with the removal of the Church's interest there would have been one less mark of upper class patronage to act as a barrier to its acceptance.

Hurt draws attention to the equivocal position of the schoolmaster in this situation:-39.

The church schoolmaster was in a doubly dependent position. The subscriptions of local philanthropists that helped to provide the school with part of his salary made him their hireling; parents paying twopence or threepence a week saw him as their employee ... After 1870 as compulsory attendance at a school declared efficient by the Education Department, the local justices of the peace or the school board gradually became enforced, the parents found their freedom of choice more and more circumscribed. Yet at the same time that the schoolmaster realized that he could demand higher standards of conduct and enforce a stricter discipline, the cash nexus continued to encourage parents to go on thinking that they were the teacher's clients if not his employers. Given parental resentment at having to submit to a new form of authority imposed on them by the state, such a confusion of roles bred further conflict especially when children were punished.

Among the farm workers who formed the majority of the village population, education seemed to have little to offer which was relevant to their own daily lives. Many of their employers would have encouraged such apathy;
Hurt quotes one Inspector's comment:

"To the farmer of the old-fashioned type it seems little short of adding insult to injury, first to make him pay a man for doing a boy's work, and then to make him pay a rate for the said boy being taught nothing that will make him a better ploughman or carter in the future ..."

Nevertheless, the support given to the voluntary schools, and the continued willingness of many parents to pay school fees, make it clear that not all families undervalued education. As the contacts between the villages and towns grew, the usefulness of literacy must have become more obvious. We have seen (Chapter 3, p. 59), that a high proportion of young people left the villages in search of work; in the 1880s as many as 80 per cent of migrants into London were aged between 15 and 25. As this experience became part of the pattern of village life, the advantages of education would have been seen. As the employment of children became more hedged in with legislation the pattern of farming itself was becoming less reliant on casual hands, and more reliant on experienced workers and machinery. Children's earnings became less valuable to their parents, and school pence less burdensome until they were finally abandoned in 1891. However, all this was in the future. In 1881 compulsory school attendance was still relatively new in the Vale of Belvoir. Some parents opposed it, some tried to avoid it, but gradually the principle was becoming established, as can be seen in one final extract from Long Clawson school log for 1881:

14 Feb. - Mrs. Cross asked if her son might stay away and go a plough-driving as he had passed the Second Standard and was over ten years old according to the New Bye Laws, she said the Attendance Officer said he was free to do so. I said I would see the Attendance Officer about it.

23 Feb. - Mr. Gillian called ... Cross is to keep on at school.
Footnotes to Chapter 8.


Note however that the validity of these findings has been questioned; West suggests that some 90 per cent of children probably went to school at some time. E. G. West, *Education and the Industrial Revolution.* Batsford, 1975. p. 19

4. Agricultural Children's Act, 1873. (36 and 37 Vic. c. 67)

5. Elementary Education Act, 1881. (43 and 44 Vic. c. 23)


7. Log books were required to be kept by grant aided schools, so only three of those I have used began as early as the 1860s (Waltham on the Wolds and Harby, 1863; Cropwell Butler, 1865); the others were begun after 1870. Although this leaves us with little information about the earlier part of the period, the decades which are covered are those during which the important changes were becoming effective. For complete list, see footnote 20.


(Quoting Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth, *Explanation of the Minutes of 1846*. (1847).


Post Office Directory, 1876.
White's *Directory of Leicester and Rutland*, 1863, 1877.
Wright's *Directory of Leicester and Rutland*, 1880.

Wright's *Directory of Nottinghamshire*, 1879.


17. Hunt points out that elementary schools were not intended to cater for the middle class.

Hurt suggests however that middle-class reluctance to use the elementary schools was gradually overcome as their facilities were shown to be superior to those of many private schools.
J. S. Hurt, *op. cit.*

p. 71
18. A Chapter of Framland Rural Deanery discussed the motion 'That the best way of increasing the efficiency of our Sunday Schools is to educate the Teachers, first in discipline, and secondly in teaching - by encouraging them to visit the Day schools, by monthly catechising, to be attended by the teachers as model lessons, and by watching Teachers Meetings - and also to have a regular system of rewards, and an Annual Inspection'. This suggests that the emphasis at this time (May 1879) was on teaching the Catechism, especially as the motion was passed after the phrases 'encouraging them to visit the Day schools' and 'and an Annual Inspection' had been deleted.

Minute Book, Framland Rural Decanal Conferences and Chapters, 1871-1887. Leicester County Record Office, DE 2435/1.

19. Thompson identifies Nether Broughton as one village in which the vicar and his family helped to run a small adult evening school in the 1860s and '70s. He gives figures of 85 parishes in Leicestershire which had tried and failed to run such a school, and 90 which had 'poor to fair' success. He confirms the tendency however for initial attendances to fall off rapidly.


20. Log books in Leicester County Record Office:--
Branstone - E/LB/43/1
Harby - E/LB/136/1
Redmile - E/LB/266/1
Waltham on the Wolds - E/LB/343/1

Log Books in Nottingham County Record Office:--
Cropwell Bishop - SL/47/1/1
Cropwell Butler - SL/48/1/1
21. The concern for discipline continued after the 1870 Act; in order to qualify for grant 'the managers and teachers will be expected to satisfy the Inspector that all reasonable care is taken, in the ordinary management of the school, to bring up the children in habits of punctuality, of good manners and language, of cleanliness and neatness, and also to impress upon the children the importance of cheerful obedience to duty, of consideration and respect for others, and of honour and truthfulness in word and act'.

Education Department circular, quoted in C. Birchenough, op. cit. p.313

22. A search through the census for Harby in 1871 reveals no young Thomas Watchorn. By 1881 there is a Tom, aged 16, son of an agricultural labourer and a dressmaker, yet there is no sign of John, or of two younger brothers. However, the 1881 census describes Tom as a cripple, while in 1871 a son of the house, William, is similarly described. The school log book for 5 June, 1874, describes an incident in which Tom Watchorn was sent home for hitting Henry Kemp in the back with the head of his crutch, sending him into a fit. Despite the inconsistency of name and age (William was 8 in 1871) it seems this might have been the same boy, since such inconsistencies are not uncommon. Similarly, 'John' in the school log may have been 'Arthur' in the census. Other Watchorn families in the village had no more likely candidates.
23. **Leicester Chronicle**, 11 October, 1853.

(Quote from -. Bellars, *The Church and the School*).


28. Elementary Education Act, 1870 (33 and 34 Vic. c.75).

See also Chapter 9, page 322.

30. **Leicester Chronicle**, 7 August, 1875.
Report by H. M. I. Blakiston on Education in Leicestershire and Rutland.


32. For main provisions, see page 243.

'The children of the poorest, the social class for whom many saw the board schools as their proper destination, were the most elusive and evaded the effective working of the law the longest'.

34. See page 261.

35. On the content of school readers up to 1870 see J. M. Goldstrom, *op. cit.*
36. Compare a dictation given to children at Melton British School by an Inspector in 1863:

While hewing yews, Hugh lost his ewe,
And put it in the Hue and Cry.
To name its face's dusky hues,
Was all the effort he could use.
Hugh brought the ewe back by and by,
And only begged the hewer's ewer,
Your hands to wash in water pure,
Lest nice-nosed ladies, not a few,
Should say on coming near Hugh, "Ugh".

*Leicester Chronicle*, 26 December, 1863.


40. Quoted in *ibid.* p. 201

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nether Broughton.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolmasters/mistresses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolteachers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Clawson.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolmasters/mistresses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolteachers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil teachers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goadby Marwood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolmasters/mistresses</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolteachers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil teachers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harby.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolmasters/mistresses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolteachers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil teachers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hose.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolmasters/mistresses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolteachers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil teachers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 29 - TO SHOW COMPARISON BETWEEN POPULATION AGED 0 - 15, AND THOSE DESCRIBED ON CENSUS AS 'SCHOLARS'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nether Broughton</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All aged 0-15</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infants 0-4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Scholars'</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of 4-15 entered as scholars</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long Clawson</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All aged 0-15</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infants 0-4</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Scholars'</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of 4-15 entered as scholars</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goadby Marwood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All aged 0-15</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infants 0-4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Scholars'</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of 4-15 entered as scholars</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chadwell and Wycomb</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All aged 0-15</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infants 0-4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Scholars'</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of 4-15 entered as scholars</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Harby</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All aged 0-15</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infants 0-4</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Scholars'</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of 4-15 entered as scholars</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hose</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All aged 0-15</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infants 0-4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Scholars'</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of 4-15 entered as scholars</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 9 - CHURCH AND CHAPEL.

The extensive literature on the subject of religion in Victorian England reflects the importance of Christianity in the formation of ideas about morality, social responsibilities and politics in the period. When we speak of Victorian values it is usually those ideas of self-restraint and charitable obligation which we have in mind, while the 'Victorian Sunday', with its narrowly restricted concept of recreation, represents a rigid application of self-discipline and social restraint. However, contemporaries were well aware that the churches, and the established church in particular, were failing to reach or to hold the working classes; the 1851 'religious census' of church attendances revealed the extent of this failure, showing between 47 and 54 per cent of the population constituting the sum of congregations on the sample Sunday tested, and a clear relationship between areas of low attendance and working-class areas. 1. It is unlikely that working class apathy in religion was a new phenomenon; already in 1799 the Bishop of Lincoln had responded to evangelical concern and appointed a commission to investigate the situation in his diocese. The report which was produced showed that only one-third of people in the diocese normally attended church. 2. While the concentration of non-attenders in 1851 was found in towns, village congregations were in many places similarly poorly supported by the working classes, as will be shown in the following account of the churches in the Vale of Belvoir.

The third quarter of the nineteenth century saw a continuation of efforts by the churches to draw in the support of a wider range of social classes. From the 1830s onwards many new churches were built, mainly in towns, since it was thought that a shortfall of seating accommodation might be a cause of non attendance. At the same time, the Tractarian movement within the Church of England made
efforts to restore what it saw as a purer, more devotional form of worship by returning to the original, Catholic, interpretation of the 39 Articles of the Church of England and a closer adherence to the rubrics of the prayer book. Although the movement caused tensions and strife within the Church, since its extreme expressions led inexorably towards a reconciliation with Roman Catholicism, its later form, Ritualism, helped to restore a beauty and tranquility to the services of the church which had been lost; many of the accepted features of Anglican worship today, such as the use of wafer bread at Communion, the wearing of a surplice or the presence of a gowned choir, were Ritualist revisions. Such practices, like many more Anglo-catholic in nature, were strongly resisted by some congregations, a resistance expressed in the Public Worship Regulation Act of 1874.3. But, as Chadwick explains:4...

... the Tractarians wanted to make the worship of little churches less bald, to teach reverence by eye as well as word, and to deepen the sacramental sense of their people. Their changes encountered suspicion or hesitation from the countryman. But often they acted with tact, and ... at last reached a time when the parish trusted them and let them do more or less what they liked.

Whereas it was seldom necessary to provide a new parish church in a village, repairs or restoration to the old church were often needed, and the period of this study saw a spate of such work in the villages, as in the kingdom. The cost of such work had to be borne by private donation, since public effort was concentrated on town parishes; the Duke of Rutland's appeal to the Archdeaconry Church Extension Association that part of its funds should be given to help country parishes, was rejected until 1874 when the major work on St. Peter's, Leicester, was completed.5. Anglican efforts, bolstered by the contributions of the local gentry, were matched and often bettered by the chapel building of the nonconformist denominations. And it was not only the buildings whose importance was recognised afresh, since both the established
church and nonconformists had a new vision of the role of the clergy, and made efforts to ensure that ordinands were given a specific theological training. 6.

A growing consciousness of the problem of poverty, and the slow political move towards democracy, encouraged Christians as well as secularists to consider social remedies. The moves towards a national scheme of popular education were examined in Chapter 8; other concerns which expressed themselves in popular movements were the promotion of temperance or tee-totalism, and the demands of sabbatarians. Just as public meetings were used to arouse support for such movements, the churches learnt to use missions to take their message directly to the people. Although mainly centered on towns, the new enthusiasms and the methods used to promote them filtered through to the villages, and we shall see some traces of them in the pages which follow. (See Chapter 10).

The parish system remained the basis of the field organisation of the Church of England. Each village, or almost every village, had its own parish church. Legislation earlier in the century had gone far to ensure that most parishes had a resident incumbent, responsible in theory for the pastoral care of every resident of that parish. In most villages as well, there were nonconformist congregations, usually with their own chapel although not always with a resident minister. The earlier animosity between the denominations was fading by the mid-nineteenth century, as legal sanctions against dissenters were removed, and as Christian ministers saw the need to work side by side to tackle ungodliness and social problems in a great Evangelical drive. Indeed, a greater difficulty than inter-denominational dispute at this time was the internal disputes which shook both the Church of England (e.g. over the Tractarian issue in the 1840s), and the Wesleyan Methodists (the Great Schism of 1848 - '52). Between 1851 and 1881 we see the churches recovering from the set-backs then incurred, rebuilding and attempting to extend their ranks.
The nineteenth century was however a period when there were other challenges to Christianity than problems of internal accord. Scientific ideas, and particularly the theory of evolution, seemed to be challenging traditional Christian teaching. The humanist philosophy of such men as Mark Pattison and T. H. Green seemed to offer a substitute for Christianity.7. Atheism found public expression in, for example, the determination of Bradlaugh to take his seat in Parliament without taking a Christian oath.8. Above all, the greater activity and relative prosperity of the industrial society left less need for the solace of religion in many people's lives, and apathy, it seems, was infectious: Inglis draws attention to the way in which social pressures were against church-going amongst the working class, and quotes a future Archbishop of York who wrote in 1882:-9.

... the marked men are those who go to church - not those who stay away.

Remote as the scholarly secularising influences might seem from village life, this acceptance of religious indifference as the normal behaviour of one's peers was certainly not unknown.10. As we explore the place of religion in the Vale of Belvoir, we shall see that it was apathy which met the best efforts of each of the Christian denominations involved.

The chapter is divided into two sections; the first discusses the Church of England in the villages, and the second, the nonconformist denominations. There was little Roman Catholic support in the Vale of Belvoir, apart from the Roman Catholic congregation whose church opened at Melton Mowbray in 1842, and which had 65 adherents in 1881.11. The largest group of dissenters in the area was that of Wesleyan Methodists, and several Primitive Methodist chapels were established around 1868. The other body represented was that of the General Baptists. Each section of the chapter first reviews the presence in the area of the seven villages of church and chapel buildings, and of clergy to
serve in them. The condition of those buildings, and efforts to restore or add to them are examined, and discussed as throwing light on the commitment of their congregations. The position of the clergy as members of village society is discussed, and the social contiguity of Anglican and nonconformist ministers is compared. The evidence of changes in the style of service in the parish churches gives the opportunity to discuss the influence of Ritualism, and the first section concludes with an examination of the impact which the church made in terms of the size of congregation. Having established the presence and strength of nonconformist congregations, the second section goes on to discuss the contribution to their work made by members of their congregations in the seven villages. Finally the chapter discusses the relationship between the Anglican and nonconformist bodies in the villages, and concludes by assessing the extent to which, together or in rivalry, they succeeded in reaching the people.

The chapter adds detail to the more general review of the religious life of the county of Leicestershire in the same period by Thompson, since its conclusions echo his. However, as in other chapters I have endeavoured wherever possible to link my account to individual villagers, and thus to enter more intimately into the fabric of village life. Since religion had long ceased to be something which could be imposed, the success of the churches can only be assessed in relation to the response which was aroused in the individual. While Thompson states that he avoids posing a theory to relate religious and social changes, it is important to be aware of the social standing of those who gave their support to the various denominations, since contemporaries recognised that it was failure to appeal across the class divisions which was the greatest limitation on the churches' efforts to expand.
The Church of England.

At the time of the Parochial Visitation of 1843, some restoration work had already been carried out on churches in the Vale of Belvoir; at Harby the roof had been releaded, the chancel floor tiled, and doors and walls had been repainted. At Goadby Marwood there had been some repointing, and a new window put in the tower, while the east window was about to be repaired. At Long Clawson, despite recent repairs to the roof and window frames, and newly applied colour on the inside walls, there was major anxiety about the safety of the south and west walls. Most neglected of the churches of the seven villages was Nether Broughton, described as damp and very dirty, and with an overgrown churchyard, while at Hose, despite the partial rebuilding of the chancel at the expense of the Duke of Rutland, the belfry frames and upper floors were in a dangerous condition, and much of the ecclesiastical furniture - bible and prayer books, altar cloths and cushions - were in dire need of repair or replacement. The contrast is apparent between those parishes where the clergyman was in residence, and those where he was not; although the maintenance of the church fabric in all areas other than the chancel was the responsibility of the congregation, it is clear that without the leadership of an incumbent little was likely to be done. Long Clawson was held in plurality with Kinoulton, Notts., until 1848; at Nether Broughton a curate lived in the Rectory until the induction of Rev. John Noble in 1847, while Licences of Absenteeism were issued as early as 1826 for Hose parish 'on account of the vicarage house being a mere cottage unfit and insufficient' for a clergyman's residence. By 1842 the parish was served from Granby, and this continued until 1879. Thompson quotes a Parliamentary Return of 1850 as listing 14 absentee clergy in Leicestershire, but suggests that the figure was probably higher than this. His source names AbKettleby, Redmile and Croxton Kerrial in the Vale of Belvoir, while the 1842 Visitation records name Eastwell and Eaton.
The Rectory at Eastwell was in need of repair, and housed a curate, while that at Eaton was 'a cottage', and the absentee vicar, while claiming to serve the parish, had allowed the church to fall into a very poor state of damp and disrepair. Several other villages had resident curates, while at Somerby both vicar and curate were non-resident. However, the villages were perhaps better served than Melton Mowbray; there the absentee vicar, Rev. R. F. Croughton, preached one of his rare sermons in the town in January 1860, intending to fulfil the endowment of a Plough Day sermon, but 'the worthy mistook the day, and consequently departed minus the £1 allowed for the purpose'.

The vicar of Granby and Hose from 1845 until 1879 was Rev. John Bradshaw. During his incumbency great improvements were made at Hose, despite his non-residency; a Gill stove was purchased to heat the church, and delivered via the canal by John Wilson, boatman, in 1860, while in 1857 over £200 was raised by subscription for the repair of the tower and the purchase of a new set of five bells from Taylor's of Loughborough. Rev. Bradshaw himself contributed £5, the Duke of Rutland £10, and Lord John Manners 3 guineas. More impressive however are the contributions of local farmers; James Rouse, Henry Shilcock, William Shilcock and William Hourd's family each gave £5, Henry Lamin £3, and T. W. Lamin. James Pears and Joseph Hourd, £2. Many contributions came from outside the village; Mrs. Shillcock of Clawson gave £2, while Robert Littler the veterinary surgeon gave 10s. and Dr. Swain 7s. 6d. William Hourd the schoolmaster gave 2s. 6d., and other small amounts came from residents of Harby, Clawson, Broughton, 'Whykem', Hickling, and other villages in the Vale. The total outlay for the year 1858 was £193. 13. 5, compared with £13 the previous year, yet though the final cost of the new bells was to reach almost £212, it was all met through the generosity of parishioners and friends.

The 1860s and 1870s saw a proliferation of restoration
work on churches in the area. John Bradshaw's other parish church at Granby was restored in 1863, with the Duke of Rutland once more meeting the costs of work on the chancel. At Tithby the north aisle was rebuilt and reslated in 1863, and the tower of Langar church rebuilt in 1864. Contributions at Langar included £31 from Earl Howe, £55 from Mr. J. C. Musters, and 5 guineas from the rector of Colston Bassett, Rev. Joshua Brooke, but by far the greatest part of the expense was borne by the rector himself, Rev. T. Butler, who is recorded as having contributed £475.14.0 in 1865, with another £100 promised.¹⁸

A note to the Ecclesiastical Census Return of 1851 remarks that at Nether Broughton 'This church three years since was in a very dilapidated condition, and has been restored by private subscription of £400 and a small rate, and 70 additional sittings obtained'.¹⁹. For the restoration of Upper Broughton church in 1879 more than £515 was raised by private subscription, including £50 from Mrs. Eddie at the Rectory, and £10 from Rev. and Mrs. Deedes at Nether Broughton Rectory. Much of the new furniture for the church was provided by the Eddie family.²⁰ Chadwell church was 'restored and beautified' in 1866, and a faculty for the repair of Harby church was issued in 1874. This specified the use of oak and deal for roofs and fittings, local stone for walling and Ancaster stone for dressed work, and required that the original design of the stone mouldings should be followed exactly; 33 additional sittings were to be created.²¹. The work spread over three years, at a cost of £1,200, and here too the rector, Rev. Manners Octavius Norman, bore much of the cost, contributing £460.²²

The generosity of these clergy and their congregations ensured the survival of buildings which, in some cases at least, might otherwise have been lost. It may be that in a few places the motives were not always single-minded; at Langar, for example:-²³.

Bishop Trollope states that in 1864 the church abounded in rich woodwork of a late
period, but we understand that at the restoration then in progress the whole of this old carved oak ... was removed to a neighbouring manor house.

No doubt the removal was justified as part of the modernisation of the church, as the old high pews were abandoned and a more open and homogeneous seating plan introduced. The 1851 Ecclesiastical census was much concerned with ascertaining the number of seats available in churches, and what proportion of these were 'free'. In fact seat rents were illegal in old churches, but there can be little doubt that the additional places obtained in many church restorations, and of which examples are given above, were achieved by the destruction of private box-pews. Ritualist influence; of which more later, with its preference for more open seating as less forbidding to potential congregations, was apparently at work in the villages.

Yet the ability of the clergy to give so generously towards the cost of refurbishment was itself a sign of the class gulf which lay between them and their parishioners. The rectory houses at Long Clawson, Harby and Nether Broughton are fine examples of the type of house in which a country parson might expect to live, far superior to almost every other house in the parish, and requiring a staff of servants to run it. The value of the living alone, not including the glebe land or tithes which accompanied it, gave most of the clergy an income far above that of most of the other villagers. In 1861 the living at Hose was worth £105 per annum, Long Clawson £120, Nether Broughton £347, Goadby Marwood £420, and Harby £497.24. Even where the living was modest, other factors distanced the clergy from their parishioners. A clergyman was:

A gentleman, with a university education and a taste for leisure, /who/ lived a private life and did not mix spontaneously with his inferiors, with whom he did not pretend to have much in common ... The clergy's income put them on the same level as the farmers, but their education aligned them with the gentry.

Rev. Norman at Harby, Rev. Bradshaw at Granby and Rev. Manners
at Bottesford were all Cambridge graduates, while Rev. Bellairs of Goadby Marwood, Rev. Deedes of Nether Broughton, Rev. Eddie of Upper Broughton and Rev. Brooke of Colston Bassett were all Oxford graduates. Rev. Edward Manners at Goadby Marwood and Rev. Manners Norman at Harby were of the Duke of Rutland's family. Rev. W. E. Hartopp, rector of Harby until his death in 1852, was the uncle of Mr. E. B. Hartopp of Dalby Hall; he married Eliza, daughter of Rev. Edward Manners, in 1850, and she, after his death, married yet another clergyman, Rev. Hubbertsy, of Stancliffe Hall, Derbyshire, in 1854. The purchase of the living of Goadby Marwood by Mr. George Bellairs of Narborough for his son Stevenson Gilbert Bellairs in 1851 has been noted in an earlier chapter. On the death of Rev. Manners in 1856, Rev. Bellairs took residence in the Rectory, and in 1857 filed a valuation of dilapidations on the rectory house. In 1867 a mortgage of £1,000 was raised from the Commissioners of Queen Anne's Bounty for repairs to the rectory, and in 1868 the marriage took place between Miss Florence Norman, daughter of Mr. George Norman of Goadby Hall, and Rev. Stevenson G. Bellairs. There was no sign by the end of our period that the gentlemanly status of the village clergyman was decreasing; in 1878, for example, the newly appointed vicar of Nether Broughton was married at St. James', Picadilly, to Josephine, daughter of the late Joseph Parker Esq., of Brettenham Park, Suffolk. The retinue of seven servants attending Rev. and Mrs. Deedes at Nether Broughton has been described elsewhere.

It was shown in Chapter 5 that, in glebe land or in private property, the village incumbent was usually a landowner. In some cases, tithes had been commuted into glebe land at enclosure; elsewhere tithe was commuted into corn rent by an Act of 1836. However, obligatory church rate persisted until 1868; this was intended to be used for the upkeep of the church fabric, and was widely resisted where nonconformity was strong, with resistance centred upon the town of Leicester, where
Congregationalist William Baines was imprisoned for refusing to pay, inspiring his friend and minister, E. T. Miall, to lead a campaign for the disestablishment of the Church of England which became an important issue in national politics. There is no evidence of such strongly expressed opposition in the Vale of Belvoir, but it may be assumed that while compulsion persisted it did not help in the formation of a good relationship between clergy and people. After 1868 the rate became voluntary; at Goadby Marwood, where it had been set at one penny in 1857, it had risen to 1½d. in 1873. Only slowly was this voluntary rate to be replaced by offertory collections. The diminishing returns from land with the depression towards the end of our period were reflected in the incomes of country clergy, and it was from about 1885 that the custom grew of an Easter offertory to be given to the incumbent.

Despite the separation of class, and the fact that some of them acted as magistrates and Poor Law Guardians which must itself have inhibited fellowship with the villagers, the Anglican clergy were in many ways involved with the administration of the village, and through this administrative function were brought into contact with their parishioners in ways other than the pastoral. Haig comments on the variety of the functions which the incumbent fulfilled in the village community:

The country parson retained to a far greater extent the 'diffuse', unspecialised functions of the pre-industrial clergyman: his influence was not mediated through specifically ecclesiastical activities and organisations, but through a general involvement in the life of his community, as agricultural land-owner, almoner, educational provider, and representative of an authoritative (if often somewhat distant) culture. ... In the countryside the clergyman had to be all things to all men, and his life and his person were to a far greater extent public property - he knew the parish, it knew him. The Vestry meeting, with the clergyman in the chair,
conducted the parish business; the churchwarden's account book for Hose in 1848 for example records the decision of the Vestry to construct a road across the south side of the churchyard, since all earlier efforts to prevent horses crossing the churchyard by means of fences had been in vain. 36. The Vestry meeting at Goadby Marwood in 1856 agreed to pay £4 for mole catching in the parish. 37. Long Clawson Vestry Minute Book for the period after 1869 records the election of constables, overseers of the poor and waywardens, and in 1874 the appointment of a parochial committee 'to act in conjunction with the Rural Sanitary Authority in carrying out measures to improve the Sanitary condition of the village'. 38. The Vestry appointed assessors and collectors of land- and income-tax, and acting on the reports of the waywardens made decisions regarding what would now be called planning applications. The members of the Vestry who sat with the clergyman were drawn from the 'middle class' of the village; a group meeting in Long Clawson in 1879 for example comprised two wheelwrights, father and son John and Thomas Harby; a master carpenter, Roger Mann; a master miller, John Shilcock; a grazier of 11 acres, Thomas Kellam, and two farmers of 46 and 65 acres, William Waite and John Bailey. The eighth member was George Stubbs, not identifiable from the 1881 census, but perhaps the husband of Martha, who by 1881 was a widow running a grocer shop. 39. Farmers like John Milnes and Markham Hoe acted as churchwardens, but were not always very literate. Hose's churchwarden's account book for 1865-6 for example includes the following entries by John Stokes, a former showmaker who had turned to farming:—

1 bottol of wine 4s.
alton of coles 7s.
and carige of coles 1s.
paid for woshen surplas 10s.
Bred for sakrement 3d.

The evolution of the clergyman from landlord and gentry-figure to a mainstay of bureaucratic administration was probably seen as a natural process; his education and
priestly function gave him an automatic position of leadership and involvement. The role of the parish Vestry, though eroded as the century progressed by the assumption of its powers by public bodies such as the Poor Law Unions and the School Boards, is identified by Chadwick as giving continuity in 'the old union of sacred and secular'. It has been seen from the school log books that the involvement of the clergyman and his family in the running of the village school was useful and valued; one master of the Board school at Upper Broughton noted the infrequency of visits by Rev. Deedes of Nether Broughton compared with those of Rev. Eddie of Upper Broughton. There were occasional differences of opinion between the schoolmasters and the clergy, as for example in January 1867, when Edwin Ball at Waltham was much annoyed to find that Rev. S. G. Bellairs had forbidden the Chadwell children to come to school on account of the fever — wrote and told them that they need not stay away.

Normally however, the authority of the clergyman made him a welcome ally of the schoolmaster in the struggle to get children into school and keep them there.

One instance is recorded of a village clergyman in the area being put in his place by the villagers. It seems that the vicar of Stathern had obstructed a public footpath between Stathern and Hose, and in July 1869 the Leicester Chronicle (a newspaper with nonconformist sympathies, so delighted to be able to report the case), reported that people using the path would not be interfered with, since the Highway Board had promised to protect the public should the vicar make any fresh attempts to stop up the path. Further, a picnic was announced, with a band to provide music, on a field which skirted the vicarage land, 'to get to which those who attend must cross the portion of the footpath which has been in dispute'. It appears that despite his gentlemanly status, the incumbent could not assume that his word would be law.
The way services were conducted changed a great deal during the century; for example, music ceased to be provided by a group of musicians, and came instead from a harmonium in most parishes. Mrs. Holt presented Upper Broughton church with a harmonium in 1869. This was a change which affected nonconformist churches as well; Long Clawson Methodist Trustees paid £5 for a bass viol in 1841, but replaced it with a £3 harmonium in 1864.

The new incumbent at Hose reported to the Episcopal Visitation in 1882 that since his arrival the singers' gallery had been taken down as no longer needed, opening up the tower arch and letting in the light. Many of the changes in practice and in the arrangement of the church building can be traced to the influence of Ritualism. Kitson Clark writes of the 'more seemly, ... more elaborate ceremonial' which replaced the dreary, slovenly old ways in Anglican churches of the period.

Bowen draws attention to the widely differing views which were expressed, evident in the reports issued by the Royal Commission appointed in 1867 to enquire into variations in ceremonial practice in the Church of England. A decision by a court of appeal judge in 1871 that the eastward position in celebration of the Communion, the mixed chalice and wafer bread were all illegal, was reversed in 1877 because it was so widely disregarded.

In the Vale of Belvoir as elsewhere it seems that congregations were reluctant to follow the lead of the clergy. Rev. Bellairs of Goadby Marwood was present at a meeting of the Ruridecanal chapter in 1874, which sent a letter to the Bishop of Peterborough stating:

The laity were unanimously opposed to any alteration in the rubrics, believing that they would not allow either Eucharistic Vestments or the Eastward position to both of which they expressed a decided opposition.

However, the Chapter expressed itself willing to be ruled by the Bishop's judgement, since:

... it is urged that these concessions should be made for fear there should be
a recession of Clergy if refused. We cannot but express our fear on the other hand that there may be a large Defection of Laity if these tendencies (sic) are granted.

It seems likely therefore that Rev. Bellairs had Ritualist opinions. Rev. Robert Miles at Bingham is also recorded as having 'imbibed' Tractarian ideas at Oxford. On the other hand, Rev. Mitchell at Long Clawson was an anti-ritualist. It would seem likely that the sixth Duke of Rutland was not unsympathetic to the view; he shared many of his brother's opinions, and Lord John Manners was a known supporter of High Church principles, with a particular dislike of 'disparting' high pews.

The livings of Harby and Hose, with others in the area which were in the Duke's gift, would have been filled by High Church incumbents if this were so. On the other hand, the Duke was not in any way intolerant of nonconformists, so his views, whatever they were, were not exclusive. Even the accounts of his funeral give no clue, since it was held in private with the minimum of public ceremonial.

One effect of Ritualist influence was an increase in the number of services and Communion services held. Thompson shows that there was a striking increase in the number of services held in the county's churches in this period, so that the number of churches where there was only one service a week fell from 109 to 63; the churches where Communion was held once a month increased from 66 to 145, and those where it was once a week increased from one to 12. In most of the seven villages the number of Communion services increased towards the end of the period. At Harby, where Eucharist had been celebrated only four times a year in 1842, by 1872 it was monthly, and by 1882 monthly plus the five major feasts. Rev. Bellairs increased the frequency of Communion services at Goadby Marwood from three a year to ten, with several more at Chadwell, of which he was curate. At Hose too the new incumbent increased the number to one a month, but at Nether Broughton and Long Clawson on the other hand five
or six Communions in the year, mostly at the major feasts of the church, were considered sufficient.\(^{58}\) All the parishes by 1872 included Harvest among these major festivals; during the century the traditional Harvest Feasts, shared by the farmer and his workers, had become outdated by the changes which affected the social classes. The church had become the centre for the harvest celebration, and seized gladly on what was to remain one of its most popular events. Obelkevich writes of attempts to revive Harvest suppers in the second half of the nineteenth century in a conscious effort to bridge the class gulf, but which only succeeded in emphasising the growing social differences.\(^{59}\) The church festivals on the other hand, drew on the tradition of communal celebration to draw in the widest possible muster of village inhabitants.

Occasional sermons formed another popular event, and were often given as fund-raising ventures. The vicar of Peterborough was invited to speak at the opening of Harby new school in 1860; some 200 people attended and partook of tea in the new building, contributing £20.16.1 towards the debt on the structure.\(^{60}\) Another special sermon was given at Nether Broughton in 1870, by a representative of the Society for the Promotion of Christianity among the Jews.\(^{61}\) This was apparently a favourite charity in the area, appearing on the list of special collections made at Harby for example in both 1872 and 1882. Another favourite cause was the British and Foreign Bible Society; John Noble was chairman of a festival held in Melton in 1872, which extended to the nearby villages with meetings at Long Clawson, Old Dalby and Nether Broughton during the week.\(^{62}\) At Long Clawson in 1872 Rev. Mitchell himself preached a special sermon to raise funds for church missions, taking £5.15.10 at 'the only collection of the year'.\(^{63}\) One of the questions in the Ecclesiastical Visitation of 1882 was whether the parish kept a book to record its visiting preachers. The church was perhaps learning from the nonconformists that the entertainment value of special services (to which Obelkevich draws
attention) could attract large congregations. 64.

However, both Obelkevich and Thompson conclude that
general congregations during the period did not increase.
In Lincolnshire: 65.

If the clergy's larger aim had been to
rebuild their congregations, they appear
on the whole not to have had the results
they might have hoped for ... and the
number of regular attenders and of
communicants showed no substantial increase.

In Leicestershire, Thompson shows that, although the
number of Communion services and communicants rose
substantially in the period 1851 - 1881, congregations
did not. Despite the claim by 44 per cent of clergymen
answering the Visitation question, that their congregations
were increasing, he comments that 'a disturbing number'
in fact gave lower figures in 1881 than in 1878. 66. At
Nether Broughton, Rev. John Noble reported average attendances
in 1872 very similar to those in 1851 - 'These numbers
have been the same for 25 years'. Ten years later, Rev.
C. A. Hulbert stated that he was 'not aware of any decrease'
in the parish, but thought the average was about 100,
whereas afternoon services had earlier reached some 170.

He explained that -

The occupation of making Stilton cheese
detains many at home on Sunday mornings,
but I do not see any way of remedying
the hindrance.

At Long Clawson the morning congregation had decreased by
about a quarter between 1851 and 1872, but the afternoon
congregation had increased substantially according to the
rector's assessment to about 180. Rev. Thomas Mitchell
inexplicably complained of shortage of pews for half the
inhabitants of the village. Certainly the church was
designed to seat some 400 in a village of nearly 800
inhabitants, but the average congregation can scarcely
have half filled the seats. By 1882 the morning congregation
was slightly larger, about 70, but the afternoon, despite
Rev. Mitchell's claim that it 'remains about the same',
had shrunk to an average 120.

There was only one service at Goadby Marwood on Census
Sunday in 1851, at which 100 people were present. In 1872 Rev Stephenson Bellairs estimated the average to be between 60 and 70, but since there were now two services each Sunday this was probably an improvement. Ten years later there was little change - some 50 in the morning and 80 in the evening. Rev. Manners Norman at Harby recorded congregations of about 150 in 1872, and correctly considered the figure to be 'about stationary', since there had been 158 at the best attended (afternoon) service in 1851. He pointed out particularly that 'the morning and evening congregations are composed of different persons to a considerable extent'. By 1881 he was able to report 'about 200 different persons at church on a Sunday - it has increased of late'. It may be that the arrival of a curate in 1880 had helped; William Chancellor was then a young man, 31, and he and his wife had recently returned from the Seychelles, so perhaps his missionary stories were an added attraction.

There are no figures for Hose in 1872, but in 1882, despite the newly resident incumbent, congregations were only 20 plus the children in the morning, and 40 in the afternoon. This shows little change from the 95 who attended the single service on census day in 1851. Rev. Bradshaw complained that - 'The extra services started by the dissenters since I came have taken some dissenters away'.

The small importance given to the Communion service in most of the villages is emphasised by the very low numbers of communicants. In some of them even the churchwardens were not communicants. In Long Clawson, Goadby Marwood and Harby there were about 40 communicants in both 1872 and 1882. At Nether Broughton the number fell from an estimated 40 to 27 in 1882, and at Hose also there were no more than 26, with perhaps 12 at an average service. This compares poorly with the trend in the county at large, where Thompson shows an increase in communicants from 4,114 in 1851 to 14,914 in 1881.68.
The Church of England had many assets; with the financial support of the gentry and clergy it repaired, redecorated, and to some extent modernised its buildings. It modified its form of service to be more attractive. The stability and status of its clergy gave it an advantage in leadership, and the involvement of the parson in the life of the community in the management of local affairs in the vestry or the school should have given him an identity with the inhabitants. Yet that very stability, with incumbencies lasting over decades and into old age, perhaps, as Obelkevich warns, 'carried dangers of stagnation and monotony, [and] may well have been a disadvantage'. At Long Clawson Rev. Mitchell was the incumbent throughout the period of the study. Rev. Manners Norman came to Harby in 1852, and was still there in 1881. Rev. John Noble, Rector of Nether Broughton in 1851, died there aged 70 in 1875. Rev. Edward Manners of Goadby Marwood died aged 71 in 1856. At nearby Colston Bassett, the vicar from 1834 until 1888 was Rev. Joshua Brooke. The advantages of having a familiar figure at the Rectory, who knew his parishioners well, might be outweighed by his diminishing zeal, particularly in this period in which the need for mission was so much felt. A congregation which could be drawn in to hear a visiting preacher might be less enthusiastic to listen week after week to the favourite themes and even sermons of the incumbent.

The parish system was at once the strength and weakness of the Church of England in the villages. It provided stability and continuity; but in a changing world it inhibited fresh challenge and variety and so was unable to re-awaken the interest of the people. The social distance of the clergyman from most of his flock, thought by the upper classes to endow him with the authority of leadership, in fact separated him from that personal contact which nonconformists used so effectively.
Nonconformists.

The Ecclesiastical Census of 1851 (Appendix VI) points clearly those villages where nonconformity was strong. In the seven villages examined in detail, Wesleyan Methodists claimed the two largest congregations on census Sunday, with 200 at Long Clawson in the afternoon and 170 in the evening, and at Harby with 125 in the morning and 185 in the evening. There was Methodist support also in Nether Broughton, with a congregation of 73 in the morning and 133 in the evening, and at Hose, where, although there was no Methodist chapel, a group of 30 met for worship on Sunday afternoon. The General Baptists had a chapel at Long Clawson, but with a congregation of only 35 at the evening service, and another at Hose, where their services were by far the best attended with 117 for the morning service and 129 for the evening. An interesting item is the small remnant of Calvinist support at Harby, with only 14 in the morning congregation. In 1851 there were no nonconformist groups recorded in Goadby Marwood, or in Chadwell or Wycomb. In Long Clawson, Harby and Hose, the total nonconformist attendances exceeded the total Church of England attendances, leaving Nether Broughton as the only one of the four larger villages where attendances at the parish church exceeded those at the nonconformist chapels; the 170 people who attended the Anglican service there formed just over 40 per cent of the village population—the highest proportion to attend any service in those villages where there was a choice of denomination. The 100 residents of Goadby Marwood, 47.8 per cent of its population, who attended the single service available to them in the parish church, confirm the tendency identified by Obelkevich in parts of Lincolnshire, where 'a much higher percentage of the population attended church in small parishes than in large'. At Chadwell on the other hand only 41 people, 24.7 per cent of the population, attended the single Anglican service, a result perhaps of the status of the church as a chapel of Rothley (Leics.), served at that time by a curate appointed from
Rothley, as contrasted with the presence of a familiar and much loved rector at Goadby Marwood.

Dissent was not new to the Vale of Belvoir. There are accounts of Quaker societies in both Harby and Long Clawson in the seventeenth century, but these had disappeared by the early nineteenth century. Josiah Gill identifies Nether Broughton as the home of the first Methodist society to be formed in the area, where it was gaining local acceptance by 1769. From there it spread to Long Clawson in 1797, where William Parkes opened his home for meetings until the first chapel was inaugurated in 1801 with a membership of 32. In 1828 William and Ann Orson fitted up a carriage house at Harby for Methodist worship, and it was another member of the family, John Orson, who provided land and much of the funding when a new chapel was built there in 1847. Meanwhile Wesleyan chapels had been opened at Nether Broughton in 1839, and at Long Clawson in 1840.72

The General Baptists were established in the area at much the same time. They opened a chapel at Hose in 1818, which was enlarged in 1841, and their chapel at Long Clawson was built in 1845. Thus by the beginning of our period all but the smallest villages had well established nonconformist congregations. The period was also to see some further spread of Wesleyan Methodism, and also the opening of a Primitive Methodist chapel at Long Clawson in 1868.73 However, although the expansion of Primitive Methodism was to continue until about 1870, for Baptists as well as for Wesleyan Methodists what Gill calls the 'halcyon days' were at an end in 1850. The number of Baptist chapels in England and Wales had almost quadrupled in the years 1801 to 1851, a rate of growth impossible to maintain, while the dispute over organisation which beset Methodism in the 1840s was thought to have lost it some 100,000 members.74 Gill records that the effects were felt in the Melton circuit in 1848-152, but that the worst disruption was avoided there. Nevertheless, there were
some losses in membership at that time; at Nether Broughton where there had been 58 members in 1847 there were 50 in 1848 and 33 in 1863. It may be however that this was part of a more long-term decline in the village, since the chapel there had been enlarged in 1839 to hold 260 persons.\(^{75}\) Strenuous efforts were made in the 1870s to increase membership in the circuit; in 1873 a new schoolroom and minister's vestry were added to the chapel buildings at Long Clawson, and the chapel at Harby was renovated. In each village the expense was met by the proceeds of a bazaar, that at Long Clawson realising £160.\(^{76}\) The Quarterly Meeting proposed the building of a new chapel at Holwell in 1875, following the opening of that at Plungar in 1874.\(^{77}\) Membership in the Melton circuit as a whole continued to rise until the end of the century; 720 members in 1863 had reached 913 by 1881. However, it seems likely that much of this growth in membership was in Melton itself; membership at the new chapel there doubled between its opening in 1871 and 1895. The attendance figures for the chapels at Nether Broughton, Long Clawson and Harby in October 1907 were substantially lower than those of 1851. (Appendix VII). Membership and attendance are not the same, but since attendance is likely to be much greater than membership the contrast is meaningful.

Until late in the period the Vale of Belvoir was served by two Methodist ministers who lived in Melton Mowbray and rode out to preach in the surrounding villages. In 1880 a third minister was appointed, also based in Melton, and 27 villages as well as the town were served. Whereas in 1874 the stipend for each of the two pastors reached £140 per annum, the newcomer was paid only £80 plus £10 expenses. These stipends were raised by the congregations; when Mr. Featherstone and Mr. Gibson proposed to the 1872 Quarterly Meeting that a minister to reside in Long Clawson should be appointed, they proposed that he should be paid £1 per week, and that the expense should be shared amongst the villages of the circuit, Long Clawson finding
£20 per annum, Harby £10, Nether Broughton £5, and Goadby Marwood 10s. The suggestion came at a bad time however, as the circuit had an outstanding debt of £250 on the two ministers' houses built in Melton the previous year, and the response to appeals had been thin. Long Clawson had been reminded earlier in the year of a deficiency of £14 in its contribution, and advised to hold a special tea meeting to raise the amount as soon as convenient. In fact, Long Clawson had to wait until 1887 for its first resident minister to be appointed.  

The Baptist chapel at Hose was licensed for marriages, and several of these are reported in the *Leicester Chronicle* as celebrated by Rev. T. Hoe. Thomas Hoe appears in the 1851 census for the village as the son of farmer Catherine Hoe, but with no occupational description. However, there is confirmation of the family's Baptist connections, as Catherine's grand-daughter, Catherine Anne Stevenson, married Rev. W. Bishop, co-pastor of the Baptist Chapel at Archdeacon Lane, Leicester, at a ceremony performed by Rev. Hoe at Hose in May 1870. Despite the family connection, Rev. Hoe does not appear to have been resident in the village in later censuses, so perhaps served a circuit of chapels with his base elsewhere. At least what we know of him serves to illustrate the difference of social background between Church of England and nonconformist clergy.

All the nonconformist congregations relied heavily on the services of lay local preachers, and some of these can be identified amongst the inhabitants of the seven villages. For example, both Henry Mantle and his son, Frederick, grocers in Hose, were General Baptist local preachers in 1861. Amongst Wesleyan Methodists, Gill mentions Enoch Paget of Long Clawson, who started his working life as an agricultural labourer, but who worked his own grazing farm by 1881. Thomas Edlin moved to Nether Broughton from Lancashire in 1862, took a local girl as his second wife, and settled into the service of the Wesleyan cause. He was a class leader and Trustee
as well as local preacher, and one of his sons, James, went to India as a missionary and died there at the age of 27. Mr. Edlin's 12 acre grazing farm was lost sometime after 1871, leaving him as a general labourer with six children in 1881. Another Nether Broughton local preacher was John Everitt, cottager and son-in-law to another prominent Methodist in the village, Jonathan Whittaker. John Featherstone, who lived in Long Clawson in 1851, moved to Hickling to run his school, Weir House Academy, there, and became a Wesleyan Trustee, Steward and local preacher. The single-mindedness of these men is perhaps best illustrated by an account of a misadventure which befell another of them; Edward Doubleday, farmer of 112 acres:

As Mr. Doubleday, of Clawson, was driving to preach at the Wesleyan Chapel, Melton, on Sunday evening, his horse fell, breaking its knees, and the shafts off the trap. Mr. Doubleday was thrown out, and cut and injured about the face; but walked to Melton and was able to take the service though he was badly shaken.

Other villagers are remembered for their services to the Wesleyan cause; Thomas Peters for example, a master brickmaker at Nether Broughton, who was for many years superintendent of the Sunday school, and who also sang and played the bass viol in chapel. At Long Clawson William Cooke, who first appeared on the census as a bailiff but later farmed on his own account, 'rendered Conspicuous service in many spheres ... Trustee of many chapels, a Class-leader, a Steward and Sunday School Superintendent for the greater part of his life'. In old age he was able to amaze with his memory for past dates and for the texts and sermons of visiting preachers long before. In Harby the Orson family were pre-eminent amongst Wesleyans; a tablet to the memory of John Orson was fixed on the chapel wall when he died in 1874, and an appreciation of his services recorded in the minutes of the Circuit Quarterly Meeting. Five years later the Meeting also noted the death of another member of the family, H. M. Orson, at Harby (but not identifiable from
The meeting calls to mind the many excellencies and virtues that endeared him to us all - his uniform kindness - his manly uprightness - his general intelligence and Catholicity of Spirit - his earnest and consistent piety - his liberality and generous hospitality, and his diligence in the cause of Christ.

At Wycomb Mr. W. H. Wright gave the use of a room, and fire and light, to the group organised for prayer meetings by Wesleyans from Scalford. The little chapel was built on the site of his house when it was pulled down in 1896.85. At Goadby Marwood it was cordwainer Robert Waite who provided a room from 1856 until 1868, when three wives of substantial farmers in the village, Mrs. Walker of White Lodge, Mrs. Ellaby of Belle-Mere farm, and Mrs. Watson, went to Belvoir Castle and secured the Duke of Rutland's help in establishing a building for the Society's permanent use. Mrs. Ellaby is specially remembered by Gill: -86.

For fifty years she resided near Goadby, impressing all who knew her by her strong character, intellectual qualities and true, deep piety. Her sympathy and pity would frequently impel her to ride on horseback many miles in order to visit the sick and dying.

Women played an important role in Wesleyan organisation in the villages, sometimes even acting as Class leaders. One of the most enjoyable duties was the entertainment of visiting preachers. Even more than in the Church of England, special sermons were a highlight in chapel life, particularly at the anniversary services which formed such an important part of the church year. Gill recalls close friendships which sprang up between visiting celebrities and the families who offered them hospitality.87.

At such times the farm-houses were filled with guests invited to meet the preachers and attend the services ... Who can think of the Anniversaries, and forget the large old-fashioned table bountifully spread, the preacher's chair, the lofty conversations, the stories, the prayers, the departure of the guests, the parents and children remaining to talk with the illustrious
There is no record to compare with this of Anglican sociability, but it is hard to imagine that the social status of the Church of England clergy allowed the same warmth of contact with parishioners.

The generosity of Methodists expressed itself too in financial terms. As contrasted with the Church of England, where collections were not regularly taken, every Wesleyan member was expected to contribute ld. a week and ls. a quarter. As well as this there were frequent appeals for causes such as the Local Preachers' Horse Hire Fund. Debts had been incurred in the building of chapels, and with the money outstanding on the preachers' houses, Melton Circuit found itself owing £1,600 in 1876. In 1877 the Circuit Chapel Debt Extinction Fund was set up, and a series of sermons and lectures combined with private donations of as much as £30 or £40 each raised enough to clear the debt and launch a Thanksgiving Fund in 1880.

There is less evidence of the activity of other nonconformist groups in the villages. The establishment of the Primitive Methodist chapel at Long Clawson in 1868 suggests continued growth of the sect in the area. There had been local preachers living in Redmile in 1830, and substantial growth in the Nottingham circuit which included this area right through until 1890. A series of mission meetings which were led by Rev. Autliff of Derby in 1865 had included Long Clawson as well as Scalford and Melton. As well as their fundamentalist beliefs and more Puritanical outlook, Primitive Methodists were distinguished from Wesleyans by the even greater democracy of their administration. Each society was run by a Leaders' Meeting, composed of stewards and class leaders, themselves almost entirely drawn from the working classes. After 1870 ministers - 'travelling preachers' - were required to attend a one year college course, but they remained far outnumbered by
lay local preachers. Money was not diverted into building Sunday schools or manses - the children were taught in chapel with their own sermon, and ministers lived in rented rooms. Strict discipline was imposed on both children and adults; failure to attend class meetings regularly led to expulsion; gambling was prohibited, and teetotalism encouraged, even to the extent of dispensing with the use of wine at Communion. Personal conduct, and particularly sexual conduct, was sternly regulated. Revivalist methods, with outdoor meetings, Revival Bands and Praying Companies, were part of the normal witness of the sect, along with intensive mission campaigns.

Despite their differences, it seems that relations between the two groups of Methodists were good. Morris reports that:

> By 1880 it was common for either 'Primitive' or Wesleyan chapels to close while the other chapel in the vicinity held special services, and for travelling preachers of one denomination to officiate in these special services of the other denomination.

A questionnaire circulated amongst the Wesleyan chapels in the Melton area in 1885 confirms the friendly feeling between the different branches of Methodism in the villages.

As we have seen, much of the most active support for Wesleyan Methodism in Long Clawson and the other villages was amongst what may be regarded as the 'middle class' - farmers, tradesmen and shopkeepers. Primitive Methodism appealed to the working class: it offered identity and purpose to the labourer and his family, without requiring the social activity which became an important aspect of Wesleyan life. There was therefore space for both denominations.

Of the Baptist congregations it is possible to say even less. The 1851 attendance figures already suggest a decline in support: at Long Clawson a chapel built to hold 130 housed a congregation of 35. At Hose the situation was better, with two congregations of 117 and 129
in the 245 seat chapel on census Sunday. However, Thompson writes of a decline in General Baptist membership in the county between 1851 and 1881, and quotes the membership of Hose chapel as falling from 153 in 1851 to 66 by 1861, and remaining at about that level until 1881.95 Some Baptist membership was perhaps lost by migration. The vicar of Long Clawson, Rev. Thomas Mitchell, wrote a letter to the Bishop of Peterborough in 1882, supplementing his Episcopal Visitation return. He apologised that he had overlooked mention of the Baptist burial ground in the parish, but - 96.

It is a place seldom used, being in size 10 yards by 9 - and having had in 33 years only 4 interments. Baptists, it appears, were not dying in the parish.

Hose Baptist chapel received some support from the Melton Mowbray congregation. In 1868 a party from Melton led by their minister, Mr. J. J. Irving, travelled to Hose where several were baptised in the chapel. 'Crowded congregations' listened to two sermons, one before and one after tea. The Leicester Chronicle reported 'The services were of an interesting character'.97 Another celebration at Hose which was reported in the Leicester Chronicle was the Baptist Sunday School Feast in 1880. As well as services and the distribution of prizes -98.

... the children had their annual treat of cake and tea, and some nuts and oranges were distributed among them in the field where they indulged in various games. ... Altogether the day was a very pleasant one, and the village club feast being held at the same time, rendered the place quite lively.

In the villages examined in detail, relations between the Church of England and the nonconformists seem to have been good, if the clergymen's comments in the Visitation Reports are reliable. Only the new vicar of Hose complained of dissenting services depleting his congregation. Rev. Norman at Harby was perhaps presenting a biased view when he wrote:-
I can hardly say many attend both church and chapel - the number of regular professed and joined members of the Wesleyan body is small.

The number of communicants at his own Eucharist services averaged 20. Rev. John Noble at Nether Broughton wrote:-

I do not consider the Wesleyans dissenters. Most of them come to church in the afternoon and many go to the chapel in the evening.

His successor ten years later commented:-

Most of the inhabitants attend both Church and Chapel, and do not declare themselves for either.

The School Board at Nether Broughton was composed of 'Four churchmen and one Wesleyan working harmoniously'. Rev. Bellairs at Goadby Marwood in 1872 commented on the occasional dissenting services held in a room in the village, but reported nevertheless that 'all the Parishioners attend the church'. One of the leading Methodists there was Robert Waite, who was also Parish clerk.

Co-operation at Harby was demonstrated in October 1880, when the Wesleyan and church Sunday schools combined to celebrate their centenary, with a procession headed by a brass band, a joint service in church, and games on Mr. Whittle's field. After tea for both children and adults there were more games until 7 o'clock, when a second service completed the day -

... a day that will be remembered in Harby as one of the most joyous ever spent there, and in which all parties, independent of age, sect, or creed, took part.

A topic on which some dispute might have been expected was that of nonconformist burials. Pressure was growing throughout the period for arrangements to be made so that nonconformists could use their own forms of burial service, conducted by their own ministers. Church of England clergy refused to allow this within their own churchyards, and although in towns the provision of civic cemeteries solved the problem, in the countryside it remained a source of friction. Anglican opposition to proposed legislation was expressed by Framland Rural Deanery at a meeting on
10 December, 1875, in a minute which reads:—

That no alteration be made in the present arrangements on Burials. ... this meeting considers it highly inexpedient that legislative permission should be granted to any persons other than the clergy of the Church of England to officiate in the churchyards at any service for the burial of the dead.

At the same time concern was expressed that ground should be made available for burial grounds, and it was suggested that compulsory purchase grants might be made available for both dissenters and for Church of England parishes. Clerical concern was for the sanctity of the churchyard, the sacramental nature of the burial service, and the priestly role within it; while for most nonconformists Anglican burial was acceptable, for some it was marred by the intolerant attitude of the clergy. For example, the Melton Mowbray Methodist Circuit Quarterly Meeting in August 1878 recorded the following two Special Resolutions:

1st. In that this meeting having heard of the unseemly conduct of the Rev. H.L. Baker, Vicar of Grimstone, at the recent funeral of the late Mrs. Freestone, for many years a member of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, desires to express its sympathy with the friends of the deceased, and at the same time its utter abhorence of the intolerance of the vicar.

2nd. That a copy of the foregoing resolution be forwarded to the vicar and to the husband of the deceased.

Although Harby was associated with the petition against the Burials Bill which Lord John Manners presented in Parliament in 1863, the village like many others seems to have been so evenly divided between the Church of England and Wesleyan Methodism that both opinions are likely to have been heard there. In spite of the passing of the Burials Act of 1880, which made it legal for relatives to choose any form of burial service they thought fit provided it was Christain and orderly, the Anglican clergy of the seven villages recorded in their Visitation returns of 1882 not a single burial service held in their churchyards.
during the previous decade by any minister other than themselves; of course this cannot be assumed to mean that no-one requested it, but it does seem likely that the acknowledged overlap in Church of England and Wesleyan attendance in the villages meant that there was a greater tolerance than in more fundamentally divided communities. 104.

In a pamphlet published in 1877 on Methodism in Rural England, Rev. Allen Rees wrote of the contribution of the dissenting churches to village life. 105. Not without bias, he commented:-

If it were not for the influence of religion, village life would degenerate into one narrow round of monotony, tittle-tattling, and rude brutality. That our villages have been preserved from this is due to the voluntary churches. Indeed, in many places religion would have been absolutely extinct but for the Dissenting chapel. The Established Church has had complete control over these villages for centuries; it has put down "a gentleman" in each parish ... Nevertheless the villages remain uneducated, and the greater part of them at the present time are completely alienated from the Church of England.

There is no reason to suppose such alienation in the seven villages. Nevertheless, the nonconformist churches obviously provided something for which there was a need, a fact recognised by Bishop Magee of Peterborough, who wrote in 1872:- 106.

In how many parishes in this Diocese, ... let us honestly ask, may not the rise of the Dissenting chapel be traced to a time not so very far distant when men who cared for their souls, must have sought food for them there or starved.

The enthusiasm with which the nonconformist churches were served is indicative of their worth. At a time when the social structure based on reciprocal loyalty was being replaced with one of class and contract, the opportunities offered in the dissenting churches for lay involvement and for social contact across the classes were invaluable.
Investigating the influence of Methodism across the county border in Lincolnshire, Scotland comments on the ways in which it encouraged independence in the working classes. 107.

Methodism promoted independent action by the country poor. The building and establishment of the chapel was often an act of open rebellion against parson, squire and farmers. Within the chapel communities, the labourers learned self-respect, self-reliance, and organisational skills. ... Methodism also had the added appeal that it openly opposed, and so undermined the authority of the established church, which it showed to be lacking in discipline and spiritual reality. ...

Of great importance also was the democratic spirit and structure of Methodist organisations which were of such a nature that opportunities of leadership and service were open to all.

Whereas in Lincolnshire the 'rebellion' manifested itself militantly in the 'Revolt of the Field', in Leicestershire the agricultural union movement was less strident. Labourers had fewer grievances than in Lincolnshire, and Primitive Methodism, so strong in Lincolnshire, made less impact. 108. Chapel building in the Vale of Belvoir did not need to be an act of defiance, since the Duke of Rutland himself encouraged it, giving financial help or even land, as he did at Woolsthorpe in 1862. 109. The interest of the Duke was in strong contrast to the intolerant attitude of those many landowners whom Rees blamed for the antagonism between denominations in the villages. 110.

John Bright, in the House of Commons this last Session, said that a gentleman in the Midland Counties told him:- "Nothing shall induce me to let one of my farms to a Nonconformist"; and he undertook to say there were hundreds of landlords who followed the same rule.

While there seems to have been little inter-denominational friction in the Vale of Belvoir, there was nevertheless a clear contrast between the attitude to class in the established and nonconformist churches, illustrated in two reports issued in 1885. The first, on the impact of Methodism in the villages of the Melton circuit, concluded: 111.
... on the whole Methodism has covered the ground fairly well and enjoys the confidence of the vast majority of the people.

In the same year, the Ruridecanal Conference at Bottesford, asked to consider the social position and claims of the labouring classes, reported on the course they felt the church should follow:-112.

It is the opinion of this Conference that in the face of the many political agitators at home and abroad, the Church and her Clergy should maintain and strengthen the ties of mutual dependence which define the social position of the various classes of the community; - adhering to the principle that if one class seeks undue advancement at the expense of others, it inflicts serious injury on the welfare of a great nation.

In defending the status quo the Church of England was closing its eyes to social changes, and cutting itself off from the aspirations of working people.

If congregations diminished during the period, one contributing factor was migration. To quote Rev. Rees once more:-113.

Those who, in spite of clerical tyranny and landed influence, attend the Methodist preaching, and have courage and principle enough to walk in the way of godliness, are the very ones who aspire for a better position in life, and therefore seek those other fields where prospects of advance open up before them.

The independence encouraged by participation in nonconformist organisation, the knowledge of the world outside the village which visiting preachers brought, and the contact with town congregations where a welcome would be found, all encouraged migration. The dissenting churches' failure to build up village congregations as the century came to an end was itself perhaps a sign of their greatest success in the broadening of people's minds and horizons.

Meanwhile, despite efforts to make more attractive its buildings and services, the Church of England was locked into its traditional identification with the upper classes. Its clergy, dedicated and generous as many of them were,
were cut off from the fraternal contacts with their congregations enjoyed by their nonconformist colleagues. Haig writes of a new breed of Anglican clergy, drawn to the more exciting challenge of the towns with all their social problems, rather than to the more serene life of a country parish.\textsuperscript{114} The gentlemen-clergy of the villages could not, perhaps did not see the need to, adapt to a changing world. They had been too long associated with a patriarchal leadership role, which made the pastoral aspects of Christian ministry very difficult to fill in a world of growing class division. The realisation in the Church in the period 1840 - 1880 that it had lost its hold on a great part of the populace, led to determined efforts to retrench. But even in the countryside, where the changes in the structure of society were much slower to be seen than in towns, too many people had moved too far away from formal religious observance. Despite the energy and devotion of small groups of lay villagers, apathy had become easier than observance, and both the established and the nonconformist churches were unable to counteract its spread.
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Chapter 10 -
TRIAL, TRIBULATION AND RECREATION.

It becomes clear that many of the most important changes to affect village life were not effected through legislation. The influence of the gentry and, increasingly, of the middle class, was very strong; we have noted the continuing power of the Duke of Rutland in, for example, the political life of the Vale of Belvoir, and the increasing role of the middle class in such bodies as the Highway Board or as leaders of nonconformist congregations. Perkin attributes the greatest changes in the structure of Victorian society to the emerging strength of the professional and entrepreneurial middle class. He traces the idealism with which the ruling classes provided social legislation on public health, housing and education, designed to shape a working class which was healthy and contented, thus ensuring the stability of the social order and the security of the more comfortably off.

As legislation reduced the squalor of working-class life however, the growing prosperity of the 1870s and on, combined with more free time, more access to information and publicity and greater scope for travel, all brought a weakening of the social barriers which separated the classes, so that the middle class became apprehensive about the effects of leisure and its freedoms on a working class with a traditional taste for wantonness and an uncertain allegiance to the authority of its betters.

Bailey examines the interaction between this increased freedom, and the efforts to create a new social conformity which would make popular leisure 'respectable'.

Most of the social legislation of the Victorian period was directed at the towns, since that was where the problems were concentrated; it was in towns that the major impact of legislation on housing, on sanitation and health was felt. In addition, attempts to provide 'improving' leisure facilities, such as the Mechanics' Institutes and the public libraries, were of necessity concentrated in towns.
But this does not mean that country pastimes were left without interference; Malcolmson traces a decline in rural recreations in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, largely as a result of the disapproval of the upper classes, leaving the way clear for the emergence of new kinds of leisure pursuits after 1850, and Bailey examines the influence of the middle class in encouraging these new 'rational' recreations.\(^5\).

However, leisure was not the only area of working class behaviour in which efforts were made to produce conformity. The very high crime rate early in the century had convinced the government that the criminal code needed revision, and Peel began in 1827 by abolishing the death penalty where it had become an anomaly, and by transferring minor crimes against property to the adjudication of the petty sessions.\(^6\). The creation of borough and county police forces following the Acts of 1835 and 1856, is seen by Ruđe as 'the direct expression of a new class system and therefore an expression of class rule'.\(^7\). Steedman extends this point:—\(^8\).

Indeed, the interesting and important point about the development of police forces in mid-nineteenth century England is that policemen, people from the unofficial community of the rural poor, were asked to join the official community as servants — as policemen. They brought with them the experience and attitudes of the unofficial community, and these were used as a tool of government policy by their employers. That policy she defines as 'institutionalised morality' — the dream that paternalistic charity combined with stern punishment for the wrong-doer would conquer the problem of crime.\(^9\).

A third aspect of social reform in which the classes came into contact was that of health care. Scientific advance in medical knowledge, together with moves to create a more professional body of medical practitioners, ensured that the treatment of illness became more uniquely a task performed by the middle class.\(^{10}\). The local doctor was a valued member of village society and no doubt even when the treatment he prescribed was of little effect, his presence as a man of science was comforting. Yet the chapter will illustrate how little could be done to protect
or cure, and how ineffectual were paternalistic kind intentions.

This chapter deals then with three fairly disparate areas of village social life. It investigates first of all the evidence regarding the cases which were brought before the local courts in an attempt to see what kinds of anti-social behaviour were met with, and whether there are signs of 'protest crime' against an unacceptable social order. Another question which arises is, whether there was in the villages an identifiable 'criminal class', or whether crimes and misdemeanours were mainly spontaneous responses to the situation of the moment.

The chapter then examines the evidence of the problems of health and accidental injury; since most of this evidence is gleaned from newspapers, the picture is of course a very incomplete one - few editors would print the news that 'the doctor called and the patient recovered'. Nevertheless as with the account of law breaking in the villages, some account of the hazardousness of daily life is a useful antidote to the golden dream of bucolic serenity which the imagination all too readily creates. The chapter demonstrates the confusion in which the middle-class leaders of the society tried to deal with epidemic, and the ways in which society was unable to provide protection against many of its most present dangers.

Finally, the chapter gives an account of some of the opportunities for recreation in village life. The middle-class pressure for respectability and restraint in public amusements had begun to take effect before 1850, but evidence of it is still to be found in our period. The different ways in which the social classes chose to amuse themselves are explored, as well as those events, like the village cricket match, which cut across class barriers. In conclusion, the sport which is synonymous with the Melton Mowbray area, fox hunting, is examined, and the extent to which in fact, as was claimed, it provided sport for every class.
For all three themes it has been necessary to rely very largely on the fitful reports in the local press, which deal almost exclusively with highlights and disasters. Even so, the detail which the incidents described add to our picture of village life is too valuable to ignore. Each of the themes reveals something of social relationships within the village, and of the social control which the upper classes attempted to exercise.

CRIME AND POLICING.

The most numerous references to the group of villages in the local press arise in the brief listings of petty sessions hearings, covering a range of offences from assault to theft, from employment disputes to traffic offences, from paternity suits to poaching. Having singled out such items, the first impression is that there are a great many of them; this amount of disputation and petty crime does not concur with a picture of the placid rural scene. However, a sense of proportion must be maintained; the items probably average out at perhaps one or two per month amongst the seven villages over thirty years, and most of them concern relatively petty offences. The courts, and particularly the petty court, still served the function of the ancient manor courts, as an area where personal or local disputes could be aired and settled. Trivial disputes were placed before the court, some of them too trivial to pursue. The magistracy remained firmly in the hands of the local gentry; the qualification to become a Justice of the Peace was the possession of land valued at £100 per annum. Repeated efforts between 1836 and 1868 to secure a Bill in Parliament to transfer the operation of the Quarter Sessions to an elected Board had failed. When the magistrate was likely to be a local landowner or clergyman an appeal to the court took a complainant less far outside the natural bounds of his own community than in the more centralised system of today; cases were frequently dismissed because those laying the charge
failed to appear. Even in the County Court, in November 1863 for example.  

There were about 40 cases entered for hearing, but none were of any great importance, and many of them were struck out through the parties not being present.

Many of the charges, particularly in the earlier part of the period, were of assault, one labourer accusing another, perhaps two labourers' wives, sometimes a tradesman or even a farmer being involved. Details are not given, so we must assume that these were for the most part fights which flared up, and were probably as soon forgotten. Some names recur, suggesting a longer term problem, however; George Warner of Nether Broughton, for example, was charged four times between November 1855 and August 1860 with assaulting his wife Phoebe. His occupation was variously described to the court as gardener, grazier, yeoman, and gentleman, and in the 1861 census he appears as a landed proprietor. In 1860 he was convicted under the Aggravated Assault Act and sentenced to six months hard labour, after which he was required to enter into recognizance in the sum of £50 to be of good behaviour for the following six months. The following spring, when the census information was collected, he had returned to the village, but was living as a lodger in a labourer's cottage, and neither then nor ten years later was his wife with him. Whatever his pretensions to middle-class status, his behaviour seems to have cut him off from a middle-class life-style.

Of the disputes between employers and their servants which form another sizeable proportion of the press reports, something has been said in an earlier chapter. (See Chapter 6, p.195) By no means all such charges were brought by the employer; following the Master and Servant Act of 1867, servants quite often applied to have their employment restored, or due wages paid, or even for compensation for physical assault by their employer. Here too some names recur; Mary Rowbotham and her son Thomas, who farmed 200 acres at Goadby Lodge made several
appearances in the petty court. In 1860 Mrs. Rowbotham charged Ann Bennett with absconding from her service; in 1867 Thomas and William Sharpe were charged by Thomas Rowbotham with misconduct in his service, and ordered to have 10s. each abated from their wages. Five months later it was Thomas who was accused of having assaulted his servant, Frances Lane, but the case was dismissed. Then in 1875 yet another maid-servant, Lucy Ann Patchett, was ordered to return to Mr. Rowbotham's service or face the possibility of arrest. Justly or not, some employers were doubtless more demanding than others, or less reluctant to apply for the support of the magistrates.

Bastardy orders were made from time to time affecting inhabitants of the villages. The young mother's accusation was not always accepted however; when Sarah Sumner accused agricultural labourer George Green at Harby in 1850 she was unable to make her case, 'the corroborative testimony being defective'. Sometimes paternity was admitted, and the case settled out of court, but where a maintenance order was made there seems to have been some diversity in the amount to be paid. Both Henry Knapp of Harby, and James Miller of Clawson, were ordered to pay 1s. 6d. a week in 1856 to support bastard children, and in 1872 another farm labourer, George Harvey of Nether Broughton, was to pay 1s. a week. However, farmer's son John Wilford of Long Clawson was required to contribute only 6d. per week to the maintenance of Louisa Scarborough's child in 1860. On the other hand, a Stathern tailor, Thomas Starbuck, paid 2s. per week to maintain the child born to Ellen Tinsley in Long Clawson in 1870, and in 1873 Mary Hardy [Harby?] was awarded 5s. per week from farmer Joseph Doar in Long Clawson. The maintenance orders seem therefore to have been sensibly based on the ability of the father to pay.

Ability to pay was also taken into consideration when villagers were charged with failing to maintain their families, thus leaving them at the charge of the parish.
Snell reports a reinforcement in the 1870s of the New Poor Law insistence upon the contribution of relatives to the maintenance of old people, following a relaxation in mid-century. The court in the Melton area usually required 1s. per week to be contributed by the family towards the upkeep of a parent who had been abandoned, whereas, Snell tells us, the Poor Law relief payment might be only 6d; this was the sum imposed on George and Edward Julian, labourers of Hose, for the upkeep of their father in 1872, and also on Freeman Smith, a Long Clawson labourer, for his mother in 1873 - a severe drain on a labourer's income. Wilful neglect was sometimes punished by imprisonment; William Smith of Harby was sent for one month's hard labour for failing to maintain his family in 1863, and William Barker, a groom, was sentenced to three months' hard labour for failing to maintain his wife at Nether Broughton in 1866. On the other hand, when John Branston, a Long Clawson tailor who had abandoned his wife and children, returned to the village in 1861, his promise 'to be a better man for the future' and to provide for his family, was accepted by the court.

Neglecting to pay the poor rate was another offence liable to meet with a sharp rebuke in the petty court. However, one case in 1854 demonstrates that the magistrates could temper justice with mercy. On the bench were Mr. Burnaby, Mr. E. B. Hartopp, and Mr. George Norman.

John Scarborough, a poor lame old man, 72 years of age, with a large family, was charged by the overseer of the poor rate at Scalford with neglecting to pay two poor rates of 6d. each. The bench considered him quite unable to pay, and exonerated him from payment accordingly.

The most harshly punished offence was theft, reflecting the importance of property in Victorian values. There were few thefts of any great value in the villages - presumably there was little of value to steal. The most serious were occasional thefts of sheep or cattle, but these were likely to be more professional crimes than the usual village pilferage. Two cows stolen from Mr. Hebb of Long Clawson in 1855 for example were later identified
at Melton market, where they were offered for sale by a man from Asfordby who had already served a prison sentence. A thief broke into the Black Horse at Hose in August 1856, and stole two teapots, one of them silver, a violin, and a family bible, all the property of James Pears. These appear to have been planned thefts. More typical however was the theft of turnips from Henry Watson's field at Goadby Marwood, or of eggs from an outhouse belonging to Henry Bonser at Farty. For the latter offence, George Sneath, a groom, was committed for 21 days hard labour, the four eggs concerned being valued at 3d. John Wrath, a labourer, stole one pennyworth of tares from Mr. Coleman at Long Clawson in 1863, and was sentenced to one month's imprisonment with hard labour, and the same punishment was given for the theft of three cucumbers from James Pears. A Hickling man, Frederick Starbuck, was convicted of stealing 7d. on the highway at Nether Broughton from 11 year old Frederick Greaves in 1862, and was to be publicly whipped as well as serving a month with hard labour. A thief who was committed to the Assizes at Leicester was James Eloner, who was accused of stealing 5 hens from Joseph Bissel of Nether Broughton during December 1866. The two local policemen, P.C.s Ball and Harrington, approached him, and found 6 fowls in his pocket. The area seems therefore to conform to the findings of Rude in other counties: But the great majority of offences seem to have been committed by people who were not full-time criminals, who worked at jobs normally, but also stole articles on some occasions, or became involved in a fight or a robbery.

Police constables did not have an easy time. The strength of the force revealed in the County Constabulary Report of 1865 was 98, i.e. one constable to 1,728 population or 5,206 acres. Steedman writes of the developing role of the police, from that of paid servants of the rate-paying class to, as 1880 approached, 'agencies of central government without any medestation by magistrate or watch committee'. Policemen were recruited mainly from the
countryside, even to serve in towns; the qualities of the labourer - stamina and deference - were those needed in a village policeman. Of the police constables who appear in censuses as resident in Long Clawson, only Charles Hamnersley (1861) was born outside the county, in Warwickshire. John Horne (1851) was born in Leicester, Joseph Collyer (1871) in Shepshed, and William Carr (1881) in Syston. All four however had Leicestershire born wives (two from Hinkley, one from Woodhouse and one from Nether Broughton), and three of them had children, of which none was aged more than two. It appears that they had all probably joined the force as bachelors, and settled into the local community with their young families. So it seems that, despite the cultivated isolation of the policeman in village society - he was deliberately not allowed to settle for too long in any one village in case familiarity undermined his authority - he must have shared in much of the life of the village. Steedman describes the training and personal restrictions which were increasingly used during the period to strengthen the image of the policeman's role. However, his real authority depended upon the support of the magistrate, to sign summonses and through adjudications in the courts.

Tackling a group of suspects alone could lead to serious difficulties, as P.C. Horne found in 1850, when he was severely thrashed by six men near Stathern Mill. The original press report described the dreadful beating he had been given by 'six ruffians, all disguised ... [who] have implicated one another in such a manner that, should the policeman die, the right parties are in custody'. However, when the case came up for trial some months later, not only had the policeman fully recovered, but the defendants - 'all excellent character references' - were acquitted. The constable was said to have approached them on the road when they were 'a bit drunk maybe'. Experience perhaps taught the wisdom of calling in a colleague when trouble threatened. In 1865 F.C. John Taylor had the assistance of P.C. Briggs of Stathern when
he arrested octogenarian John Adcock at Harby, and the old man was charged with assaulting both of them. 34.

Much of the violence in the villages was caused by drink, and the charges of drunkenness were frequent. Publicans were from time to time charged with permitting drunkenness on their premises, or for selling beer outside licensed hours. Charles Harvey, a publican at Nether Broughton, was warned by the magistrates in 1870 that his licence would be withdrawn if he repeated the offence of opening after hours, and in 1878 Enoch Jackson at Long Clawson had his licence endorsed following an incident in which three labourers were charged with drunkenness. 35.

Restriction of opening on Sundays seems to have been particularly difficult to achieve; a Harby publican was fined as much as £5 plus costs in 1857 for opening his premises outside the permitted hours. 36. Magistrates warned in 1862 that cases of drunkenness arising from disregard of the permitted hours would be severely dealt with, but the cases continued to arise. 37.

Harrison suggests that nineteenth century disgust at the uncivilised behaviour of drunkenness betrays a fear of the fragility of the social order. 38. There had been few safe alternatives to intoxicating drinks available early in the century; only as tea became cheaper (for which water is boiled) did it offer a popular alternative. As class behaviour diverged, the middle class forsook the public house, leaving it to the occupation of the working class, for whom it provided warmth, light, comfort and companionship, things which they could not find in their homes. In a village, the pub. was usually the only public building, so was used for meetings and entertainments, business or even as court or prison. 39. The middle class tended to see drunkenness as a cause of working class poverty rather than as a result of it; it was not possible to be a drinker and respectable, so an abstainers' movement grew up which tried to educate the working class away from drink by sermons, meetings and pamphlets, discrediting the virtues which alcohol was supposed to have as a medicine or good rcurishment. Although progress
was slow, some headway was made as the century progressed; the activities which might take place in the public house were limited, sales to children prohibited, and opening hours restricted - on Sundays from 1855, and during the week from 1864. At the same time other forms of entertainment gradually became available, and by the last decades of the century there was a tendency for the working class to aspire to the standards of respectability set by the middle class. Evangelical Christianity was of course a factor in the effort to control drinking habits, both Anglican and nonconformist clergy becoming involved in the campaign. While teetotalism was not at this stage a platform of Wesleyan Methodists, they naturally disapproved of any immoderation, while the spread of Primitive Methodism in the Vale of Belvoir in the 1860s ensured that the teetotal message was heard. A Teetotal Festival was held in Long Clawson in August 1877, and the school children were given a half-holiday to attend; by 1880 nearly all the children in the village were said to belong to the Band of Hope.

By the time of the Episcopal Visitation of 1882 the clergy seemed to feel that intemperance was decreasing, but most of them claimed that there had never been much of it in the villages. Once again we are reminded that those items which reach the newspapers assume an exaggerated importance. The public houses provided one of the few opportunities for recreation, and it is not really surprising if there was the occasional over-indulgence. The problem was not an exclusively working class one; most of those charged with drunkenness were labourers, but farmers were not immune. George Doubleday of Long Clawson appeared before the magistrates six times between December 1872 and March 1879 on charges of drunkenness, each time paying a fine and costs. Another Long Clawson farmer, John Hoyles, was fined for being drunk in charge of a horse in February 1876, and John Hopkins, grazier and cattle jobber of Nether Broughton, was killed when he was thrown from a horse which he had borrowed
to ride home from Melton Cattle Fair in 1869, being 'very much the worse for liquor'.

Traffic offences formed a smaller element of the court's business than they do today, but were nevertheless a recurring one. Samuel Starbuck, the Harby carrier, was for example fined £5 in 1866 for driving at a pace for which he had not obtained a licence. In 1861 a visiting Nottingham lace manufacturer, Jonathon Burton, was charged with driving a carriage furiously on Hose Town Street, thereby endangering the lives and limbs of passengers. More typical however were charges of riding without reins, or of riding on the shafts of the cart; farmer Joseph Pickard was fined for committing both these offences in Long Clawson in 1873. The danger of driving in such a casual fashion was clear; Freeman Tinsley, a waggoner on William Shilcock's farm at Hose Grange, rode on the shafts of his cart with some children sitting on the load of hay, and a little boy on the leading horse. A passing vehicle frightened the horses, and Tinsley, unable to control them, fell under the wheel and broke his leg. Several of the children were thrown from the cart, while the lad on the horse managed to keep his seat for some while, but at last was thrown, cutting his head badly. He was unconscious for some time, and thought to be dead, but gradually recovered.

Another accident caused by insufficient care in driving was that which killed Edward Ison in 1856. He was about to be married, and was returning to Long Clawson from Melton with a cart full of furniture; he had been drinking, and rode on the horse's back instead of on the driving seat of the cart, when going down Potter's Hill towards AbKettleby the horse suddenly bolted and he was thrown and run over by the cart. He managed to get himself to the Sugar Loaf public house, and Dr. Swain was fetched from Clawson, but he could not be saved.

There were occasional disputes over the sale of horses, usually alleging that a horse sold as quiet was in fact unmanageable. In one such case in the County Court in 1866,
Mr. G. Bagley, baker of Harby, had sold a horse, said to be sound and quiet, to the vicar of Plungar, Rev. W.S.Shipley, whose grooms found that it kicked when attempts were made to wash its feet. Mr. Bagley replied that a cut on the fetlock was causing the problem, aggravated by the ignorance of horse-management of those employed by the plaintiff. It was considered that there was insufficient evidence of the claims made at the time of sale, and the case was dismissed. Dr. Swain of Long Clawson had been more successful in an action he brought in 1861, being awarded £16.1.10, the sum he had lost on re-selling a horse bought of Count Bathyang's groom; he had however been able to produce a warranty given at the time of sale. 49.

Efforts were made to protect the public against retailers using false weights, and the petty sessions notes make it clear that an inspector toured the villages at intervals. One day in May 1860 for example, George Hives and John Mantle, bakers, and William Marriott, coal dealer, all of Hose, and John Haywood, coal dealer of Harby, were all fined for the use of incorrect weights, as were others from Eastwell, Waltham, Stonesby and Sewstern. Most of the fines were of 5s. or 10s., plus 9s.6d. costs, but John Haywood, unless it is a misprint, was fined £5. 50.

In the 1861 census Haywood describes himself as coal merchant and farmer of 407 acres, so it may be that the fine was set in relation to his landholding.

Also in the area of public protection were efforts to ensure that foodstuffs were not adulterated. Attention had been drawn to a severe problem in an article in The Lancet in 1855; although a permissive Act of 1860 proved ineffective, further legislation in 1872 and 1875 not only made the sale of adulterated comestibles an offence, but defined what constituted adulteration. 51. The appointment of local Inspectors of Nuisances to detect breaches of the law remained permissive, but was gradually adopted through the 1880s. 52. Superintendent Goodman of the County Police force brought charges at the Petty Sessions in December 1880 against Nether Broughton grocer,
John Skinner; he had paid 6d. for six ounces of mustard, which was weighed out from a tin labelled 'Colman's mustard'. When analysed by the county analyst it was found to be composed of 65 per cent mustard, 5 per cent turmeric and 30 per cent wheat flour. The defendant claimed that it was as he had bought it, and that it was sold as a condiment, not as an unblended substance, and the case was dismissed. 53.

The problem which the police faced in dealing with poaching by railway navvies has been mentioned in another chapter (Chapter 7, p. 223). However, the problem neither began nor ended with the building of the railway, nor was it confined to the occasional rabbit. In April 1853 a sheep was reported stolen from Mr. Shilcock's field at Hose. 54. Three years later, when another was stolen at Holwell, the police went immediately to the home of George Bilson, 'a known poacher', and found his wife washing blood-stained clothing, with 'an unexplained shoulder of mutton' in the house, and another in the nearby pond. 55.

Most poachers from the seven villages however were charged with 'trespassing in search of conies', and the charges were usually brought by John Poyzer or another of the Duke of Rutland's gamekeepers. While gamekeepers patrolled the fields and woods, police powers to search suspected poachers were restricted to the highway (Night Poaching Prevention Act, 1862, 25 and 26 Vict. c.114); Steedman comments on the way in which the policeman kept to the road, both because of the 1862 Act, and in order to be able to walk fast enough to cover the area. 56.

Despite this restriction however, Horn points out the resentment amongst country people of this facet of the policeman's role, - 'they were condemned as mere lackeys of the preservers'. She cites Joseph Arch, who, far from seeing the Act as a limitation of police powers, saw it operating to set them free. 57.

...to spring out on the labourer, from the hedge, or the ditch, or the copse, or the field.
It seems to have been normal to poach in a village other than one's own - Justice Ecob of Goadby Marwood was caught at Stathern, for example, and Edward Greenwood of Harby at Eastwell. Nevertheless, apart from the period of the occupation of the railway navvies, cases of poaching were only occasionally before the court, and there is no-one in the seven villages who can be identified as a persistent poacher. If poaching is to be regarded as a 'protest crime' against the domination of the landed classes, then there is little sign of inveterate protest in the Vale of Belvoir.

There were two cases of murder in the area during the period, and no doubt the villagers relished the scandal created. In December 1863 John Hutchins was committed for trial on suspicion of having poisoned his wife at Waltham, but he was later acquitted by the County Court for lack of evidence. In May 1872, at his house on the road between Plungar and Harby, -

James Wright, an old and infirm man, about 80 years of age, shot his son-in-law, Francis Welbourn, killing him dead on the spot. ... the deceased was about 48 years of age, and unfortunately, appears to have been addicted to drink, and when in a state of intoxication, he was generally rather excited. They lived on no very good terms, it being said that Wright was a miser, and afraid that Welbourn was squandering his property. ... There was no immediate quarrel, but on a Sunday morning when Welbourn finished his breakfast, he stepped outside the house door, when Wright came behind him and shot him in the head from within 12 inches.

The death sentence was passed, but with a recommendation for mercy, and as far as I can discover, was never carried out.

The number of prosecutions involving residents of the villages suggests that the presence of the law was quite noticeable. This was not a totally placid, quiescent community. Nevertheless, most of the cases were only in the petty sessions, and involved minor offences - personal and employment disputes, drunkenness, the occasional small
theft. The law played its part in protecting the public against sharp practice or the dangers of traffic. Of the more aggressive crimes, like murder, rape or arson, there is little evidence, even poachers being rarely caught. There is therefore nothing to suggest a rebellious and discontented community or one in which the major landlord, the Duke of Rutland, or his tenants, aroused violent resentment which found expression in crimes of violence.

PUBLIC HEALTH AND ACCIDENTAL DEATH.

The stories of death, accident and disaster which the Leicester Chronicle recounts reveal something of the uncertainties of village life, and the extent to which such threats were outside control. Illness was dangerous; the reports in the school log books of epidemics of measles, whooping cough or 'fever' show the lack of understanding of the most elementary principle of infection. Dr. Swain for example told the children at Long Clawson in 1879 that those with 'hooping cough' need only stay away from school 'in very bad cases'.61. That such diseases were contagious was self-evident; Harby parents were reported in 1876 as 'afraid to send their children to school lest they should fall victims' to scarlet fever.62.

Two years before that, when children returned to Long Clawson school after a summer break extended to eight weeks because of an outbreak of scarlet fever, Dr Swain sent infected children home again. A week later some of them came back to school, the rector 'having been to the parents and said they were to do so'. Dr Swain compromised, and said they might come if their houses had been disinfected.63.

An outbreak of smallpox in the Melton area in 1861 brought calls in the press for the provision of a fever hospital, as it was recognised that overcrowded housing would 'breed and propagate and perpetuate a disease which of late has sadly increased, and that in no mitigated form'. The Board of Guardians denied that it was their responsibility, and discussions continued on the new drainage scheme for Melton Mowbray.64. In 1866 a common lodging house keeper at Harby, John Dickman, was fined
£2.10.0 for failing to report an outbreak of smallpox in his house. (On the same day he was fined another £2.10.0 for allowing opposite sexes to occupy the same sleeping apartments). In 1872, announcing another outbreak of the disease, the *Leicester Chronicle* described a new method of controlling its spread introduced from New York, in the use of burning sulphur to fumigate a room.

Another disease which appeared from time to time was hydrophobia. Mr. Shilcock of Hose Grange destroyed all his greyhounds in 1852, after one of them had gone mad, biting several other dogs and the hand of a groom; it was hoped that the skill of Mr. Marriott, surgeon of Colston Bassett, would save the man. Another scare in the summer of 1855 brought a regulation that all dogs were to be kept tied up, on pain of a £5 fine. The *Leicester Chronicle* took the opportunity to publish a 'remedy' for hydrophobia:-

Dissolve a pound of common salt in a quart of spring water, and wash and squeeze the bitten part immediately after the infliction of the wound for an hour, and then bind some salt on it for 12 hours. ... The person bitten should be kept as quiet as possible before the ablution, that exertion may not promote the absorption of the virus.

However, a navvy bitten by a dog near Twyford died raving mad in 1878.

If medicine had its limitations, there was doubtless some recourse to folk medicine and even, perhaps, magic. However, this did not generally reach the press, and I have found only one incident reported in the area. It concerned a man named Matthews, of Waltham, who was fined 13s. in 1851 for using a 'charm' on a Scalford woman to cure jaundice. 'She declared doctors had done no good, while this man had completely cured the complaint in a very few days'. From time to time a death was reported which it seems could have been prevented if diagnosis had been more skilful; for example, the young wife of Long Clawson grazier John Hallam complained of back ache following a confinement, but was allowed to return to normal life, only to be found dead. The cause of death was given as 'heart disease'. 
Accidental deaths were fully described in the newspapers. While less dangerous than cars, horses had dangers of their own. For example, a horse which 13 year old William Wrath was riding at Hose Lodge slipped into a ditch, and the lad was found lying dead underneath it two hours later. Mr. Morley of Chadwell got his feet tangled in the halter of a young horse he was breaking in, and was dragged behind the horse as it charged down two gates and crossed a field. Slow moving carts must often have tempted children to steal a ride; five year old John Norris was killed at Harby when he slipped from a pole underneath a dray driven by John Starbuck, and the wheel went over his head.

Several children from the seven villages were drowned during the period. Sarah Simons was only two years old when she fell into the pit used for washing horses at the Royal Oak Inn at Long Clawson, and although she was only in the water for a few minutes, she was dead before another little girl, Sarah Barnard, got her out. At Harby lock on the Grantham Canal, children would play on the swing bridge, trying to jump onto it from the side, and in 1866 nine year old Jane Coy fell and was drowned. Another death in the canal was that of John Hollingworth, a 36 year old farm servant. He worked for his cousin John Whittle, but 'had been dull and low spirited since last summer'. Village life, even with security of employment, provided no protection against depression.

Then as now, the most saddening deaths are those of children in their own homes, accidents which should have been avoidable. For example, a Nether Broughton brickmaker, Mr. Hall, rubbed the feet of his two year old daughter Ann with benzoline as a cure for chilblains, while another child held a small lamp so that he could see. The naked flame came too close to the father's hands, and set light to the oil, and in a panic, the child dropped the lamp. Little Ann was so badly burnt that she died eight days later. In Long Clawson Frederick Miller, aged four years, went to put the kettle
on the fire, caught light to his clothes, and was so badly burnt that he died next day. The inquest was told that his mother had gone out charring, leaving four children at home alone, the eldest six years old. 79.

The Leicester Chronicle commented:

These constantly recurring instances of deaths of children by fire really ought to urge people to procure fireguards, so as to preserve children from such sad calamities.

The wisdom and necessity of leaving such small children unattended caused no comment whatever.

The threat of fire to property was ever present. Amongst other fires in the seven villages were those at Mr. Coleman's farm in Long Clawson, in which a hay stack and other property, worth £32, was destroyed in 1850, and at Mrs. Hourd's farm at Hose. In this four stacks of straw and one of beans were destroyed, as well as two hovels, before the fire spread beyond the stackyard and gutted two labourers' cottages on the adjoining property. It was said to have been started by a boy playing with a lucifer match. 80. Fortunately Mrs. Hourd was insured with the County Fire Office, and the firemen 'exerted themselves in a most praiseworthy manner'. The Leicester Chronicle drew attention to the services offered by the Melton Mowbray fire brigade in 1861: 81.

The town wardens have, during the past year, augmented their stock of buckets, and caused the working gear to be put in an efficient state of repair. These engines are available for the district as well as the town of Melton, and any parish subscribing the small sum of 10s. per annum is entitled to the use of two engines; whilst non-subscribers have to pay the sum of £5 in the event of their being required. Surely, all the parishes in the immediate neighbourhood will avail themselves of such an advantage, and private gentlemen will be willing to contribute so small a sum for the local good.

Yet again it is the generosity and benevolence of the landowners and gentry which is invoked, with no suggestion that a collective responsibility might be assumed.
Although arson was not a crime which came often before the courts, some cases did occur. William Cross, a labourer from Long Clawson, was charged with setting fire to a plantation belonging to Thomas Hallam in 1863, but discharged for want of evidence.\textsuperscript{82}. Also from Long Clawson, Bradley King was accused of setting fire to a stack of straw and one of beans, causing £46 worth of damage to the property of farmer John Stokes in 1865, and the case was referred to the Quarter Sessions.\textsuperscript{83} These are the only two cases in the seven villages which suggest malicious intent. Another charge of arson was brought against John Key; he had lived in Harby with his aunt, Mary Musson, for many years. She treated him as an invalid, believing him to be insane. He would often get up in the middle of the night and make a fire. In July 1862 he told Richard Dunsmore that he had set fire to a hay stack and a straw stack when £7 worth of damage was done. While he was found not guilty on grounds of insanity, the court required that he should be confined during Her Majesty's pleasure, 'during which time he would have the advice of the best medical authorities, and be returned to his friends when it might be safe to do so'.\textsuperscript{84}

One other, slightly more sinister, case of arson occurred in Long Clawson in 1850, when a girl called Ann Hardy gave evidence that she had been sent off from Thomas Hickling's farm yard, and looking back when she reached her father's house 150 yards away, she saw a fire. Hickling was arrested, having insured his property at the Globe fire office only days before.\textsuperscript{85}

From this selection of examples it can be seen that the villages had their share of tragedies. There were accidental deaths, some avoidable, others not; with naked lights and open hearths fire was a particular danger. The Melton fire brigade, be it as efficient as it might, could hardly be expected to provide prompt attention to a fire at Harby or Long Clawson. When illness struck, Dr Swain and his colleagues did what they could, but that was often very little. John Wilson writes with great affection of Dr. Swain, who lived to be 100 years old.\textsuperscript{86}
He was well qualified, an M.R.C.S., and had the great advantage of long residence in the village. As Loudon explains:

... great weight seems to have been given to a family doctor who was familiar, friendly, and able to deal with all except a few rare medical occasions. In addition, the all-purpose general practitioner should not be too young. He was, in fact, allowed to be old or even ancient provided he was the familiar figure who attended successive generations of the families in his area.

He had a set round of the villages, charging ls. 6d. for a visit, including medicine, for those who could afford it, or a payment in kind or work for those who could not. He was kind and generous, giving the school children at Long Clawson a bun and an orange at Easter, but for all his kindness he could not guarantee a long life for his patients. One headstone in Nether Broughton churchyard records the deaths of six of the children of Elizabeth Milnes between 1858 and 1867, the youngest at one month and the most long-lived not surviving past 21. Even without a consideration of those problems of poverty, of poor housing, and of under-employment, problems which we can be sure existed although there is no direct evidence to present for the Vale of Belvoir, it is clear that life was not without hardship. Town life then as now was considered far more unhealthy and dangerous than country life, but that does not mean that life in the villages was anything but very hard and, often, very short.

While so much of the organisation of village life depended upon the good offices of the wealthier classes there was no possibility of collective action to provide protection against even the preventable dangers like fire and epidemic. Where the law made provision, the magistrates could only punish after the damage had been done. But in the field of public health by far the greatest enemy was ignorance; the best qualified doctors were only entering upon the expansion of medical knowledge which was then beginning, and village medicine was to remain rudimentary for several generations to come.
LEISURE.

Let us finish on a happier note. There were recreations and high lights in village life, in addition to the comforts of the public house, and the newspapers and school log books give us a few glimpses of those happier moments. The thesis put forward by Malcolmson is that, between 1700 and 1850, the new requirements of regularity and sobriety in the industrial society, coupled with a move led by the Evangelicals towards greater restraint in personal behaviour, had quashed traditional recreations. 89. He describes these as being essentially rural, impossible to maintain in the larger, urban environment. 90.

[They] arose directly out of the fabric of common interests and common sentiments among the working people themselves. The fundamental social basis for several of the calendar festivals was the relatively small, tightly knit rural community.

Many such recreations, he suggests, were shared by all classes, or at least, depended upon the consent and co-operation of the gentry for their survival; the harvest feast was provided by the employer, while racing or prize fighting, even mumming, morris dancing or wassailing relied upon the gentry's financial support.

By the early nineteenth century however, Malcolmson sees 'a solid barrier ... between the culture of gentility and the culture of the people'. 91.

Bailey carries forward the argument into the later nineteenth century (1830 - 1880), seeing the chief influence at that stage as the middle-class urge for respectability; their wish to preserve the now well established social distance between themselves and the working class led the middle class to intervene by providing 'improving' recreation for the workers. 92.

The recommended corrective was that of rational recreation, both to continue the political and educational improvement of the class and, through public good manners, to oblige the other classes to respect the working man. ... Play was not to be allowed any form of special licence; rather it had to be firmly and unequivocally integrated
with the rest of life and securely anchored in orthodox morality.

Howitt expresses the contemporary view: 93.

Happiness ... does not consist in booths and garlands, drums and horns, or in capering round a May-pole. Happiness is a fireside thing. It is a thing of grave and earnest tone. ... And the more our humble classes come to taste of the pleasures of books and intellect, and the deep fireside affections which grow out of the growth of heart and mind, the less charms will the outward forms of rejoicing have for them ... for, seen at hand, there is a vulgarity in most popular customs that offends invariably our present tastes.

The outstanding local example of this wish to transform the working man's leisure is the attempt in 1877 to provide a temperance club for railway navvies in Melton Mowbray. (see page 224). 94. The earnest intent of many village festivities in our period is typified in the social activity which centered on the nonconformist churches, described in the previous chapter; perhaps one more example may be allowed: 95.

HOSE.- This sprightly little place let out its mettle in topping style, on Christmas day, when a tea meeting and concert took place in the Baptist chapel, and attracted about 350 persons from the village and neighbourhood. Several first class pieces of sacred music were given in a very superior manner, and the whole affair reflected high credit on all concerned in catering so well both for mind and body.

The predominantly middle-class and nonconformist concern for the morality of the labourers' leisure pursuits was felt probably more acutely in the countryside than in towns. The country fair, the statutes, the village feast, were all occasions for eating and drinking, a rare opportunity for the sexes to mingle in surroundings other than those of work. The alarm expressed at the rowdiness of Melton Statutes has been described in an earlier chapter, and the substitution of employment offices for their function as hiring fairs. (Chapter 6, p.198) When a Royal Commission visited Melton Mowbray in 1888, it was told
that, although the town estate had bought the rights of the general market from Lord Melville's trustees in 1855, the market now seemed to be decaying, under the disapprobation of the (middle class) shopkeepers and householders of the town. While the village feast survived, it became a tea party with games. The harvest festival became a religious function, rather than a convivial meeting of master and men. The new concern for sobriety was typified in the magistrates' response to an application for a spirits licence for the August bank holiday North Leicestershire Show in 1879. They insisted that the high light of the show, known as 'pig hunting' should be moderated. By custom, men tried to walk along a greasy pole over a pool, which, if they managed it, released a pig into the pool to be scrambled for. This time, a leg of mutton or 'some other suitable substitute' was to replace the pig. Most of the fun, and much of the value of the prize, was in this way sacrificed to the concern of the middle class. Newby writes of:

... attempts by the local establishment to construct an idyllic representation of village life in which relations between the classes consisted of benevolent paternalism and grateful deference. ... What mattered was that the vulgar and even riotous elements of traditional customs were replaced by an appropriate respect for person and property which did not interfere with the important business of commercial farming.

An earlier chapter has shown the struggles of schoolmasters to dissuade parents and children from taking holidays to attend every village feast within reach; the school log books quoted contain mention of the feasts at Barkstone and Granby, as well as amongst their own villages, and of Grantham Fair and even Nottingham Goose Fair as drawing children away from school. While they met with some success, it was not complete by 1881, for in October of that year attendance at Cropwell Bishop school, for example, was reported as 'a little lower' because of the Goose Fair.
Some efforts were made to provide other, more salutory, entertainment for the children, such as the magic lantern show, lasting nearly two hours, which the Rector of Redmile provided in January 1878. However, the Sunday school treats and anniversary celebrations described in the previous chapter were typical of the high moral tone which such entertainments provided, and their aim of course was not purely to entertain; the *Leicester Chronicle* noted in 1857 the reluctance of children who attended day school to attend Sunday school as well, and referred to such a treat held at Melton Mowbray as an example of the inducements offered. The celebration of Plough Monday, when boys dressed up and collected pennies, had virtually ceased by the end of the period; the Rector at Redmile provided one penny to every boy who attended the village school in both morning and afternoon of that day in 1878, ensuring a better attendance than the 18 who had remained in school the previous year. The *Leicester Chronicle* recorded of Melton Mowbray in 1881:

> Plough Monday passed off without any evidence of the occasion except a boy or two with a black face seen here and there. This was the occasion of considerable demonstration years ago.

Other attractions which kept children away from school were weddings, or the sale of property following a death; ice on the canal brought the opportunity to skate, and in January 1879 the lanes were so icy that the police put up notices warning children and their elders that 'any person found sliding on the roads or footpaths will be prosecuted'. Some villages, like Redmile and Waltham, organised children's Drum and Fife bands, and the railway enabled them to travel to take part in competitions. Golby and Purdue draw attention to the important role of village bands in developing local spirit; it became a widespread enthusiasm, with an estimated 40,000 brass bands in existence around the country in 1887.

Organised sport, while intended mainly for adult participation, attracted the children as a spectacle;
cricket, horse racing and hunting were important social events, attracting all ages and classes. In the early years of the period even cricket, it seems, could give rise to unruly behaviour, as in 1851 four men from Old Dalby were fined 12s. each after celebrating winning a cricket match at the Crown Inn, and then provoking a fight in which a man's leg was broken. 106. During the 1860s Harby school log mentions several matches between boys from the villages, for example between Hose and Stathern boys, or Harby and Waltham. Adult matches between the villages were also played; at a game in August 1864 between a combined Waltham and Goadby Marwood eleven and one from Asfordby and Kettleby, 'the brilliant innings of E. A. Gillett Esq. (41, not out) was much admired'. 107. The idealisation of cricket as a multi-class pursuit appealed to the middle class; Howitt described it as:- 108.

... the noble ... the true English game of cricket, which shows whither the mind of the people is tending, and what will be the future character of English popular sports.

It combined the civilising influence of a decorous pursuit with the certainty of each man knowing his place:- 109.

... the truly English republican element of a mixture of classes with the right man in the right place, is nowhere better exemplified than in the cricket field.

As well as Mr. Gillett, the Waltham side included two members of the Norman family. Other players identifiable from the Goadby Marwood census of 1861 were carpenter Joel Brutnell, farmer Thomas Rowbottom and tailor Matthew Chamberlin. The side also included W. Allen, T. Allen, J. Jullian, W. Welborn, and W. Musson. It is possible that J. Jullian was the agricultural labourer of that name from Chadwell, which would make the social spread of the team very wide indeed.

Some entertainments were reserved for the gentry. The weekend parties held at Belvoir Castle for example sometimes included Mr. and Mrs. George Norman amongst the guests, or Rev. Miles of Bingham, but humbler residents of the villages were never mentioned in press accounts.
A concert at Goadby Hall in 1863 was certainly by invitation only, although with an audience of 150 it seems likely that it included farmers' families as well as visiting gentry. The entertainment, consisting of 'glees ... admirably rendered by Mrs. G. and the Misses Norman' seems to be intended for a middle-class audience.  

Croxton Park Races, held in early spring, were an important occasion. In 1851, for example, the second day of the meeting began early at 10 a.m., as the principal stewards and gentlemen were to attend a dinner party at Lord Stanley's in the evening, and needed to catch the special train laid on to leave Melton at 3.30 p.m. Aristocratic interest however did not ensure efficient organisation of the event, as one year later the *Stamford Mercury* reprinted an item from *Bell's Life* which complained not only of the inaccessibility of the meeting, but also that:

> The management too ... is invariably distinguished by an utter disregard of method, energy, and punctuality; and the course is so formed, and the stands are so ingeniously contrived, that only a very small portion of the racing is visible to the spectators. We see no prospect of a change for the better, and cannot wonder that every year shows a decline in the character of the sport, or that the prestige of the club is passing away.

Nevertheless, the races continued to provide a high light in the villagers' year; in 1876 schoolmaster Jonathan Oliffe recorded at Harby:  

> Only about 20 children presented themselves at school on Wednesday morning the majority absented themselves for the purpose of witnessing the carriages and traps going through the village on the way to Croxton Races and as this is a great day and holiday with the Harby folks the school was closed for the day.

George Milner at Redmile refused to give a holiday, and wrote in disapproval of the excitement which sent children 'roaming and running in the lanes more like wild animals than ordinary human beings'. Even if the excitement
for the children consisted largely in seeing the quality folk drive by, the races were intended to cater for all elements in society. Amongst the races was the Farmers' Plate, which offered a prize of £40 to the winning farmer.\textsuperscript{115} The enumerator of the 1871 census for Long Clawson drew attention to the presence of four men and two women visiting the village for Croxton Park Races and Melton Steeplechase; they were the guests of William Coleman. Some of them came from Yorkshire, and the two whose occupations are given were a farmer and his wife.

In the Melton Mowbray area the other sport which was claimed to give pleasure to all classes was fox hunting. Other than the village feasts, it is the most often mentioned cause of absence from school in the log books, as children lingered to watch the meet or ran over the fields behind it. During the season the daily meets were listed in the press, and sportsmen often had a choice. The Duke of Rutland's hounds were the most likely to be seen in the area of the seven villages, and sometimes met in one or other of them. Accidents in the field to notable riders were recorded in the press, and their progress towards recovery followed. In 1850 the Marquis of Granby with the Belvoir hunt was in pursuit of a fox near Melton Mowbray when it crossed the river - \textsuperscript{116}.

\ldots and the noble marquis charged it at full speed where it was impossible for any horse to leap over, and it was with considerable difficulty the horse and rider were extricated.

In 1873 the Prince of Wales rode with the hounds from Belvoir Castle, setting out from Croxton Park with a field estimated at between 400 and 500 people. The first fox raised ran to Goadby Marwood, but was lost there; the second, raised at Waltham, was killed at Edmondsthorpe.\textsuperscript{117}

While the influx of sportsmen brought an annual period of prosperity to Melton, it is to be doubted whether villagers gained very much from the presence of the hunt other than the occasional excitement of seeing them pass. Farmers must have suffered some damage, but little evidence survives of their opposition if it existed; many
of them must themselves have been huntsmen. F. M. L. Thompson writes of hunting farmers being drawn into 'one close bond of society' with the gentlemen. Itzkowitz comments on 'the possibility of close social contact based on the acceptance of inequality' which the hunt offered. One incident was reported however which suggests that not everyone welcomed the hunt. Meeting at Croxton Park, the Duke of Rutland's hounds followed a fox through several villages to Buckminster. Here they lost the scent, and shortly afterwards a shot was heard.

It seems that Marshall was on his land with a double-barrelled gun, and that when the fox passed near him after the dogs had lost the scent he deliberately fired, and having shot it dragged it to a hovel adjoining. Mr. John Welby, of Allington, who was one of the first to come up to Marshall after this wanton act demanded to know the cause of the same, saying that if he had ever received any damage to his crops or land from the chase, he had only to send in his claim, and compensation would be promptly made by the gentlemen of the hunt. Marshall, in reply, made use of the most insulting language, and, placing himself with his back to the door of the hovel, stood with his gun in hand threatening to shoot the first person who should attempt to obtain possession of the fox. ... The Duke of Rutland, calmly insisted on the fox being given up, and as Marshall still refused, he dismounted, handed his charger to one of his servants, and going coolly up to Marshall seized him by the collar and forcibly ejected him from his position against the door of the hovel. The fox was then taken and thrown to the dogs. The indignation and disgust felt by "the field" can be better imagined than described, and several of the farmers could hardly be restrained from immersing the "little freeholder" in an adjoining pond, or administering to him a summary castigation.

The rights of farmers were held by the hunt as of secondary importance to the sport; while compensation for damaged crops might be paid, damaged fences were not acknowledged as its responsibility, and neither was the damage to livestock caused by 'preserved' foxes, and while compensation funds
might exist, payments were not automatic. 121. Opposition to the hunt was not unique to farmers; Lord Harborough came into dispute with the Belvoir Hunt when he surrounded Stapleford Park with a dog-spear fence. 122. The increasing use of wire in hedges and fences in the 1860s, very dangerous to horses and riders, provoked the Duke of Rutland, supported by a large group of landowners, to issue a circular in 1863 calling on farmers to stop using it. In a reply in The Field, E. A. Paget, a farmer in Thorpe Satchville near Melton, explained the expense of fencing grazing farms, and suggested that if huntsmen wished 'to keep up the popularity of fox-hunting amongst the yeomanry of England, upon which ... its very existence depends', they should be prepared to help the farmer meet the costs of alternative fencing. 123. On the other hand, the strength of support for the sport is illustrated by the reaction to Mr. C. H. Frewen's threat to clear the area of foxes in the election campaign of 1868, when his appearances were greeted with men carrying fox-tails and masks. (See Appendix IX).

The popularity and fascination of the hunt, and the expertise with which it was followed, are illustrated by the regular reports which appeared in newspapers. An article which appeared under the name of Nimrod (the best known hunt journalist of the time), described a run with the Belvoir hounds in 1877, showing that hunting could be enjoyed in the imagination as well as on the ground. 124.

Saturday - a day in the Vale with the Duke's at Hose Grange - a favourite meet and a large turn-out. The little three-cornered spinney held no fox, and Gilliard had to go to the hills to find one. Finding at Clawson Thorns, the fox went away on a well-known line, crossing the deep bottom which stops so many; then, leaving Clawson to the right, he got to better ground as he ran pointing to Sherbrook Cover; but he missed his mark, and went beyond towards Hickling, as if meaning to try for Curate's Gorse; but strange to say, hounds ran well up to fence, suddenly threw up, and could make no more out.
The Duke of Rutland's hounds were greatly admired. The Melton Mowbray Times quoted an article from an un-named publication of 1867:

The Belvoir Hounds possessed as much excellence and as much intrinsic value as any pack can ever hope to obtain. This is amply testified by their extraordinary family likeness, their stamina in pursuit, their undaunted courage, and the thoroughbred sheen of their coats. Moreover, from the large extent of country they hunt over, thanks to the goodwill of landed proprietors and of farmers, as also for the vast acreage owned by the House of Manners, the hounds have always been kept up to concert pitch, as well in the cub-hunting as in the regular season.

The Sixth Duke maintained the hunt at his own expense for more than twenty years after succeeding to the title. However, the agricultural depression which so badly affected landowners after 1878 made such expense impossible even for the Duke of Rutland to continue, and obliged him to open the hunt to subscribers. Thus yet another aspect of country life became governed by economic considerations, and the role of the great landowners slipped a notch further from its former pre-eminence. Itzkowitz comments that, whereas 'In the hunting field, the old England of squires and tenants, of mutual dependence and deference lived on unchanged', with the depression of the late 1870s the entire deferential basis of hunting was brought into question, and it could no longer be revived, no matter what recovery agriculture might make ... The society whose values hunting had mirrored was changing irrevocably, and hunting people had no choice but to follow suit.

The three themes of this chapter are linked by the interface between 'ordinary' villagers and the middle class; villagers' experience of the law, of medicine, and, increasingly, of recreation, was coloured by their relationship with the middle and upper classes. From that experience two trends emerge. The first:- that change in the village was very slow. There was very little
difference in the type or range of cases heard by the petty sessions in 1881 from those in 1851; the increase in crime during the period of the railway building was temporary and essentially imported. There is no indication in the Vale of Belvoir of that social unrest expressed in violence which manifested itself in nearby Lincolnshire. As far as we can tell, neither the practice of medicine nor people's vulnerability to illness and accident changed at all during the period. Similarly the pattern of leisure pursuits changed very little, except that it was enlarged by the opportunities provided by improved transport, and with the reservation that local fetes were increasingly centered on the religious bodies. The rejection of rowdy and brutal amusements was a very long term process, of which our period saw only a small part. Essentially, village amusements remained rooted in the village society - 128.

... a robust and ritualistic popular culture rooted in the tightly knit, inward looking world of the country village, its calendar generously studded with festivals and holidays that derived their warranty and meaning from an intimate connection with the seasonal rhythms of the agricultural year and the working life of the community.

Bailey's precis of the style of recreation described by Malcolmson as already superceded before 1850, continues to have relevance to Vale of Belvoir villages in 1881. Whereas the pattern of leisure in towns had had to change, that in comparatively remote villages like these had retained much of its older character. Where the chapel tea party had taken over from the village feast, it remained a communal fete, open to all, part of a regular pattern of events.

The second trend is in the gradual assumption of leadership and hence of power by the middle class. As medicine became more professional, the prestige of the village doctor could only increase. The creation of the county police force, although at this time the police remained largely dependent for their powers upon the
landed magistracy, was a sign of the expanding powers of the 
bureaucracy. The demand for the establishment of the 
police force was itself very largely created by middle 
class concern for a more stable society, and it was that 
same concern which influenced pressures for more restrained 
leisure and encouraged a more conscientious attitude to 
ad hoc holidays. Drunkenness, whether in farmers or 
their workers, was strongly disapproved, and the new social 
gathering offered was the tea party or the lecture, 
organised we may be sure by middle-class leaders. At the 
same time, the sports which extended across class barriers - 
cricket, hunting, the races - only did so in clearly 
defined strata; because a farmer put on a hunting jacket 
he was not necessarily invited to the hunt breakfast; 
the Farmers' Plate at Croxton Races was in a separate class 
from the races for gentlemen's hunters. However, although 
the Duke of Rutland was able to keep his private pack 
longer than many, the Belvoir Hunt was soon to be open to 
subscriptions, and from then on anyone who could afford 
it was an acceptable member.

And so we see in these social aspects of village life 
the same pattern which has emerged in most of the other 
aspects here considered - a slowly, sometimes very slowly, 
emerging abandonment of the society of deference, and a 
new leadership by the middle class. At the same time, 
middle-class patterns of behaviour were being passed on 
to the working class. As Talvin argues, the widespread 
working-class acceptance of middle-class values was not 
merely a result of precept and example, but was encouraged 
by the slowly improving economic condition of the labourer 
as the century drew to a close; so that 129.

... people lower down the social scale [had] 
material items and styles of life they 
wished to protect. The 'respectable' 
working class, as much as the middle class, 
had much to gain from peaceable law-abiding 
behaviour; they were no less outraged by 
petty thefts or habitual drunkenness.
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Chapter 11 - CONCLUSION.

The theme of this study has been the interplay between change and tradition in village society. It has examined some areas of change which were imposed or initiated from outside the local community, and the ways in which the acceptance of such changes was tempered by the perceptions of village residents. The Vale of Belvoir, with which the study deals, is an area on which almost no detailed work has been published, and the range of manuscript and printed primary sources cited have not previously been used for such a study. The findings have emphasised the variety of local experience, showing that national trends cannot be assumed to have had equal impact on disparate communities; fluctuations in the national economy for example were regulated in their impact on diverse localities by local conditions and responses. While the national population continued to increase, village populations declined; this drift of population towards the towns, so often read as indicating a stagnation in agriculture and village life, is here shown to have been beneficial.

The study examines changes emanating from a variety of sources - legislation, economic pressure, social control and fashion. It explores developing communications with nearby towns, and the motivation behind migration. It emphasises the ways in which people and situations in a locality alter over time, producing complex differences in behaviour and living standards. At the same time, it reveals the strength of tradition, and the difficulty with which innovation was accepted. The close study of communities within the Vale of Belvoir provides an opportunity to observe the processes of change at work within the community, complementing the generalisations of more widely based commentaries. At the same time it avoids the sometimes distorting effects of a close comparison with the villages at a later period; the nineteenth century village community is allowed to
stand on its own, speaking wherever possible in its own words.

There can remain no doubt that processes of change were affecting the villages of the Vale of Belvoir during the third quarter of the nineteenth century. Enclosure at the end of the previous century, followed up by the Duke of Rutland's programme of extending pasture and tree planting had set the pattern for agriculture in the Leicestershire section of the Vale; this change may have been dictated by the failure of the area to produce the quality of grain harvest for which sections of it had been noted in the past. Whatever the motivation, the change was one which continued in the period which here concerns us, to the great advantage of landowner, tenant, and, ultimately, labourer, protecting them from the worst effects of the 'Great Depression' in agriculture in the 1870s and '80s.

Changes in the economic life of the nation directly affected the lives of villagers. The growth of towns offered a different, more lively, more prosperous environment to villagers whose lives at home were weighed down by poorly paid and seasonal employment, or by the subservience of life as a 'living-in' farm servant. At the same time the concentration of mechanised industry in the towns obliterated many of the cottage industries which had supplemented the labourer's wage, and absorbed a seemingly never-ending flow of workers migrating from the countryside. We have seen that the villages lost a high proportion of their young people as they reached adulthood. While migration in search of work had not been uncommon, the advent of the railways made it easier, and railways of course ran directly to the big towns.

Faster and easier transport extended possibilities for business and leisure. Milk and dairy produce could be delivered to urban markets at a greater distance, while heavy goods like fuel or building materials, or the ironstone quarried on the Belvoir estate, could more easily be transported. For those with a little money, visits to towns like Nottingham or even London became possible, opening new
horizons and extending people's ideas of what life could offer. As the major roads became a public responsibility, increased traffic on them made it ever more important that they should be adequately maintained. The complaints to the Melton Mowbray Highway Board in the 1870s possibly indicate that one of the reasons why the roads were in a bad state was that they were increasingly used: the legislation which forced the Highway Board to maintain the former turnpikes itself provided a change which must have been felt in the villages, by road users and rate payers alike. The carrier services which continued along those roads between Nottingham and Melton and the villages provided a ready contact with the goods and services which the town had to offer.

The legislation which sought to ensure that every child, including those in the smallest village, had an adequate education, was a change which was imposed upon the villagers, but which could only be beneficial to them. Those who grew up literate and numerate not only had more choices of occupation open to them, but were better able to weigh up the advantages of leaving the familiar environment to venture on something new. Those who remained in the village would do so by their own choice, not because they were doomed from birth to a life of swingeing toil on the land. The other great area of choice, that of the practice of religion, had had its great expansion in the fifty years or so preceding the period of this study, with the growth of nonconformity. The failure of the efforts of the churches both Anglican and nonconformist (except perhaps the Primitive Methodists) to attract a wider following in the later nineteenth century can perhaps be seen as a greater exercise of choice by the working man. The social pressure to conform at this period was high; much of the education offered in the village school was directed towards the instillation of religious precepts and social behaviour governed by the morality which they dictated. We have seen how the 'social conscience' of the middle classes influenced the leisure pursuits of the common people, modifying fairs
and feasts, replacing statutes with the bureaucracy of the employment office. We have seen something of middle-class morality at work in the courts, imposing sentences of hard labour for petty thefts, making the catching of a rabbit a crime. Yet at the same time that this perception of morality was restricting villagers' lives, the practice in self-organisation which the circuit system of the nonconformist churches gave, provided another way in which ancient bonds were loosened. The village middle class, farmers and craftsmen, shop-keepers and tradesmen, were encouraged to develop their tradition of independence. The village clergyman, in most of the villages the only representative of the wealthy classes, lost some of his prestige when measured against the circuit minister of the nonconformist denominations; farmers whose sons could become missionaries or ministers would have been less in awe of a sanctity achieved in great measure because the incumbent was a gentleman. At the same time, the perceived authority of the landlord began to be questioned; the reform of the franchise, of constituency boundaries, the moves towards the ballot, all overlap this period. They were in a sense more changes which were imposed; at least however the ideas of reform were available in the villages via the newspapers. The challenge to the political autonomy of the Duke of Rutland posed by the candidacy of Mr. Frewen in 1857, or the criticism of the award of a pension to Lord John Manners in 1880, were events which cannot have failed to raise comment in the villages of the Vale of Belvoir. G. E. Mingay draws attention to a growing sense in the last quarter of the nineteenth century that the leadership of the landowners was not infallible, a sense increased by the helplessness of landlords to do anything effective to combat the depression. 

The article cited forms an introduction to a series of essays on *The Victorian Countryside*; in almost every one of those which are relevant, there are noted trends which we have seen reflected in the villages of the Vale of Belvoir - migration, decreased isolation, faltering social deference, developments in agricultural methods, growing indifference - As Mingay puts it:
The Victorian countryside was thus very far from quiet, peaceful, unaltering ... If one word could be said to sum up the essence of the studies which follow, then it must be 'transformation'.

Yet despite the barrage of change which was directed at them, there is little sense that life in the villages had changed appreciably over the thirty years of the study. The generalisation by Hugh Smith, that Rural craftsmen departed and their mills and smithies were closed. Village life stagnated.

does not ring true of these villages. There was some loss of population from the peak of 1851 or 1861, yet all but the smallest villages in the area were substantially larger in 1901 than they had been a century earlier. Despite a loss of young population, the balance of age groups in the larger villages was not unduly disturbed; there was no long-term imbalance of the sexes produced, and the village community was not dispersed. While the smallest villages suffered the proportionately severest loss of population, they had probably always been quite different from the larger villages, and much less self-sufficient. Whether or not they were 'closed' villages, there was apparently little encouragement for them to grow, with few occupations other than agriculture and domestic service, little in the provision of shops or services, few agricultural craftsmen. None of this changed as the population dwindled. Fewer adults naturally produced fewer children. As agriculture required fewer hands, there was little inward migration. Yet the villages have survived; they are still small, they still lack most of the amenities of the larger villages, yet the residents are content to stay. The larger villages also continue to thrive; by 1881 none of the larger villages of the study group had fewer inhabited houses than there had been in 1851; in Nether Broughton and Harby there were new houses in construction in 1881. Long Clawson is the only one of the seven villages in which the proportion of the population defined as without apparent income was not smaller in 1881 than in 1851. There was no
village in the group studied in detail in which the proportion of population providing retail and consumer services declined sharply, nor those providing agricultural crafts. The loss of the textile occupations appears to have been a severe blow, yet the change may have been less acute than it appears from the census. The definition of out-work to be included by the enumerator may have changed; it is doubtful whether many of today's lace out-workers would declare it as a full-time occupation. John Wilson had clear memories of lace spotting (the embroidering of chenille spots on lace net) in Long Clawson, which must have continued therefore for some time after the apparent diminution of the craft according to the 1881 census. There are no records of unrest, no obvious increase in petty crime amongst the villagers. On the contrary, the reports of village festivities, mainly connected with the nonconformist churches, suggest communities which could co-operate in providing a pleasant occasion.

The thesis questions the generalisation that decline or development of a village sprang primarily from its status as 'open' or 'close', and demonstrates that, despite the dominance of the Duke of Rutland as major landowner, his estate was intermingled with numerous small holdings. It shows that, among the villagers, ownership of land did not guarantee prosperity, but that prosperity did provide the marks of status. In these early years of the depression, it was the farmers of large areas, owned or rented, who could afford to buy machinery or to experiment with cheese-making. Major landowners still held a great deal of power because of the standing which their land wealth still gave in social and administrative terms. Land ownership remained a qualification for the magistracy, or for membership of, for instance, the Highway Board. The continuing predominance of 'the landed interest' in Parliament enabled the gentry to block all moves to devolve the control of county government until 1888. Thompson draws attention to the ingrained reluctance of farmers to break the bonds of dependence, despite the changes in
the legal definition of the tenant-landlord relationship.7. Mills describes the influence of the major landowner as a restraint, the gentleman's park and the nonconformist chapel forming 'two opposite and opposing currents in Victorian life'.8. Beckett on the contrary praises the aristocratic contribution to the agricultural revolution, describing as 'vital' the promotional role of the great landlords in agricultural change, in providing investment in drainage and building, and in support for the county interest in Parliament.9.

The influence of the Duke of Rutland was supreme in the Vale of Belvoir; his policies, both in the development of pasture farming and in resisting the introduction of frame-knitting, were, perhaps by chance, those ultimately most beneficial to the inhabitants. When the railway line across the Vale was proposed, it was the Duke's support which bore most weight. His family provided incumbents in many of the most important parishes, and an occupant in Goadby Marwood Hall. His political influence, although perhaps questioned by the end of the period, remained unbroken. The thirty years following 1881 were to see changes which would diminish the real power of the Duke - political reform, the creation of County Councils, the drain on resources initiated by the agricultural depression. In the thirty years before 1881 those villagers who remained in the countryside still accepted the old habit of deference; their quarrels with that newcomer, the school-master, for example, were referred to the clergyman; the fine folk assembling at Belvoir Castle or Croxton Races, or arriving for the Hunt meet, brought a glimpse of a world outside their experience.

We have seen however that there are indications of a decline in deference towards the Duke of Rutland; the evidence we have is mainly confined to opinions which were circulated amongst what has to be called the middle class of the villages, and since Conservative Members of Parliament continued to be elected, we must assume that the readers of the Liberal Leicester Chronicle in which
these ideas found expression, were in the minority. However, a letter from Edward Bradbury appeared in the Labourer in July 1877, which attacked the Duke's monopoly of the land in the villages of Woolsthorpe and Branston, so criticism may have made itself heard throughout village society. The tendency to challenge upper-class authority is most clearly seen in the support given to the nonconformist churches; the clergyman's status as a gentleman was still respected, but that respect did not necessarily extend into attending Church of England services. Only in Goadby Marwood, where the family at the Hall was present to support the clergyman, was nonconformity slow to find a following. (The small size of such villages as Chadwell and Wycomb made it unlikely that an independent congregation could be formed). However, most of the nonconformist congregations in the area had originated before 1851, so the disregard for the authority of the parson was not new to our period. What was new was the spread, albeit limited, of the Primitive Methodist sect in the 1860s; this is one certain sign of independence amongst the labouring class - not just the inertia of not going to church, but an active attempt to achieve a new dignity.

In most of the villages of the Vale of Belvoir the great landowner was not part of everyday life; he was seldom seen, so perhaps failed to provide that reinforcement of the agent's authority which Beckett identifies as an important element in the preservation of tenants' loyalty. Nevertheless, when he was seen, the doffing of the hat was as natural to the large-scale tenant as to the humblest labourer. Despite the provocation of land reformers or unionists, there were few signs of rebelliousness in the Vale of Belvoir. So it was not the failure of deference which was the important aspect of change in village society, but the growing independence of the lower classes.

The most stable element of the village population was the middle class - not merely the professional group of
doctor, vet., and solicitor etc., but the farmers and some of the more successful tradesmen. The leadership of such men in the organisation of the nonconformist churches has been noted, and in other fields as well they assumed an important role as instigators of change. They were the rate payers who made decisions about the formation of a school board, or who sat on the school committee; it was they who elected, or perhaps served on, the Highway Committee. It was middle-class influence which brought about the suppression of statute fairs and the tendency for less roisterous public recreations.

Whether land owners or tenants, the management of their farms was left very largely in their discretion; while the Duke of Rutland could help his tenants with encouragement or financial aid, he seems to have reserved to himself few powers of decision making in the running of their farms, even in the increasingly difficult early years of the depression. While it was the Duke who, through rent remissions, bore the brunt of the slump, the whole area was dependent upon the farmers' response to changing circumstance to maintain the prosperity of the area. Farmers like William Coleman and the Shipman family, who were flexible to adopt new methods, were the same men who adapted to new relationships with their employees, or to newly imposed regulations when plague threatened. It was among such men that ideas circulated which challenged the expectations of deference towards the upper class, but who at the same time widened the social gap between themselves and their employees by the changes in life style to which they aspired. The role of the middle class was pivotal in the implementation of most of the changes affecting village life; only in those few areas outside their control, like the construction of the railway across the Belvoir estate and the consequent development of the iron-stone business, were they not instrumental.

Laslett suggests that, until recent times, it was the shared fear of poverty which provided the centre for a
sense of community in the countryside. The era of High Farming, which made successful farming dependent upon the investment of capital, completed that social separation of farmer from labourer which some see enclosure as having begun. However, the rise in the farmers' expectation of standard of living began to be echoed in the later nineteenth century by a rise in that of the labourers. The beneficial effect of migration, giving the labourer a choice of whether to go or stay, and reducing the supply of farm labour so that those who stayed behind were better paid, was the first step in a slow improvement in rural conditions. Just as the farmer aspired to a middle-class style of life, the labouring class was increasingly exposed to influences which suggested a less rough-and-ready way of life - cheaper and more varied food and clothes, the chance of travel, more likelihood of an adequate education, so that cheap newspapers could be read, perhaps experience of a middle-class home for a member of the household who had been in domestic service. In this way the external pressures created by the middle-class efforts to 'improve' the working class, were echoed by changes in the aspirations of working people. For example, the rowdyism of statute fairs was what concerned middle-class critics of the system, while the workers who had to offer themselves for hire at such fairs came to dislike the system as degrading. Similarly, the resentment which some parents felt at first at the compulsion to send their children regularly to school, seen as middle-class interference with the natural authority of the parent, was gradually overcome as the benefits of education became apparent, so that today the village school is highly valued as a focus of the local community. It would have been impossible to replace the boisterous traditional recreations with chapel based fetes, had the people themselves not acceded.

All these factors contributed to a slow reduction in the roughness of the labourers' life, so that, as the
middle class of farmers moved away from the labourers socially towards a more genteel life style, the tendency was to some extent echoed in the reduction in insecurity in the lives of agricultural labourers and the possibilities thereby created for a more 'respectable' life style. Because the rise in aspirations was shared, and often expressed by mutual allegiance to a nonconformist sect, the changes which were initiated through middle-class influence became acceptable; and as acceptable developments they were absorbed into the 'traditional' pattern of community life. Most importantly, the community remained intact, so that the sense of permanence was left undisturbed.

Thus we see an echo in the relationship between the village middle class and the labouring class, of that described by Beckett in the higher ranks of society. Beckett suggests that the aristocracy were able to safeguard some aspects of their position of leadership by drawing the middle class into an acceptance of them, for example through involving the middle class in such sporting pursuits as hunting. Laslett uses the word 'mimesis' to describe the imitation of a small wealthy segment of society by a much wider, much less wealthy, segment, and sees much of the self-styled middle class in the twentieth century as being in fact working class which has adopted a middle-class life style. In examining the effectiveness of nineteenth century attempts at social control, F. M. L. Thompson concludes that, while the working class had adopted middle-class values by 1900, these had not been imposed, but were selected and adapted 'by the workers for the workers'.

... when it comes to gauging the actual results of the efforts of individuals or groups who did have social controlling motives, it seems that the intended recipients picked out what they wanted from the facilities on offer, and rejected the moral or authoritarian message.

The changes in employment relations of the late nineteenth century have been seen by some observers as destructive of
the sense of community in the village. George Sturt, writing in 1912, commented:

... those relations of mutual approval which were not uncommon between master and man cannot now be maintained. ... By becoming wage-earners solely, the villagers have fallen into the disfavour of an influential section of the middle classes, most of whom have no other desire than to keep them in sufficient state of servility to be useful.

Mingay writes of the stresses which threatened the cohesion of rural society, created by 'new stirrings of democracy and independence'. Obelkevich sees village society transformed into a class-divided one as farmers actively set themselves apart while the labourers clung reluctantly to old habits. Other writers trace the break-down of village society to earlier changes, such as enclosure (see footnote 13) or the New Poor Law. Snell for example quotes the report of a Royal Commission of 1851, which could already comment:

A wide distinction of habits grew up ... between the two classes. ... It was impossible to restore the old relations, the familiar habits of the master and his servant, their almost equal moral elevation ...

On the other hand, Armstrong sees the reluctance of farmworkers to unionise as a demonstration of their lack of class awareness, and points out that the literary sources fail to demonstrate any genuine class hostility. In the Vale of Belvoir, it is noticeable that John Wilson's cry of protest when the Coleman estate was broken up was not one of class, but against the influence of the towns. (See page 83). Class relations in the village had changed by 1881, but they had done so to the benefit of the labourer; the farm worker was still poorly paid and poorly housed, but he knew that he had a choice of where to look for work, or what type of work to do, and once employed his rights as well as those of his employer in regard to their contract were protected. Vincent has identified the evidence contained in working-class autobiographies
As the worker's economic power increased, so did his capacity to gain some independence of blind fate. In the same way, the middle class were less dependent upon the landlord; the tenant farmer could take the responsibility for improving his farm knowing that his investment would not be forfeit when he left the property. Where poverty, the bonds of service, and the obligations of deference had held together the old village society, by the late nineteenth century the community was more loosely bound. Yet it was still a community, with shared interests and aspirations. While the life style of the middle class was continuing to become more clearly different from that of the labourers, a relationship survived. Even Obelkevich, whose view of village society at this period is generally so gloomy, identifies a 'lingering desire for community'.

Through the activities of the nonconformist churches, and through shared recreations, members of the middle class remained the natural leaders of village society. The changes which they helped to introduce, while some met with initial reluctance, were for the most part ultimately recognised as beneficial, and accepted into the traditional pattern of village life.

The theme suggests areas in which further research might clarify the picture of a rise in labourers' expectations. The use of parish registers to extend the family reconstruction already supplied by the census would give the possibility of examining family size and structure in more detail. It would, in particular, help to confirm the impression that there was a noticeable reduction in the number of large families during the period, at an earlier stage than elsewhere. (See page 22). The place of women in the community, and the opportunities open to them to earn a living, is another theme which has not been fully explored here; there were a number of women who continued to run the family farm after the death of a male relative, but for most other women in the villages apart from domestic servants, paid work seems to have
been occasional. A closer knowledge of the distribution of lace making in the area would give a better idea of the extent to which it offered a source of income, and thus the degree to which poverty was overcome. While sources for such information remain a problem, the publication of the 1891 census will of course give an opportunity to confirm which were the growth areas of employment, as well as some further indications of the effects of the depression; it will be interesting to see whether the loss of population to the towns continued, or whether the diminishing grounds for discontent which I have outlined produced a more stable population.

Because of its relative isolation, and because of its small size, a village today remains a better integrated community than a town. Kin relationships remain important; W. M. Williams suggests that the continuing presence of a group of kin is a prerequisite for the survival of a village spirit into the twentieth century. During the period 1851-1881 there were many examples of families of the same name which included farmers and craftsmen as well as labourers and even paupers. Even today, the children at Long Clawson school can read the old log book and, recognising names, feel themselves part of a continuing fraternity. While the migration of the nineteenth century scattered families, for many the roots remained important; servant girls returned to visit, and many labourers returned to the village to settle down after a period of working elsewhere. In his study of Chelsea, Vermont, between 1840 and 1900, which shared a similar experience of outward migration, Barron comments on the stability which characterised the population which remained behind, persuaded to do so by 'the psychic importance of certainty and familiarity'. It is the continuing sense of identity among the village population which makes it difficult still for newcomers to find acceptance.

We have here the reasons for the belief that the village has remained unchanged. Change was resisted while it
seemed to be imposed, but accepted into the traditional life of the village when its usefulness became apparent. While relationships changed, with class difference becoming more remarked, there were enough shared experiences for the community to remain unified, and to preserve its sense of permanence. John Wilson could therefore write of the period immediately following the period of this study:—29.

In Long Clawson rumours of the outer world had begun to stir, but the habits and customs of an earlier time were still retained. The village was yet a community welded together by many relationships and traditions that lay deeper than mere economic conditions ... The villagers followed the same round of duties and pleasures year after year, and the people and scenes they had known from birth, and while the shape of their lives sometimes expanded a little, it never changed.

Efforts to impose middle-class morality may have changed the form of some of the village merry-making, but not its shared character. While drunkenness became less socially acceptable, the pub continued to provide the warmth and companionship which the villager craved. The tradition of community life was not extinguished; on the contrary, as F. M. L. Thompson has expressed it:—30.

There is the possibility that the working class themselves generated their own values and attitudes suited to the requirements of life in an industrial society, and imposed their own forms on middle-class institutions.
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    Quote from the *Labourer*, 15 July, 1877.
The governing class continued its policy of extinguishing the old village life and all the relationships and interests attached to it, with unsparing and unhesitating hand...

'To the enclosure of the common more than to any other cause may be traced all the changes that have subsequently passed over the village'.

'By becoming workers for wages and nothing else, labourers lost status, and the whole character of the English community was changed'.

Traces the gradual recognition of education as a means of natural development of children.
'Even the bitterest Radical forgives the patrician who shoots and rides exceptionally well, and hunting is a pursuit which brings the peer and the commoner side by side...'

18. P. Laslett, *op. cit.* p. 229
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29. J. Wilson, *op. cit.* p.69
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## APPENDIX I.


Land in Leicestershire.
Owners resident in selected villages in Vale of Belvoir area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Gross Estimation</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arnall, John</td>
<td>Bottesford</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashbourn, Geo.</td>
<td>Croxton Kerrial</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Baguley, T. &amp; W.</td>
<td>Harby</td>
<td>12 (79)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnes, Wm.</td>
<td>Broughton</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barke, Rbt.</td>
<td>Stathern</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Barke, Rbt. snr.</td>
<td>Harby</td>
<td>61 (62)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Barnard, John</td>
<td>Clawson</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Barnes, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Harby</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnes, John</td>
<td>Harby</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bates, Wm.</td>
<td>AbKettelby</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell, Eustace, exors.</td>
<td>Belvoir</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Bellairs, Rev. S.G.</td>
<td>Goadby Marwood</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birch, Rcd.</td>
<td>Redmile</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Bishop, Matthew.</td>
<td>N. Broughton</td>
<td>12 (75)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Bissell, Wm.</td>
<td>N. Broughton</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Bonser, Henry</td>
<td>Harby</td>
<td>19 (19)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonser, John</td>
<td>Barkstone</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouverie, Hon. P.P.</td>
<td>Haymarket, S.W.</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>727</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Bowley, Mrs.</td>
<td>N. Broughton</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Bowley, Wm.</td>
<td>N. Broughton</td>
<td>2 (50)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braithwaite, Eleanor</td>
<td>Stathern</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braithwaite, Geo.</td>
<td>Stathern</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braithwaite, Wm.</td>
<td>Stathern</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewitt, Wm.</td>
<td>Bottesford</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, James.</td>
<td>AbKettelby</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Thomas</td>
<td>Holwell</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Wm.</td>
<td>Holwell</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Burton, Samuel.</td>
<td>Hose</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I, Cont'd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Related Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carter, T. M.</td>
<td>Waltham</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caunt, Geo.</td>
<td>Statherm</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caunt, Wm.</td>
<td>Plungar</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challands, Wm.</td>
<td>Bottesford</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity, Tr. of Chester</td>
<td>Barkstone</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchwardens of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. Clawson</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goadby Marwood</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harby</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waltham</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare, Henry</td>
<td>Belvoir</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Coleman, Wm. jnr.</td>
<td>L. Clawson</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>(400) 510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coley, Henry</td>
<td>Scalford</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constables of</td>
<td>Holwell</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Cooke, Wm.</td>
<td>L. Clawson</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>(328) 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Corner, Rbt.</td>
<td>Hose</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(24) 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Daft, Stephen</td>
<td>L. Clawson</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(40) 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day, R. exors. of</td>
<td>Goadby Marwood</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis, Rbt.</td>
<td>Bottesford</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon, Geo.</td>
<td>Bottesford</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon, T. exors. of</td>
<td>Holwell</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolby, Wm. jnr.</td>
<td>Waltham</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Doubleday, Edw.</td>
<td>L. Clawson</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Doubleday, John.</td>
<td>L. Clawson</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Easom, John.</td>
<td>L. Clawson</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*East, John.</td>
<td>N. Broughton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebsworth, Rev. G. S.</td>
<td>Croxton Kerrial</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Edlin, T. B.</td>
<td>N. Broughton</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(12) 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flowers, Henry, Trs. of</td>
<td>Holwell</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freckingham, Rev.</td>
<td>Ab Kettelby</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Furmidge, Sml.</td>
<td>Harby</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garner, John</td>
<td>Bottesford</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Garratt, Hannah</td>
<td>Hose</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gill, Josiah</td>
<td>Holwell</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gill, Mrs.</td>
<td>Holwell</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillett, Geo.</td>
<td>Waltham</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodbourn, Thos.</td>
<td>Upp. Broughton</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I, cont'd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goodson, James</td>
<td>Bottesford</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodson, Red.</td>
<td>Scalford</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodson, Thos.</td>
<td>Eastwell</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groce, Wm. exors.</td>
<td>N. Broughton</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy, Daniel.</td>
<td>Bottesford</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hall, Edmund.</td>
<td>Harby</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartoppe, E.B.</td>
<td>Little Dalby</td>
<td>5,423</td>
<td>8,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Harvey, Chas.</td>
<td>N. Broughton</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Harwood, Wm.</td>
<td>Harby</td>
<td>8 (150)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hatton, Wm.</td>
<td>N. Broughton</td>
<td>53 (53)</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Haywood, J. jnr.</td>
<td>Harby</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Haywood, John</td>
<td>Harby</td>
<td>8 (150)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Haywood, John, jnr.</td>
<td>Harby</td>
<td>5 (69)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haywood, Thos.</td>
<td>Waltham</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higden, Susannah.</td>
<td>Bottesford</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hind, James</td>
<td>L. Clawson</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital, Trsts. of</td>
<td>Bottesford</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourd, Joshua</td>
<td>Hose</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoyle, Mrs.</td>
<td>Stathern</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Huckerby, Francis.</td>
<td>L. Clawson</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Huckerby, Thos.</td>
<td>Hose</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson, John</td>
<td>Stathern</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Jackson, Mrs.</td>
<td>Harby</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson, Thos.</td>
<td>Bottesford</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson, Wm.</td>
<td>Stathern</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James, Edw.</td>
<td>Bottesford</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James, Sarah.</td>
<td>Bottesford</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Rev. J. F.</td>
<td>AbKettelby</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Kellam, John</td>
<td>L. Clawson</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Kellam, Thos.</td>
<td>L. Clawson</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Kemp, Geo.</td>
<td>Harby</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Kemp, Wm.</td>
<td>Harby</td>
<td>11 (94)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettleborrow, Eliz.</td>
<td>Bottesford</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidd, Mrs.</td>
<td>Stathern</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk, W.T.</td>
<td>Scalford</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knight, Wm.</td>
<td>Berkesstone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamb, Josiah.</td>
<td>Bottesford</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I, cont'd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Lamin. Henry.</td>
<td>Harby</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Lamin. John.</td>
<td>Harby</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamin. Peter. exors. of</td>
<td>Hoze</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Lamin. Thos.</td>
<td>Harby</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane. Trophimus.</td>
<td>Bottesford</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leatherland. James.</td>
<td>Bottesford</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levesley. Benjamin.</td>
<td>Stathern</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levesley. Wm.</td>
<td>Stathern</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord. Geo.</td>
<td>Bottesford</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord. R. exors. of</td>
<td>Stathern</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Lovett. John.</td>
<td>N. Broughton</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lovitt. Rcd.</td>
<td>Redmile</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machin. Ruth.</td>
<td>Stathern</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackley. Rbt.</td>
<td>Redmile</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March. Geo.</td>
<td>N. Broughton</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriott. J. exors. of</td>
<td>Colston Basset</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriott. Rbt.</td>
<td>Bottesford</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall. Wm.</td>
<td>Bottesford</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May. Thos.</td>
<td>Bottesford</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Milnes. John.</td>
<td>L. Clawson</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Mitchell. Rev. T.</td>
<td>L. Clawson</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris. Thos.</td>
<td>Eaton</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musson. Elizabeth.</td>
<td>Barkstone</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musson. John. exors. of</td>
<td>Stathern</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Musson. Sam.</td>
<td>Harby</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Newcome. F.P.</td>
<td>L. Clawson</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Noble. Rev. J.</td>
<td>N. Broughton</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman. Rev. F.J.</td>
<td>Bottesford</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Norman. Rev. N.O.</td>
<td>Harby</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odd Fellows Soc.</td>
<td>Harby</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver. Rbt.</td>
<td>Stathern</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Orton. John.</td>
<td>Harby</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orton. R.B.</td>
<td>Bottesford</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oswin. Chas.</td>
<td>Scalford</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outram. Rev. G.S.</td>
<td>Redmile</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. Clawson</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eaton</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(404)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overseers of</th>
<th>Scalford</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Stathern</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parr. Wm.</td>
<td>Redmile</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Pears. Hannah.</td>
<td>Hose</td>
<td>15 (13)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell. Rod.</td>
<td>Plungar</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pick. Michael.</td>
<td>Stathern</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Pickard. Wm.</td>
<td>L. Clawson</td>
<td>18 (56)</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickering. Thos.</td>
<td>Bottesford</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Piggin. Wm.</td>
<td>Hose</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor, Trustees of</td>
<td>Croxton Kerrial</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pozzer. Otho.</td>
<td>Stathern</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulfree. Wm.</td>
<td>Barkstone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravell, Matthias</td>
<td>Bottesford</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravell. Wm.</td>
<td>Bottesford</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards. Thos.</td>
<td>Bottesford</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rippin. T. Trustees of</td>
<td>Waltham</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts. Thos.</td>
<td>Scalford</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson. James.</td>
<td>Bottesford</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson. Mary.</td>
<td>Bottesford</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rowbotham. Thos.</td>
<td>GoadbyMarwood</td>
<td>5 (200)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland, Duke of</td>
<td>Belvoir Castle</td>
<td>30,109</td>
<td>42,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryder. John.</td>
<td>Belvoir Castle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Scarborough. Day.</td>
<td>L. Clawson</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School, Trustees of</td>
<td>Barkstone</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Bottesford</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>L. Clawson</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Shelton. Mrs.</td>
<td>N. Broughton</td>
<td>21 (133)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Shilcock. Henry.</td>
<td>Hose</td>
<td>34 (132)</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Shilcock. John.</td>
<td>L. Clawson</td>
<td>68 (94)</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Shilcock. Wm.</td>
<td>Hose</td>
<td>58 (360)</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Shilcock. Wm. jnr.</td>
<td>Hose</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipman. Andrew.</td>
<td>Stathern</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipman. Henry.</td>
<td>Stathern</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipman. Mrs.</td>
<td>Waltham</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipman. Thos.</td>
<td>Croxton Kerrial</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Shipman. Wm.</td>
<td>Harby</td>
<td>71 (175)</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipman. W. &amp; H.</td>
<td>Stathern</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith. Wm.</td>
<td>Bottesford</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Bottesford</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stevens, John</td>
<td>Barkstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Stokes, Elizabeth</td>
<td>L.Clawson</td>
<td>259 (34)</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stokes, Geo.</td>
<td>Upr.Broughton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stretton &amp; Young</td>
<td>Harby</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Summer, Ann.</td>
<td>Bose</td>
<td>5 (30)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer, H. &amp; S.</td>
<td>Stathern</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer, John</td>
<td>Stathern</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Swain, Ann.</td>
<td>L.Clawson</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swale, Rev. H.</td>
<td>Eastwell</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, Rev. J. W.</td>
<td>Stathern</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempest, Mrs.</td>
<td>Eaton</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipping, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Harby</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tronsell, Chas.</td>
<td>Eaton</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twells, Rev. Henry</td>
<td>Waltham</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler, Mrs.</td>
<td>Holwell</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urry, Geo. Devis</td>
<td>N.Broughton</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent, Francis</td>
<td>Bottesford</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Wakeling, Luke</td>
<td>Chadwell</td>
<td>49 (50)</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker, Abigail</td>
<td>Bottesford</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner, Thos.</td>
<td>Scalford</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellbourne, Francis</td>
<td>Plungar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells, A. &amp; G.</td>
<td>Plungar</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells, Geo.</td>
<td>Plungar</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells, Hannah</td>
<td>AbKettelby</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells, John</td>
<td>Scalford</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whalley, Elizabeth</td>
<td>L.Clawson</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittle, C.W.B.</td>
<td>Scalford</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Whittle, John, jnr.</td>
<td>Harby</td>
<td>118 (118)</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittle, W.</td>
<td>Scalford</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilford, Edw.</td>
<td>Scalford</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Wilford, Wm.</td>
<td>L.Clawson</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilford, Wm.</td>
<td>Scalford</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, Rev. J.H.</td>
<td>Eaton</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, Rev. &amp; others</td>
<td>L.Clawson</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willows, Catherine.</td>
<td>Upr.Broughton</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Acreage 1</th>
<th>Acreage 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, John</td>
<td>Waltham</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood, J. exors. of Waltham</td>
<td>Wycomb</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood, Rev J. A.</td>
<td>Waltham</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodruffe, Thos.</td>
<td>N. Broughton</td>
<td>34 (35)</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Belvoir</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Plungar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright, J. exors of</td>
<td>Statherm</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright, John</td>
<td>N. Broughton</td>
<td>27 (101)</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wynn, Rev, Rbt.</td>
<td>Scalford</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total owners of land, 1 acre and upwards: 4,927
Total owners of land, less than 1 acre: 8,921

Total Leicestershire landowners: 13,848

* indicates names which appear on the 1871 census for the seven villages.

Acreages in brackets are those declared as acreages worked on the 1871 census.
**APPENDIX II.**


Land in Nottinghamshire.
Owners resident in selected villages in Vale of Belvoir area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Gross Estimate Rental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baker, Wm.</td>
<td>Hickling</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldock, Jos.</td>
<td>Cropwell Butler</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldock, Wm.</td>
<td>Cropwell Bishop</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell, John.</td>
<td>Hickling</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bestwick, Ed. Exors. of Upr. Broughton</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingham, Exors. of (Granby)</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bissell, Wm.</td>
<td>Redmile</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blagden, Elizabeth</td>
<td>L. Clawson</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradshaw, Rev. John</td>
<td>Granby</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brett, John</td>
<td>N. Broughton</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brett, Rbt.</td>
<td>Hickling</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks, Rev. Joshua</td>
<td>Colston Bassett</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Lydia</td>
<td>Upr. Broughton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Wm. Trustees of Upr. Broughton</td>
<td></td>
<td>237</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrbage, John</td>
<td>Granby</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler, Sml.</td>
<td>Whatton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler, Thos.</td>
<td>Langar</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caunt, Wm.</td>
<td>Plungar</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlewood, Rev. T.</td>
<td>Kinoulton</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheetham, John</td>
<td>Orston</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchwardens of Stathern</td>
<td>Stathern</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Watton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke, Chas.</td>
<td>Cropwell Butler</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collishaw, Jane</td>
<td>Hickling</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collishaw, John</td>
<td>Hickling</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collishaw, Wm.</td>
<td>Hickling</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper, Matthew</td>
<td>Cropwell Bishop</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corner, Septimus</td>
<td>Hickling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crampton, Thos.</td>
<td>Cropwell Butler</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Page 1</th>
<th>Page 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross. Sm.</td>
<td>Upr. Broughton</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross. Wm.</td>
<td>Upr. Broughton</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daft. Hannah</td>
<td>Hickling</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies. John</td>
<td>Hickling</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davy. G.F.</td>
<td>Colston Basset</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickman. Hy.</td>
<td>Hickling</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Doubleday. Sm. snr.</em></td>
<td>L. Clawson</td>
<td>6 (167)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubleday. Thos.</td>
<td>Granby</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards. Rev. W.H.</td>
<td>Hickling</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faulks. John</td>
<td>Hickling</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Featherstone. John</td>
<td>Hickling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher. John</td>
<td>Orston</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garham. John</td>
<td>Cropwell Bishop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greasley. John</td>
<td>Whaddon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grice. John</td>
<td>Upr. Broughton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall. Jos.</td>
<td>Hickling</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickman. Wm.</td>
<td>Orston</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopewell. Elizabeth</td>
<td>Cropwell Bishop</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkinson. J.G.</td>
<td>Hickling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornbuckle. Thos.</td>
<td>Barketstone.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hord. Rd.</td>
<td>Granby</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James. Wm.</td>
<td>Langar</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk. Thos.</td>
<td>Plungar</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk. Wm.</td>
<td>Scalford</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maltby. Chas.</td>
<td>Orston</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maltby. Jos.</td>
<td>Hickling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maltby. Thos.</td>
<td>Orston</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mann. John</td>
<td>Hickling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March. Geo.</td>
<td>Hickling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriott. Geo.</td>
<td>Colston Basset</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriott. John</td>
<td>Colston Basset</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriott. John</td>
<td>Cropwell Butler</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriott. Jos.</td>
<td>Cropwell Butler</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriott. Jos. exors.</td>
<td>Cropwell Butler</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriott. Rd.</td>
<td>Langar</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriott. Wm.</td>
<td>Colston Basset</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Amount 1</td>
<td>Amount 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall.Trophimus.</td>
<td>Orston</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall.Wm.</td>
<td>Orston</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason.Wm.</td>
<td>Whatton</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maw.Mary.</td>
<td>Broughton</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melling.Rev.W.J.</td>
<td>Orston</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison.Hy.</td>
<td>Hickling</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller.Thos.</td>
<td>CropwellButler</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills.John.</td>
<td>Orston</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oddfellows Club.</td>
<td>CropwellBishop</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodge.</td>
<td>Orton</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orson.J.Devs.of</td>
<td>Upr.Broughton</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orton.Mrs.R.B.</td>
<td>Orton</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker.Vincent.</td>
<td>CropwellBishop</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parr.John.</td>
<td>CropwellButler</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell.Jos.</td>
<td>Whatton</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaster Co., Belvoir.</td>
<td>Orston</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumptree.Rev.W.H.</td>
<td>Whatton</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulley.Count de.</td>
<td>Elton</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>1,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recks.Hy.</td>
<td>Granby</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards.Gibson.</td>
<td>Orston</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards.James.</td>
<td>CropwellBishop</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards.Wm.</td>
<td>Gránby</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland.Duke of.</td>
<td>Belvoir Castle</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelton.Georgina.</td>
<td>CropwellBishop</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelton.Rebecca.</td>
<td>CropwellBishop</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipman.H.</td>
<td>Hickling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson.John.</td>
<td>CropwellBishop</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slater.Thos.</td>
<td>Granby</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith.Hy.</td>
<td>CropwellButler</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith.John.</td>
<td>CropwellBishop</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith.Mary.</td>
<td>CropwellButler</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith.Wm.</td>
<td>CropwellBishop</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spencer.Wm.</td>
<td>Hickling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squires.John.</td>
<td>CropwellBishop</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II, cont'd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Owners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starbuck, Jos.</td>
<td>Hickling</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starbuck, Wm.</td>
<td>Cropwell Bishop</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staveley, Chr.</td>
<td>Orston</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storer, Geo.</td>
<td>Thoroton</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaine, J.</td>
<td>Hickling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talbot, Francis.</td>
<td>Whatton</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treece, Mary.</td>
<td>Thoroton</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent, Francis.</td>
<td>Bottesford</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner, Geo. exors. of</td>
<td>N. Broughton</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warriner, John.</td>
<td>Thoroton</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wartnaby, John.</td>
<td>Upr. Broughton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weatherall, Rev. Rod.</td>
<td>Elton</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellbourn, Edw.</td>
<td>Cropwell Bishop</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells, Andr.</td>
<td>Plungar</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells, Guy.</td>
<td>Hickling</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells, Rod. Guy.</td>
<td>Hickling</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, John.</td>
<td>Hickling</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wickham, Mrs.</td>
<td>Orston</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widdowson, Matthew.</td>
<td>Cropwell Bishop</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widdowson, Wm.</td>
<td>Cropwell Butler</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkinson, Wm.</td>
<td>Granby</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willoughby, John.</td>
<td>Cropwell Butler</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willows, Mrs. C.</td>
<td>L. Clawson</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, J. Devisees of</td>
<td>Upr. Broughton</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, Mrs.</td>
<td>Cropwell Bishop</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, Wm.</td>
<td>Orston</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodroffe, Wm.</td>
<td>Hickling</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodruff, Devs. of</td>
<td>Upr. Broughton</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wragby, T. exors. of</td>
<td>Cropwell Butler</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total owners of land, 1 acre and upwards: 4,628
Total owners of land, less than 1 acre: 9,891
Total Nottinghamshire landowners: 14,519

Returns derived from valuation lists for rating in each parish. Includes lessees for over 99 years, or with a right of perpetual renewal, but not lessees for shorter periods.
APPENDIX III. The Village Squire.

George C. Broderick.

English Land and English Landlords. (1881)

David & Charles, 1968. p. 267

To the Englishman born and bred in the country, it appears the natural order of things, if not the fixed ordinance of Providence, that in each parish there should be a dominant resident landowner, called a squire, unless he should chance to be a peer, invested with an authority over its inhabitants, which neither the Saxon chief, nor the Norman lord, in the fulness of his power, ever had the right of exercising. This potentate, who, luckily for his dependents, is usually a kind-hearted and tolerably educated gentleman, concentrates in himself a variety of rights and prerogatives which, in the aggregate, amount to little short of patriarchal sovereignty. The clergyman, who is by far the greatest man in the parish next to himself, is usually his nominee, and often his kinsman. The farmers, who are almost the only employers of labour beside himself, are his tenants-at-will, and, possibly, his debtors. The petty tradespeople of the village community rent under him, and, if they did not, might be crushed by his displeasure at any moment. The labourers, of course, live in his cottages ... they sometimes work on the home farm, and are glad to get jobs from his bailiff, especially in the winter; they look to him for advice in worldly matters ... Nothing passes in the parish without being reported to him ... He is, in fact, the local representative of the law itself, and as a magistrate, has often the means of legally enforcing the policy which, as landlord, he may have adopted. Add to all this the influence which he may and ought to acquire as the leading supporter and manager of the parish school, and as the most liberal subscriber to parochial charities, as the patron of the village games and the dispenser of village treats, ... and it is difficult to imagine a position of greater real power and responsibility.
APPENDIX IV. James Prior Kirk, 1851 - 1922.


... born at Mapperley Road, Nottingham. His parents were James Kirk and Sarah Jane Kirk (nee Prior), carrying on together a millinery business at Peck Lane, Hounds Gate and Pelham Street, afterwards drawn together at 20 South Parade. He attended a preparatory school kept by the Misses Goodall ... Then for about ten years he attended a school kept by Mr. Porter. At eighteen he left this school and was articled to Mr. Rothera, Solicitor. Instead of devoting himself to the study of law, he gave most of his time to studying languages and literature. He had a great love for Greek, and all his life the Greek classics were a delight and a consolation to him.

At the end of three years for which he was articled, he was far from ready for his final examination. After a stormy scene with his father, it was decided that he should give up the study of law, which he disliked, and devote himself to literature. No success came; and when he was 27 he took a post in a boys' boarding school at Southport. After a single term here he taught for a short time at Merton, Sussex. While teaching he was also studying for the final B.A. (London) examination. His studies were stopped by very serious trouble with his eyes. The trouble remained for the rest of his life (at intervals being very severe and painful and seriously affecting his general health).

In 1880 his father died. For about a year he devoted himself to carrying on his father's business. Then the business was taken over by two of his sisters, though he continued to give them a certain amount of assistance until the business was given up in 1914.

An uncle who carried on business at Uppingham as a Butcher and Grazier was in difficulties, and it was in endeavouring to help this uncle that he got his own affairs entangled, and suffered considerable money loss. In the hope of straightening things out he took over the grazing business, again losing
which is so valuable a part of his books. He stuck to the farming for five years and then was forced to give it up. In the meantime he had married his cousin, Lily Kirk (1886). He lived for a short time in Nottinghham, then moved to Radcliffe on Trent. He lived there for three years, and then, in 1891 went to Bingham, where he spent the remainder of his life. Up to this time he had written a number of plays and stories without any success. All his important work, beginning with "Renie," was written at Bingham. It was with "Ripple and Flood" that he showed himself as a master among novelists. Then came "Forest Folk," "Hyssop," "A Walking Gentleman" and "Fortune Chance." His subsequent work, as yet unpublished, was done under great difficulties, and in the midst of much suffering and trouble. After a long illness, his wife died. About this time he was granted a small civil pension in recognition of his services to literature. His elder son died of wounds received in battle. His eye troubles became worse and for long periods he was practically blind. Operations partially restored his sight, and he resumed his work cheerfully and courageously.

He died of pneumonia, after a few days' illness.
APPENDIX V.

Melton Highway Board - Statement of receipts and expenditure on account of highways of selected parishes for year ending 31 December, 1875. (extracts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£. s. d.</td>
<td>£. s. d.</td>
<td>£. s. d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nether Broughton</td>
<td>6 miles.</td>
<td>120 13 0½</td>
<td>137 0 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Clawson</td>
<td>12 &quot;</td>
<td>344 18 0</td>
<td>348 7 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goadby Marwood</td>
<td>6 &quot;</td>
<td>111 13 0½</td>
<td>100 8 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hose</td>
<td>6 &quot;</td>
<td>146 15 9</td>
<td>153 6 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wycomb &amp; Chadwell</td>
<td>3 &quot;</td>
<td>76 0 0</td>
<td>80 17 5½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals for district

319 "  6,076 0 3  6,659 0 0  763 0 0

### APPENDIX VI

**ECCLESIASTICAL CENSUS 1851. Melton Mowbray District (extracts).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sittings</th>
<th>a.m.</th>
<th>p.m.</th>
<th>ev'n.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nether Broughton.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Marv</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesl'n. Meth.</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total as % of pop'n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. of E.</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All denominations</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total as % of pop'n.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. of E.</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All denominations</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Long Clawson.** | | | |
| St. Remigius | 400 | 81 | 120 |
| Gnl. Baptist | 130 | - | 35 |
| Wesl'n. Meth. | 400 | - | 170 |
| Total as % of pop'n. | | | |
| C. of E. | 46 | 9.3 | 13.8 |
| All denominations | 107 | 9.3 | 31.8 |

| **Goadby Marwood.** | | | |
| St. Denys | 197 | - | 100 |
| Total as % of pop'n. | 94.3 | - | 47.8 |

| **Chadwell cum Wycomb.** | | | |
| Parish. | 80 | - | - |
| Total as % of pop'n. | 48.2 | - | 24.7 |

| **Habry.** | | | |
| St. Marv | 300 | 74 | 158 |
| Wesl'n. Meth. | 300 | 125 | - |
| Calvinist | 100 | 14 | - |
| Total as % of pop'n. | | | |
| C. of E. | 47.9 | 11.8 | 25.2 |
| All denominations | 111.8 | 34 | 25.2 |

| **Hose.** | | | |
| St. Michael | 169 | - | 95 |
| Gnl. Baptist | 245 | 117 | - |
| Wesl'n. Meth. | - | - | 30 |
| Total as % of pop'n. | | | |
| C. of E. | 35.9 | - | 20.2 |
| All denominations | 87.9 | 24.8 | 26.5 |

| **Melton and Billesdon Areas.** | | | |
| Total % of pop'n. | | | |
| C. of E. | 24.1 | 36.2 | 29.8 |
| All denominations | 26.8 | 38.6 | 28.9 |

| **Whole County (Leics).** | | | |
| Total % of pop'n. | | | |
| C. of E. | 20.5 | 29.5 | 25.7 |
| All denominations | 24.1 | 34.3 | 26.2 |

Source. Leicestershire Record Office, MF142. HO 129/418.
### APPENDIX VII

**CENSUS OF ATTENDANCE IN CHAPELS OF THE MELTON MOWBRAY WESLEYAN METHODIST CIRCUIT, Sunday 6 Oct., 1907.**

(Extracts).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapel</th>
<th>Morning</th>
<th>Evening</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clawson</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harby</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broughton</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goadby</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### APPENDIX VIII

**MEMBERSHIP OF HOSE GENERAL BAPTIST CHAPEL, 1851 - 1881.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The North Leicestershire election of 1868 is yet another example of the fact that where foxhunting was concerned, party lines meant little, though in this case we can see the beginnings of a radical dislike of hunting, based not on any aversion to the sport itself, but on an identification of hunting people, whether Liberals or Conservatives, as the representatives of an essentially conservative and social order.

As befitted a county so closely associated with foxhunting, the two official Conservative candidates in the dual-member constituency were two men whose own association with the sport was well known. Lord John Manners was the brother of the sixth Duke of Rutland, hereditary master of the Belvoir Hunt. S.W. Clowe, though not a Leicestershire man, had been master of the Quorn from 1863 to 1866. The constituency was so solidly under the influence of the Duke of Rutland that the Liberals did not bother to contest the seat, but the excitement of a contest was not to be denied the local inhabitants. C. H. Frewer, a member of a prominent and wealthy local gentry family, declared himself an independent Conservative candidate, and proceeded to campaign hard. ... He had unsuccessfully contested the seat since 1857. ...

The election of Lord John Manners was a foregone conclusion. The contest very quickly became one between Clowe and Frewer for the second seat. The great national issue of the campaign was the disestablishment of the Irish Church. The great local one was the political influence of the House of Rutland. On the first, there was no difference of opinion between Frewer and Clowe. It was on the second that Frewer chose to make his stand. Accusing Clowe of being the nominee of the Rutlands, he put forward his candidacy as a means of breaking the stranglehold of the Duke's family on local politics. Most local opinion, whether it favoured Frewer or not, saw his candidacy in the same light.

On the Saturday preceding the poll, 14 November, the Leicester Advertiser printed a letter from Frewer to the Duke of Rutland: I do not think that Mr. Clowe's prospects of
success in North Leicestershire are very encouraging, but there is a decided feeling with many that if he should be dragged [sic] in to represent the foxhunting interest, why then, the sooner foxhunting is put an end to the better, - and if it should happen that he get in some of us intend to do our best to clear the country of foxes, which can very easily be done. When poor men have been turned out of their land because they dared to vote for me in 1865, we shall be quite justified in taking this course.

[At subsequent meetings he was greeted by a mob with a fox's brush and mask on a pole.] ... The newspapers that supported Clowes, of course, had a field day with Frewen's letter, offering it as proof of his lack of fitness for office. The liberal Chronicle maintained a discreet silence, and the radical Mail clearly wished that the letter had never appeared. ... His boldness did him no good. When the votes were counted, Lord John Manners, to no one's surprise, topped the poll with 3296 votes. Clowes had 2092, Frewen, 1750. ... Certainly, the Rutland influence cannot be discounted, though the great difference in the number of votes gathered by Manners and Clowes indicates that it helped Clowes far less than it did Manners.
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