

Note de recherche — Research Note

Generations, Mobility and Persistence: A View from Genealogies

Randy William Widdis*

Recent studies on rural transformation and mobility have emphasized the importance of considering these interrelated themes in relation to specific locational and historical contexts. This paper argues that in order to integrate historical demography with the social history of Ontario's rural population, it will be necessary to move beyond the confines of the census-based cross-sectional approach and instead develop a longitudinal perspective. A life-history approach based on linking the information found in genealogies with other records is suggested as a possible strategy enabling researchers to better understand how individuals and families responded to changes in rural society.

Les études récentes portant sur la mobilité et les transformations dans le monde rural ont mis l'accent sur l'importance de considérer ces deux sujets en relation avec le contexte régional et historique. Cet article tente de montrer que pour intégrer la démographie historique et l'histoire sociale de la population rurale ontarienne, il est nécessaire de dépasser les limites de l'approche transversale basée sur les recensements et de développer plutôt une perspective longitudinale. Nous suggérons que la constitution d'histoires de vie, liant les informations trouvées dans les généalogies et celles provenant d'autres sources, pourrait permettre aux chercheurs de mieux comprendre comment les individus et leurs familles ont réagi face aux changements dans la société rurale.

Almost a decade ago, Robert Swierenga made a plea for historians and geographers to respond to "the scholarly neglect of rural life" that characterized most of the so-called "new social history".¹ His clarion call did not go unheeded as rural historians have begun the difficult task of unravelling the complex transformations of rural society free from the dominant metropolitan

* Randy William Widdis is professor of geography at the University of Regina in Saskatchewan.

This research has been supported by the postdoctoral fellowship and the research stipend awarded by the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada. The author thanks Mark Côté for his cartographical assistance and two anonymous reviewers for their constructive comments.

1. Robert Swierenga, "The New Rural History: Defining the Parameters", *The Great Plains Quarterly*, Vol. 1 (1981), 211-223.

bias inherent in both modernization and marxist interpretations.² While these perspectives differ considerably, particularly with regard to the benefits of industrial capitalism, they both assume that social change in rural areas paralleled urban and industrial trends. But can we assume that the characteristics of urban-industrial society provide satisfactory models for understanding rural life and change in rural society?³

As argued elsewhere by this author, while the economic, political and social context provided by the development of industrial capitalism is the framework for the study of both urban and rural society and their interrelationships within the regional setting, the precise ways in which these exogenous forces affected individuals or local social groups also depended on a number of local features.⁴ Recent work has demonstrated that indigenous capitalist development, not originating from the metropolis, also played a role in directing the development of rural communities and in changing relations among classes in the countryside.⁵

Scholars have paid particular attention to the role of mobility in the study of rural transformation, arguing that mobility is crucial to an understanding of the social, economic and structural changes that took place during the nineteenth century. However, because mobility is both an agent of and response to change, its significance cannot be appreciated in any general theory. Harris and Moore get right to the heart of the matter when they argue:

...that the significance of mobility can be addressed only in relation to a specific locational and historical context. This points to a deficiency in both empirical and theoretical literature on mobility. Both assume that mobility is of intrinsic importance rather than attempt to establish this as a necessary and prior basis for their analysis.⁶

This emphasis on the mobility factor, a factor associated primarily with the twin processes of urbanization and industrialization, has led to the neglect of continuity in terms of persistence within rural communities. The continuous presence of family members during this period of tremendous change “also may have played an important role in the historical experience of communities where there were high levels of transiency.”⁷

2. See, for example: Hal C. Barron, *Those Who Stayed Behind: Rural Society in Nineteenth Century New England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984); Stephen Hahn and Jonathan Prude, “Introduction”, in S. Hahn and J. Prude, eds., *The Countryside in the Age of Capitalist Transformation* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1985), 3-21.

3. Barron (1984).

4. Randy William Widdis, “Belleville and Environs: Continuity, Change and the Integration of Town and Country During the Nineteenth Century”, *Urban History Review*, XIX, 5 (1991), 181-208.

5. Hahn and Prude (1985); Widdis (1991).

6. Richard Harris and Eric Moore, “An Historical Approach to the Study of Mobility”, *Professional Geographer*, Vol. 32, 1 (1980), 28.

7. Herbert Mays, “‘A Place to Stand’: Families, Land and Permanence in Toronto Gore Township, 1820-1890”, Canadian Historical Association, *Historical Papers* (1980), 186.

Of all our records, census manuscripts are used most often to interpret the changes taking place in Ontario during the course of the nineteenth century.⁸ While this source remains the backbone of historical demography in English Canada (a case can be made for the importance of the parish records in Quebec), there are intrinsic deficiencies and chronological limitations which restrict its use. The censuses vary greatly in terms of information as the criteria for data collection varied over time. For example, the 1851 and 1861 censuses do not include information on tenure. Detailed information on agricultural production is not available after 1871. There are no specific fertility or nuptiality data beyond born and married in the census year and, so, scholars resort to identifying vital rates through examination of age and determining fertility by calculating child-woman ratios.⁹

The biggest problem is the fact that the census is available only from 1851 to 1891. The 1892 year rule, recently changed from the 100 year restriction, prevents individual-level analysis and allows only aggregate examination for the decades after 1891. Thus, census-based synoptic populations studies of Ontario are only possible for the second half of the nineteenth century. While they focus on distributions of population at a single point in time, record linkage of censuses captures to some extent "change over time". But such an approach is limited given the decennial collection of the material and the highly mobile nature of the population.

For the pre-census period, generally felt to be the frontier era in Ontario, demographic analysis is even more difficult. During its pioneer period, Ontario was on the fringe of the British Empire and relatively little organized data collection took place. Recourse, therefore, is made to a scattered collection of other sources, including parish registers, assessment rolls, property deeds, directories and local histories. Yet it is rare to find comprehensive collections of data describing the initial demographics of communities in Ontario.¹⁰

The problems associated with the limited set of sources available make it difficult to examine the dimensions of social change in rural nineteenth-century Ontario and to respond to Bouchard's request for "a double reform of

8. For examples of how the census manuscripts have been used in analysis, see: David Gagan and Herbert Mays, "Historical Demography and Canadian Social History: Families and Land in Peel County, Ontario", *Canadian Historical Review*, Vol. LIV (1973), 27-47; and R. Marvin McInnis, "Childbearing and Land Availability: Some Evidence from Individual Household Records", in R.D. Lee, ed., *Population Patterns in the Past* (New York: Academic Press, 1977), 201-222.

9. Chad Gaffield, "Theory and Method in Canadian Historical Demography", *Archivaria*, Vol. 14 (1982), 124.

10. Norris's study of Adolphustown is a notable exception. See: Darrell Norris, "Household and Transiency in a Loyalist Township: The People of Adolphustown, 1784-1822", *Histoire sociale — Social History*, Vol. XIII (1980), 399-415.

demographic history".¹¹ In order to develop a longitudinal perspective and to integrate historical demography with the social history of Ontario's rural population, it will be necessary to discover sources and methods which move beyond the confines of the census-based cross-sectional approach.

The life-history approach has become the accepted strategy among this small group of scholars devoted to migration analysis at the micro-level. This research is reflective of the shift from cross-sectional and one community-oriented studies to what Hagerstrand in geography¹² and Hareven in history¹³ term "life-course" analysis. In this approach, changes in the life-course are in part caused by changes in the requirements for real and human capital in the economy. Mobility is seen as a response to a changing set of opportunities. In addition, these changes are mediated by the family and its cycle of procreation, marriage and mortality. Thus, a major focus of life-course migration analysis is on the significance of landholding, marriage and inheritance structures in generating selectivity amongst both migrants and persisters.

In the study of the interplay between individuals and the family, and families and society, concern is with life-course transitions, how the individual passes through different family settings and different family roles. The genealogical-based approach is essential to this endeavour, I believe, as it is one of the best ways to relate individuals to their families and socio-economic and physical environments. Well documented genealogies provide an opportunity to study the mobility experiences of pioneer families and their descendants. They follow the patterns of marriage, fertility and mortality and, when linked with other records, allow us to trace land ownership, occupation and other economic and demographic indicators as well.

Bruce Elliott's recent study of Irish migration to Canada is the major Canadian example of large-scale life-course analysis using a genealogical method.¹⁴

Elliott concentrates on a well-defined group who shared a common origin and left good records of themselves, making it not too difficult to locate, identify and trace their experiences. The success of his venture strengthens the cause of the genealogical approach to the study of migration, but skeptics might wonder as to the utility of this approach for examining the mobility experiences of less well-defined native-born groups moving internally within North America. Residential persistence among immigrant groups often

11. Gérard Bouchard, "Family Structures and Geographic Mobility at Laterrière, 1851-1935", *Journal of Family History*, Vol. 2 (1977), 368.

12. T. Hagerstrand, "The Domain of Human Geography", in R. Chorley, ed., *Directions in Human Geography* (London: Methuen, 1973).

13. Tamara Hareven, "The Family As Process: The Historical Study of the Family Cycle", *Journal of Social History*, Vol. 7 (1978).

14. Bruce Elliott, *Irish Migrants in the Canadas: A New Approach* (Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1988).

depended on the processes of chain and cluster migration which, in turn, were capable of transplanting culturally homogeneous and often kinship-related populations to North America. Such transplanted communities were often reinforced by a strong institutional focus and settlement in areas which offered immigrants the possibility to establish themselves among their own kind. Availability of land was a major factor in ensuring residential and, to a certain degree, cultural stability.

Yet frontiers that changed quickly with the rapid settlement of land discouraged community formation and persistence among immigrants. Native-born North Americans were similarly affected by settlement of the frontier, but were less likely to be influenced in their location decisions by any sense of maintaining transplanted communities. Subsequent generations of immigrants who did not share the emigration experience and were affected more directly by the assimilative forces present in their new homes were more likely to be less attached to their communities of origin. Yet the maintenance of kinship and other ties based on business, religion or other factors may have played an important role in the mobility decisions of this group.

In their elaboration of the genealogical perspective in social history, Taylor and Crandall list several reasons why genealogy is a valid and valuable historical method and source.¹⁵ Most importantly, they stress that a genealogy is more than a chartered lineage; it is the history of a family. Its focus on the family can help illuminate larger processes such as community growth or decline. Many historians have chosen to explore individuals and families in particular communities through the method of family reconstruction which is essentially the construction of genealogies by linking births, marriages and deaths.

Genealogies specify the particulars of lives over time and space within the context of kinship and with their longitudinal focus transcend the limits of the cross-sectional census-based approach. In this way, the genealogical approach moves beyond the life-cycle model that defines a sequence of stages from birth to death in order to approximate family change by compiling age-specific groups from successive manuscript censuses. Also, the genealogy's residential information allows one to investigate lifelong geographical mobility and note in particular the importance of kin in migration. Equally important is the genealogical investigation of persistence and the development of community as researchers increasingly realize that despite the tremendous mobility that characterized nineteenth-century North America, many individuals remained in place and played a key role in the development of community, particularly in the rural context.

15. R. Taylor, Jr., and R. Crandall, "Histories and Genealogists: An Emerging Community of Interest", in Taylor and Crandall (1986), 3-28.

Yet while completed genealogies can provide the kind of data that migration, community and transformation studies require, they can be criticized on several grounds as to their representativeness. By and large, genealogies are secondary compilations based on primary sources and many of the earlier genealogies are highly unreliable, reflecting the poor state of record collection techniques that existed in the past. The majority of published genealogies are often testimonies to social status and, in some cases, albeit a minority, religious or racial purity. This, of course, is changing with the growing interest in genealogy among other sectors of society. Recent genealogies are also much more reliable and detailed in nature as researchers take advantage of more sophisticated compilations of records (eg. the U.S. Soundex Index to the manuscript census) and expand their pedigree charts to include full scale biographies.

While case histories do not allow us to draw broad conclusions about societal processes, they nonetheless are illuminating and reveal much about the circumstances and consequences of migration, persistence and community development. These are some of the important themes addressed in my current research project, which involves an analysis of Anglo-Canadian migration to the United States at the turn of the twentieth century. Five well documented genealogies of Bay of Quinte families introduce different family groups who will serve as the *dramatis personae* of this monograph. These genealogies provide an opportunity to study the mobility experiences of pioneer eastern Ontario families and their descendants (over 900 descendant families) throughout the course of the nineteenth century) and, when linked with other records, allow us to follow the patterns of marriage, fertility and mortality, and trace land ownership and occupation over time. The experiences of these family groups, which are categorized into persisters (0 move outside their township or urban centre of birth), stayers (1 move), movers (2-5 moves) and chronic movers (6+ moves), following the example of Taylor,¹⁶ will provide insight into nineteenth-century persistence and mobility and allow us to identify and examine certain determinants of migration.

At the initial point of settlement during the 1780s and 1790s, a hierarchy of land owners was established among this predominantly Loyalist population. While field officers received 1,000 acres, privates were entitled to 100 acres only, which later increased to 200 acres. Non-Loyalists were also granted 200 acres although settlers were required to pay survey and settlement fees. The five families chosen represent this spectrum of landholding groups and, so, even though the sample is small, the members are relatively independent and fairly representative of that society at the beginning of settlement. One was an ensign who was granted 750 acres; two were privates

16. R. Taylor Jr., "The Olin Tribe: Migration, Mutual Aid and Solidarity of a Nineteenth Century Rural American Kin Group", unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Kent State University (1979).

who received 100 acres; the fourth was a sergeant who never received a grant in the Quinte area; and the last died in a loyalist refugee camp in Quebec before obtaining his grant.

Secondly, while legitimate concerns can be raised regarding the representativeness of a few published genealogies, they should not detract in any way from the value of the genealogical method to historical research as is so evident in Elliott's study. The longitudinal nature of genealogical information and the concern with synthesizing primary data from a wide array of sources in order to capture the specifics of lives within the context of kinship are what genealogy offers to historical research.

Upon examination of thirty different genealogies, both published and unpublished, I selected five which were most thorough in terms of geographical and biographical information and which satisfied the various criteria of representativeness. Unfortunately, none of these genealogies are complete. Missing and, in some cases, false genealogical information combined with the loss and destruction of personal sources (eg., assessment rolls, property records) in both Canada and the United States impeded the tracing procedure, hindering in particular the attempt to compare and contrast the economic status of persisters and movers.

Additional information on the five family groups has been collected from a variety of sources, including communication with the living authors of two of the five genealogies, and research trips to the American destinations of the descendants of the five progenitors. Much of the census information was collected from microfilmed manuscripts housed in the Burton Library in Detroit, Michigan, during 1985 and 1986. Further research will include a visit to the Genealogical Library in Salt Lake City to take advantage of the excellent genealogical sources available in the Family History Library operated by the Mormon Church.

This research note is intended to demonstrate the potential of genealogical research with reference to some preliminary analyses of two of the five genealogies selected for study. The analyses on occupational geographical pattern are suggestive and illustrate the possibilities of genealogies as bases for research beyond routinely-generated nominal sources. The two chosen families, the Mordens and the Denyees,¹⁷ were selected because their records were virtually complete, and because these two families started out in similar circumstances, making any analysis of differences between them relevant to the study of mobility and persistence.

17. Information on the Morden family was collected from two unpublished genealogies housed in the Lennox and Addington Historical Society Museum in Napanee, Ontario. The authors of these genealogies are unknown. Information on the Denyes family was collected from Drury Denyes, *The Denyes Family 1750-1982* (Bloomfield, Ontario: 1982). The Denyes genealogy is the only one of the five chosen for study that has been published.

Migration Patterns

Migration theory suggests that the migration fields of successive generations during the nineteenth century became much wider and more random as mobility aspirations and opportunities increased, and the association with families, friends and familiar institutions weakened.¹⁸ The number of descendants by generation for the Denyes and Morden families is shown in Table 1. The cumulative locations of the first- second- and third-generation sons and daughters are traced in Table 2.

The operational definition of migration for this study includes all movements outside the rural township or urban centre of birth. Migration is a difficult concept to define as it must be specified both temporally and spatially. This particular definition can be criticized for the fact that it considers short distance movement outside place of birth into an adjacent township as migration and yet a move covering a greater distance, but within the confines of that particular geopolitical unit as persistence. In the context of past rural life, even "local" moves were disruptive to some extent. Yet persistence in one's place of birth either meant continued residence at home or relocation within a relatively short distance from parents and friends, a proximity which played a very important role in the lives of individuals and families in past rural societies.

The detailed geographical data presented in the genealogies allows for insight into migration patterns. Migration has been viewed traditionally as a dramatic, disruptive experience with individuals either being "uprooted" or "pulled" from their homes by both exogenous and indigenous forces. Yet much recent work in social history and historical geography paints a very different picture of mobility. While the transition to capitalism was the central force in shaping group and individual behaviour, "revisionist" studies, such as John Bodnar's history of immigrants in nineteenth-century urban America,¹⁹ have emphasized the dimensions of individuals facing the processes of capitalism, industrialization and urbanism, and viewed mobility not necessarily as a disruptive experience, but often as a response conditioned by immediate goals of family-household welfare. The emphasis in this work is on the culture of everyday life, a culture which mediated between "the microscopic forces of daily life...and the macroscopic world of economic change and urban growth..."²⁰ The dynamic of industrial capitalism produced a variety of options for individuals and decisions were made to ensure order and stability both for themselves and their families. For many, geographical and occupational mobility was perceived as the best way to achieve stability while for others, order was best attained by persistence in both place and occupation.

18. Hudson (1976).

19. John Bodnar, *The Transplanted: A History of Immigrants in Urban America* (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1987).

20. *Ibid.*, 212.

In light of this new emphasis in historical research, the genealogical approach is valuable in discerning the strategies followed by individuals and families in response to the changes taking place not only in their own lives but in society as well. In terms of migration, the genealogical approach might enable us to determine whether patterns are to be seen as evidence of impressive migration at the long-distance intercontinental scale or of localized, almost "circular", patterns of regional migration. To this end, geographic patterns of migration will be presented and, then, an evaluation of the importance of certain factors which may have contributed to this migration will be attempted, following Taylor's argument that "socio-demographic profiles of movers and stayers provide keys to unlocking migration determinants."²¹

Tables 2 and 3 indicate the initial and final residences of both the Denyes and Morden families. All three sons of Martin Denyes settled close to each other in Thurlow Township, breaking off ties with their father's homestead in Fredericksburg Township. Martin had left his oldest son John 50 acres of the homestead in Fredericksburg with his choice as to whether to farm the front or the rear and, likewise, left the other 50 acres to his youngest boy Jacob. He also instructed John to pay the middle son, Peter, \$50 when he became of age. As Martin died comparatively young, John bore heavy responsibilities for the care of his brothers and sisters as well as his mother. This responsibility and the financial burden it entailed, combined with the rapid settlement and subsequent increasing prices of land in Fredericksburg, may have prevented John from expanding his farming operations and ultimately prompted him to dispose of his property in 1833, including some free grant land in Alwick Township. He moved immediately to Thurlow, a more recently settled township with lower land prices, and purchased 207 1/2 acres, significantly increasing his property. Both Peter and Jacob had made the move to Thurlow before their oldest brother and purchased land in the township, the former using money saved from farm labour to buy lot 13 in the 9th concession from the Canada Company in 1835, and the latter using the income of the sale of his Fredericksburg property to buy the northeast quarter of lot 7 in the 8th concession in 1826.²²

Thurlow would constitute the nucleus for the Denyes clan for the next two generations with almost 25 percent of the second generation and 10.4 percent of the third generation residing in that township. Yet there was significant movement out of the region among the second and third generation with the net result being the widening of the kin network. Over 82 percent and 78.5 percent of the second and third generations respectively moved outside the township or town of their birth. Just over 50 percent of the second generation moved elsewhere in the Quinte region while 22 percent moved

21. Taylor (1979), 98.

22. Information on land transfers was collected from individual deeds and the abstract index to deeds.

elsewhere in Ontario. Two-thirds of the second-generation Denyes migrants remained in the Quinte region upon leaving home.

Information about final residences of second-generation Denyes descendants indicates that the majority of those who initially moved elsewhere in the Quinte region continued to live there while a considerable proportion of those who initially moved elsewhere in Ontario emigrated to Michigan. This State became an important secondary centre of settlement for this family. Over 40 percent of the second generation moved out of the region. By the middle of the century, land was no longer readily available in this part of Ontario and farmers' sons intent on farming began to look elsewhere for land.

Third-generation Denyesses extended the migration network as more and more Quintean-born migrants joined their relatives in Michigan, western Ontario and New York and as a greater proportion moved directly to the interior of the United States to take advantage of new agricultural and commercial opportunities. Just over 25 percent relocated within the Quinte region and 20 percent moved to other parts of Ontario. If we subtract those descendants who did not leave their place of birth, then, almost 36 percent of the third-generation Denyes migrants moved initially to other townships and towns in the region while just over 28 percent of this same group made their final residence in the Quinte region.

The small group of six second-generation Denyes families who settled in various parts of Michigan expanded their numbers and branched into other parts of the State. From rural localities such as Caro and Greenbush, third-generation Denyesses moved into Detroit, Saginaw and other growing communities in the State, responding in part to increasing opportunities. Indeed, Michigan became a second core of settlement for the Denyesses and a 'jumping-off' point for the further expansion of the kin network west into Missouri, Kansas and California. The attraction of expanding industrial centres in nearby New York State (New York City, Utica) drew five Quintean-born Denyes families and created a new geographical branch of the family tree.

The Mordens, on the other hand, were a less peripatetic group than the Denyesses and displayed a much stronger attachment to the Quinte region over time. The four sons of the progenitor (no information exists for his only daughter) settled in Sophiasburg and Ameliasburg townships. Like the Denyes brothers who all settled within two miles of each other, the four Morden boys lived close to each other and Prince Edward County, known affectionately as "The Island" among locals, would form the dominant core for this family for the rest of the century.

The majority of second-generation Mordens did move out of the two townships of their birth, yet only one moved out of the Quinte region. Some of this group did eventually leave the region and move elsewhere in Ontario, particularly Bruce County, where newly opened land was selling cheaply. One

family moved to Utica, New York. But almost 80 percent of the second-generation Morden migrants continued to reside in the Quinte region permanently, a notable persistence when compared to the mobility figures calculated for Hamilton and Peel County during the mid-century period.²³

Even more striking is the attachment to the Quinte region displayed by the third generation of this family given the decline in the population during the latter part of the century. Over 60 percent of the third-generation Mordens, including both migrants and those who remained in their township of birth, never left the region. Almost 59 percent of this group moved elsewhere in the Quinte region upon first leaving home while only 11.4 percent moved to other parts of Ontario. Only one family moved initially to Michigan. Over 82 percent of the third generation whose migration destinations are known took up residence in the Quinte region upon leaving home. Some continued farming while others moved to nearby centres such as Picton, Napanee and Belleville. Some of this Quinte group eventually moved to other areas of Ontario, particularly the Toronto region, the Canadian west and Michigan and a small number dispersed throughout the United States. But no second nucleus of settlement would emerge for this group as for the Denyses.

The evidence presented in Table 4 suggests that the Mordens demonstrated a greater reluctance to move than the Denyses and a far greater attachment to both place of birth and local area, which, for most, was the Bay of Quinte region. The second generations of both families tended to make shorter distance moves than the third generations, and yet both the second- and third-generation Denyses were much more likely to make longer distance moves than their Morden counterparts. Males dominated long distance moves among both groups, particularly in the third generation, but at the same time, displayed a greater persistence than females, a pattern which may be explained partly by the patrilineal transfer of property.

This cursory examination suggests that chain migration and kin clustering played important roles in determining the migration patterns of both families. While the kin network remained particularly strong for the more persistent Mordens, evidence also suggests that the generationally-defined kin network continued to be an important factor in the lives of the more mobile Denyses.

The analysis of kinship and its role in mobility centers on the transfer of property, the sharing of residence and the giving of various forms of aid such as care for the elderly, gifts or loans of money, inheritance of real estate and capital, the provision of employment and the brokering of real estate. This study examines briefly the transfer of property through gift, sale and inheritance; the gift of capital through inheritance; and the sharing of residence.

23. See: Michael Katz, *The People of Hamilton, Canada West* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975); Gagan (1981).

The majority of first- and second-generation male Denyeeses acquired land from their fathers in one form or another while an overwhelming majority of the third generation did not partake in any type of property transfer with their parent. This is supported in Table 5 which reveals that only 16.1 percent of the Denyees third-generation males inherited, received or bought land from their folks as compared to 66.7 percent and 53.3 percent for the first- and second-generation males respectively. In total, 34 percent of the patrilineal Denyees males inherited, received or purchased land from their parents.

Unlike the Denyeeses, the majority of first- and second-generation Mordens did not become involved in some type of property transfer with their fathers. A slightly higher percentage of Mordens were involved in inter-generational property transmission in the third generation, the most common type of transfer being the sale of land (Table 5). Only 23.5 percent of the patrilineal Morden males inherited, received or purchased land from their parents and 80 percent of this group belong to the last category. By contrast, 66.7 percent of the Denyees who were involved in property transfer with parents inherited land.

Yet while the Denyeeses exhibited a greater involvement in property transfer with their parents, they were more mobile and less attached to the Quinte region than the Mordens. This mobility, however, did not necessarily result in the disruption of the family network as many relocated to where they had some family connection. The amount of land transferred between parent and child may explain the difference between the two family groups. Following this assumption, we would expect larger amounts of property to be transferred among the Mordens and, thus, ensure their greater persistence. Yet over 82 percent of the properties transferred among the Mordens were less than 100 acres in size as compared to 58 percent for the Denyeeses. Thus, size of property transferred between father and son was not a factor in explaining the greater persistence among Mordens.

There were other types of kinship assistance besides the transfer of real estate which may have played a role in ensuring persistence. An examination of the probate records in the Ontario archives revealed 13 wills for the Morden families and 7 wills for the Denyeeses. In total, the Denyees wills included 53 transfers while the Morden wills included 81 transfers. Besides, inheritance of property, gifts of money, gifts of personal property, provision for education costs and assignment of power to kin to dispose of property were also included in these documents. Ten of the transfers included in the Denyees wills were between husbands and wives and of this number, 4 involved personal goods, 2 involved gifts of money, 2 involved inheritance of land and 2 included transfer of the right to dispose of property. Twenty of the transfers were between father and sons with 8 involving transfer of property, 7 involving inheritance of money, 3 including the right to dispose of property, 1 involving the provision of funds for education and another one involving the transfer of personal property. Fourteen of the transfers were between father and daughter

and of this number, 9 pertained to gifts of personal goods and 5 involved gifts of money. Only 1 of the Denyes transfers was between husband and wife and this related to the inheritance of property. Five of the transfers were between mother and daughter and all of these involved gifts of money. Finally, 3 of the Denyes transfers included those between grandmother and grandchildren and all of these involved gifts of money.

Ten of the Morden transfers were between husband and wife and 4 involved personal goods, 4 related to inheritance of property and 2 involved transfer of power to dispose of land. Sixteen of the transfers were between fathers and sons and of this number, 7 involved inheritance of land, 4 related to gifts of personal property, 3 involved money and 2 included the power to dispose of property. Twenty-four of the Morden transfers were between fathers and daughters with 11 involving personal goods, 9 involving money and 4 relating to land. Eleven of the Morden transfers were between grandfather and grandchildren with 6 relating to money, 3 involving personal goods and 2 involving the provision of education costs. Eight of the transfers were between brother and brother with 3 related to money, another 3 involving the power to dispose of property and 2 involving the transfer of land. Five of the transfers were between brother and sister, 3 involving money and 2 pertaining to land. Four of the transfers were between brother-in-law and sister-in-law with 2 related to money and 1 involving land. Three of the transfers were split evenly between brothers-in-law, uncle and niece, and son and mother and they all involved the transfer of money.

The proportions associated with type of transfer were almost identical for both families, but they differed in terms of the incidence of transfer among kin. Transfers between fathers and sons were much more common among the Denyeses than the Mordens, but the latter showed a much wider diversity in the transfer of aid among kin. The evidence in Table 6 shows that the second-generation Morden patrilineal males were much more likely to buy and sell property from relatives than their Denyes counterparts.

Why did the Mordens display a greater propensity to transfer real and personal property beyond the nuclear family? They did not own significantly greater amounts of land than the Denyeses and, so, their persistence cannot be linked to a legacy of landed wealth. The evidence presented from the analysis of wills and property records suggests that the Mordens experienced closer associations with members of their extended family while the Denyeses provided as well as they could for their nuclear families. Analysis of the property records also shows that the Denyeses in the Quinte region were over 200 times more likely to sell parcels of land than the Mordens and it was the most active land dealers who were more likely to be geographically mobile. Yet they were not a landed upper class with vast amounts of property which they could place on the market. Instead, many Denyeses chose to play the great Upper Canadian land game, buying and selling land in order to either improve their farming effort or make enough capital to allow them to move on. The

Mordens, on the other hand, were more conservative in their land dealings, their occupational diversity and their geographical behaviour.

A detailed investigation of the landholding and mobility histories of the John Denyes branch shows a relatively high degree of continuity in the transmission of family property among this group as 34 percent of the male descendants inherited, received or purchased land from their parents. This figure is even higher if we consider first and second generations only. No one system of inheritance dominated the John Denyes branch. In some cases, estates were left to one principal heir while in others, property was devised upon one, two or even more heirs who in turn were legally responsible to satisfy the demands made by the deceased for the provision of his remaining dependents. In general, the Denyeses followed a variation of the English Canadian inheritance system described by Gagan,²⁴ but other types of land transfers were as prevalent as inheritance. In many cases, parents required some financial compensation when transferring property over to children. Yet by the latter part of the century, most of the Denyes fathers in Ontario were no longer able to enter into any type of transfer relationship with their offspring, reflecting their inability to provide sufficient land in the face of unfavourable human/land ratios. Some fathers attempted to preserve family solidarity by selling their property and moving to new agricultural frontiers where land was available and cheap. But many second-generation Denyes families remained in place, ensuring that their children would be largely on their own upon their coming of age. Yet they were not cast adrift to face the cruel world alone; the practice of chain migration so evident for this group meant that for many Denyeses, a network of kinship support existed not only in the local region but elsewhere throughout Canada and the United States as well.

Although the evidence demonstrates a strong relationship between the acquisition of family land and persistence in one's native township, that relationship was not absolute. Eight out of twelve of the second- and third-generation males who received, inherited or purchased property remained in the same township as their parents. Yet the examination of the John Denyes line shows that property transfer did not always ensure persistence and that the non-existence of such transfers did not always ensure turnover. Despite the fact that the majority of the descendants did not enter into any type of property transfer with their parents, 42 percent of the third-generation Denyes males continued to live in the Quinte region.

Occupation and Migration

Several factors play a role in migration selectivity, but our attention here is directed only towards occupation. Table 7 shows that farming continued to be the major functional occupation of the Denyes and Morden males although

24. D. Gagan, "The Indivisibility of Land: A Microstudy of the System of Inheritance in Nineteenth Century Ontario", *Journal of Economic History*, 36, 1 (1976), 126-141.

a considerable number of descendants, especially in the third generation, were employed in other fields. Our examination is limited to males only as the overwhelming majority of females in both families (91% of the Denyees and 95.1% of the Mordens) worked within their own households and were directed in terms of migration by decisions made largely by husbands and fathers even though, in some cases, migrating families moved to join the wife's relations or maternal relations. These questions are addressed: did migration rates vary with major occupation? Should we expect stationary families to be most heavily committed to farming while frequent movers to display greater flexibility in occupation? Major occupation is defined as that in which the subject spent the majority of his working years. The greatest problem with this analysis relates to the question of whether mobility or occupation is the dependent variable. In other words, did one move to change jobs or change jobs in order to move?

Second-generation figures show that persister/stayer groups were most tied to farming for both families although the Denyes movers group was more prone to be employed in a trades position and just as likely to own a business or be employed in a clerical position as to take up farming. Morden movers also displayed some movement into semi-skilled and clerical positions as well although the vast majority of this group remained in farming. The second-generation movers in both families were more likely to change occupations than persisters and stayers. This was particularly true for the more peripatetic Denyes group. A higher mobility rate meant a greater likelihood that an individual would be employed in more than one occupation.

Greater movement out of farming for both family groups is evident among third-generation males. This is especially noticeable for the Denyees where the mover group was much more likely to move into other occupations than the persisters and stayers groups. Of particular note was the tendency for the Denyes movers to take up semi-skilled and skilled occupations, especially those who moved to Michigan, not a surprising fact given the development of that State's industrial base towards the end of the century. This group also showed some movement into business ownership and clerical occupations.

Third-generation Denyes persisters showed considerable movement into commercial dealings and private land dealings. Persistence in place, perhaps afforded by land acquisition or some other basis, might have enabled these individuals to garner enough capital to enter into such ventures although Quinte persisters faced a local economy struggling with sluggish growth and periods of real decline. Also interesting is the fact that a considerable proportion of stayers as well as movers had three or more occupations, again perhaps a reflection of economic instability for those who remained in the Quinte region.

The third-generation Mordens were more tied to farming than their Denyes counterparts, especially those who persisted in place. As shown previously, only a small percentage of Mordens inherited, received or

purchased land from their parents and yet, they continued to demonstrate a significance persistence in place and persistence in farming. Almost one-half of the Morden stayers, who for the most part remained in the Quinte region after their one and only move, undertook a semi-skilled or skilled trade in nearby communities such as Picton, Deseronto and Napanee. A considerable percentage of the movers group entered the professions or started a business. Generally, the Mordens displayed occupational stability even among the more geographically mobile members.

Persisters were most likely in both families to carry on farming while the more frequent movers were more likely to pursue other occupations and change jobs more often. Yet the Mordens were notably stable in terms of occupation. The positive association between frequency of migration and number of occupations for the Denyees suggests a career instability among frequent movers and that the fundamental reason for moving was to change jobs. The very weak association between migration and occupational rates among the Mordens suggests that for this group, other factors besides the pursuit of another career may have played a role in migration. One might note here that the assumption of considerable occupational change in the last century is not supported in these two cases; Katz's diary writer, Wilson Benson, was not like most members of these two families.²⁵ Does this mean Benson was an exception or that the occupational mobility experiences of the Denyees and Mordens were unrepresentative? These data are too limited to bear wide generalizations, but their differences from the well-known Katz example conjure up a number of interesting questions.

All of the second-generation Denyees who chose to continue farming upon first leaving home remained in the Quinte region. Those who practiced a trade after leaving home located elsewhere in the Quinte region, other parts of Ontario and Michigan while the two individuals who occupied a clerical position remained in the Quinte region. One Denyee became a merchant and moved to southwestern Ontario. The second-generation Mordens who continued farming after leaving their township of birth remained for the most part within the Quinte region. The other two Mordens who chose not to pursue farming, but instead practiced a trade and occupied a clerical position also moved within the Quinte region.

Of the eleven third-generation Denyees who continued to farm upon leaving home, 23.4 percent of the total number of migrants, eight continued to do so in the region while the remaining three men moved directly to southwestern Ontario, Missouri and Kansas. The latter two individuals left their parents' residence in Michigan. Ten of the Denyees third generation chose to pursue a trade upon leaving home and decided to do so elsewhere in Ontario in centres like Toronto and in Michigan in cities such as Detroit and Saginaw.

25. M. Katz, *The People of Hamilton, Canada West* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975).

Only one Denyes undertook a trade within the Quinte region while over eleven pursued a clerical position within the region, elsewhere in Ontario, New York and Michigan. Ten entered business after leaving home with the majority doing so within the region or elsewhere in Ontario. Three Denyeses pursued a profession, two becoming doctors and the other a minister, and all located in the Midwest while the two labourers, whose parents had earlier moved to Michigan, remained in that State.

Agriculture continued to play an important role in the lives of the third-generation Mordens as 31 or 54 percent of the third-generation migrants farmed after leaving home. Twenty-four of this group remained in the Quinte region and the remaining seven farmed elsewhere in Ontario, primarily in Bruce County, demonstrating the importance of kin in relocation. Eight of the third-generation Mordens took up a trade and the majority remained in the region. Nine entered business and of this group, all but one stayed in the region. The few who became manufacturers, professionals or worked as unskilled labourers also remained in the region.

Only five of the second-generation Denyeses who continued to farm after settling in their final place of residence (61.5% of the total) remained in the Quinte region. The remainder settled in New York, Michigan and California. One-half of the second-generation Denyeses who took up a trade (15.4% of the total) ended up in New York (Utica, New York City) while the other half settled in Michigan (Detroit, Saginaw). The two Denyeses who occupied clerical positions settled in the Quinte region and Michigan while the one Denyes male who became a merchant eventually settled in California.

The fact that over 30 percent of the third-generation Denyes males farmed after settling as compared to only 23 percent who farmed upon first leaving home indicates that for some, migration and pursuing another occupation were temporary stages in their plans to eventually settle and resume farming. Of this group, ten last resided in the Quinte region while the remainder were scattered throughout the Canadian west and the American Midwest. Eleven of the third-generation Denyeses undertook some trade upon settling and, except for one, relocated in other areas of Ontario, Michigan and throughout the Midwest. The eleven Denyeses who were employed in clerical capacities (20.8% of the total) were distributed widely throughout North America with only one remaining in the Quinte region. Ten third-generation Denyes males operated a business after settling and of this group, only two remained in the Quinte region, four lived elsewhere in Ontario, and the remainder lived elsewhere in the U.S. The two doctors settled in the Midwest while the minister established his practice in Washington State. The two unskilled labourers continued to live and work in Michigan.

Twenty-seven or almost 53 percent of the Mordens continued to farm after settling permanently, but of this group, only 16 remained in the Quinte region. Some who farmed in the region after leaving home later moved away and pursued some other occupation. Those third-generation Mordens who

practiced a trade or owned a business continued to reside primarily in the Quinte region, unlike their Denyes counterparts, but of the 7 men entering the professions (13.7% of the total), only 3 stayed in the area while the remaining 4 settled elsewhere in Ontario and in Michigan.

Whether the positive association between migration and occupation rates reflects an upward socioeconomic mobility or a socioeconomic instability among more frequent movers is, unfortunately, a question that cannot be answered given the paucity of information on wealth. Case studies of individual Denyes and Morden descendants which do contain limited information on status indicate that wealth accrued to both persisters and movers, but space does not permit a detailed discussion of these life histories. Yet mention can be made of the second- and third-generation Mordens who continued to live in Ontario and farmed in 1861. The manuscript agricultural census of that year contains information on total cash values of farms and, thus, allows a comparison of farm value by migration frequency for the group who demonstrated greater persistence in both farming and residence within Ontario. The one second-generation Morden whose farm was worth over \$10,000 in 1861 only moved once in his life. Fifty-four percent of the second-generation Mordens had farms valued at between \$5,000 and \$10,000 and of this group, 50 percent were persisters, 33.3 percent moved only once and 16.7 percent moved between two and five times. Just over 27 percent had farms worth between \$2,500 and \$5,000 and of this group, 33.3 percent were persisters, 33.3 percent were stayers and 33.3 percent were movers. The one farm that was valued under \$2,500 was owned by a Morden who had moved four times during his lifetime.

Twenty percent of the third-generation Mordens who owned farms in 1861 were in the \$5,000 to \$10,000 category and of this group, 33.3 percent were persisters and 66.7 percent were stayers. Of one-third in the \$2,500 to \$5,000 category, 60 percent were persisters and 40 percent stayers. Almost 47 percent had farms valued between \$500 and \$2,500 and of this number, 14.3 percent were persisters, 57.1 percent were stayers, 14.3 percent were movers, and another 14.3 percent were chronic movers. This is evidence of a weak negative relationship between value of farm and frequency of movement, but the association is not significant. For some members of the third generation, the 1861 value only represents an assessment based on a limited time in farming and, thus, little of significance can be made of these statistics.

In summary, the Morden case shows neatly, although only illustratively, how a single genealogy raises questions about the selection of persistence and landed inheritance. Yet the tables also reveal the potentially idiosyncratic results of one or two genealogies with respect to occupation, migration and settlement. The results can only show the variety of factors and patterns relating to the study of mobility at the micro-level and illustrate the richness of detail that can be achieved through a linkage strategy based on genealogies.

Conclusions

It should be emphasized that the genealogical approach to the study of rural transformation and migration is valuable only when placed in a far larger body of data about people and land in the Quinte region. Yet "representative" genealogies, as defined previously, make it possible to reconstruct the spatial patterns for successive generations of migrants and persisters. Especially notable among the general findings concerning migration patterns were the interrelated aspects of chain migration and kin clustering, particularly among the Denyeses, and the remarkable persistence and attachment to the Bay of Quinte region displayed by the Morden family. The study suggests that native Quinteans participated in the continental westward movement not only at the international and interprovincial levels, but also at the intra-provincial and local levels. The cumulative pattern of intra-regional flows exhibited by the first-generation Morden and Denyes families underlines the importance of short-distance moves in the frontier context. The short distance nature of movement continued into the second and third generations among nuclear families even though the span of the migration increased. This pattern can be described as a spread of the genealogical rather than the nuclear family.

The longitudinal perspective afforded by the genealogical approach revealed that the Mordens displayed a greater geographical and occupational persistence than the Denyeses in spite of the lower degree of intergenerational property transfer through inheritance, gift and sale taking place among the nuclear families of the former group. The qualitative dimension of attachment to place is almost impossible to ascertain given the lack of appropriate sources (eg., letters, diaries), but analysis of the deed books suggests that the Mordens were more likely to transfer real and personal property beyond the nuclear family than the Denyeses. The latter were much more active in their land dealings within their nuclear families and with others and yet, kinship continued to play an important factor in their decisions as to where to relocate.

Upon examination of other individual and family-specific factors for their possible influence on migration, only sex, age, family size, occupation and the transfer of aid and property among kin played significant roles. The sex, age and occupational differentials in migration displayed by both families correspond to migration theory although the Mordens were surprisingly persistent through all age, sex and occupational groups. Frequent movement was associated unexpectedly with larger family sizes, although further discussion is beyond the scope of this research note. Finally, there is some reason to believe that the more prevalent tendency to provide aid and buy and sell property among kin displayed by the Mordens may have played a significant role in ensuring persistence. Yet while family strategies for property transmission helped to assure persistence, many other factors including quantity of land, size of property, marriage patterns and family size are also important in the analysis of continuity and change in the Quinte region.

The penultimate question of mobility research, that of whether persisters or movers were more successful, remains largely unanswered because of the lack of data on wealth. But some inferences can be made based on the available information. Persisters in both families were more likely to carry on farming and work as unskilled labourers while frequent movers were more likely to pursue other occupations and change jobs more often. Little of significance can be stated about the relationship between persisters and socioeconomic mobility. While movement into the potentially higher status professions was associated with more frequent mobility among the Mordens, no such discernible relationship existed for the Denyes group.

Even if we had information on wealth, this would by no means ensure that we could identify those who were successful and those who failed. There are other criteria of success besides wealth that should be considered and yet will forever remain hidden to the researcher's eyes. The numerous criteria which must be considered when assigning the label of success can only be ascertained at the individual level following the life history approach. At the same time, individual life histories have to be placed in the context of the society in which they are a part in order to more effectively identify success. While wealth and status information for some stayers and movers in both families is available, until enough information is collected to develop an appreciation of the meaning of success and failure in a region which experienced both continuity and change, any judgment will be biased to an unacceptable degree.

This research note is intended only to demonstrate the potential of this genealogical-based linkage approach and care must be taken not to overextend the comparison of these two genealogies. Five cases will provide a more credible basis for analysis. This will be a difficult and time-consuming task, but the ambitious blending of the horizontal and longitudinal approaches in order to understand individual and family behaviour is a legitimate and valuable strategy in which to appreciate the dimensions of persistence and mobility through the context of changes occurring in nineteenth-century society.

Table 1 **Number of Descendants by Generation:
Denyes and Morden Families**

Generation	Denyes				Morden			
	Males		Females		Males		Females	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
First	3	75.0	1	25.0	4	100	0	0
Second	17	41.46	24	58.54	20	68.97	9	31.03
Third	70	47.30	78	52.70	79	50.0	79	50.0
Total	90	46.64	103	53.37	103	53.93	88	46.07

Source: unpublished Morden family genealogy (Lennox and Addington Historical Society Museum, Napanee, Ontario); Drury Denyes, *The Denyes Family, 1750-1982* (Bloomfield, Ontario, 1982).

Table 2

**Initial Residence by Generation:
Denyes and Morden Families**

Initial Destination	Denyes						Morden					
	First		Second		Third		First		Second		Third	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Quinte Region	3	75.0	22	53.66	38	25.68	4	100	24	82.76	93	58.86
Elsewhere in Ontario	0	0	9	21.95	30	20.27	0	0	1	3.45	18	11.39
Manitoba	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Alberta	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
British Columbia	0	0	0	0	2	1.35	0	0	0	0	1	0.63
New York	0	0	0	0	5	3.38	0	0	0	0	0	0
Michigan	0	0	1	2.44	14	9.46	0	0	0	0	1	0.63
California	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kansas	0	0	0	0	5	3.38	0	0	0	0	0	0
Missouri	0	0	0	0	4	2.70	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mid-Atlantic	0	0	1	2.44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Midwest	0	0	0	0	5	3.38	0	0	0	0	0	0
Southwest	0	0	0	0	1	0.68	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pacific Northwest	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Elsewhere	0	0	0	0	2	1.35	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not leave home ¹	0	0	7	17.07	29	19.59	0	0	4	13.79	28	17.72
Unknown	1	25.0	1	2.44	13	8.79	0	0	0	0	17	10.76
Total	4	100	41	100	148	100	4	100	29	100	158	100

1. Includes those who continued to reside at home for the remainder of their lives.

Source: see table 1.

Table 3 **Final Residence by Generation:
Denyes and Morden Families**

Final Destination	Denyes						Morden					
	First		Second		Third		First		Second		Third	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Quinte Region	3	75.0	18	43.90	32	21.62	4	100	19	65.52	72	45.57
Elsewhere in Ontario	0	0	4	9.76	30	20.27	0	0	4	13.79	21	13.29
Manitoba	0	0	0	0	2	1.35	0	0	0	0	2	1.27
Alberta	0	0	0	0	1	0.68	0	0	0	0	1	0.63
British Columbia	0	0	0	0	3	2.03	0	0	0	0	0	0
New York	0	0	1	2.4	5	3.38	0	0	1	3.45	2	1.27
Michigan	0	0	6	14.63	16	10.81	0	0	0	0	6	3.80
California	0	0	2	4.88	1	0.68	0	0	0	0	1	0.63
Kansas	0	0	1	2.44	5	3.38	0	0	0	0	0	0
Missouri	0	0	0	0	1	0.68	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mid-Atlantic	0	0	0	0	1	0.68	0	0	0	0	0	0
Midwest	0	0	1	2.44	9	6.08	0	0	0	0	1	0.63
Southwest	0	0	0	0	4	2.70	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pacific Northwest	0	0	0	0	2	1.35	0	0	0	0	2	1.27
Elsewhere	0	0	0	0	2	1.35	0	0	0	0	1	0.63
Not leave home ¹	0	0	7	17.07	29	19.59	0	0	4	13.79	28	17.72
Unknown	1	25.0	1	2.44	5	3.38	0	0	1	3.45	21	13.29
Total	4	100	41	100	148	100	4	100	29	100	158	100

1. Includes those who continued to reside at home for the remainder of their lives.

Source: see table 1.

Table 4 A Comparison of Generational Mobility by Type of Move Over a Lifetime:¹
Denyes and Morden Families²

Generation		% Local[1]	% Intra-Prov /State[2]	% Inter-Prov /State[3]	% [1]+[2]	% [1]+[3]	% [2]+[3]	% Not move ³	% Unknown
a) Denyes	First (4)	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
	Second (37)	45.95	13.51	16.22	8.11	2.70	2.70	10.81	0
	Third (128)	26.56	16.41	21.88	3.91	3.91	7.81	10.16	9.28
Males	First	(3) 100	(0) 0	(0) 0	(0) 0	(0) 0	(0) 0	(0) 0	(0) 1
	Second	(6) 40.0	(2) 13.33	(3) 20.0	(1) 6.67	(0) 0	(1) 6.67	(1) 13.33	(0) 0
	Third	(11) 17.74	(14) 22.58	(17) 27.42	(3) 4.84	(2) 3.23	(2) 3.23	(9) 14.52	(4) 6.45
Females	First	(0) 0	(0) 0	(0) 0	(0) 0	(0) 0	(0) 0	(0) 0	(0) 100
	Second	(11) 50.0	(3) 13.64	(3) 13.64	(2) 9.09	(1) 4.55	(0) 0	(0) 9.09	(1) 0
	Third	(23) 34.85	(7) 10.61	(11) 16.67	(2) 3.03	(3) 4.55	(8) 12.23	(4) 6.06	(8) 12.12
b) Morden	First (4)	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	25
	Second (29)	65.52	6.90	0	3.45	6.90	0	13.79	3.45
	Third (144)	24.31	5.56	5.56	6.25	1.39	2.78	36.81	17.36
Males	First	(0) 0	(0) 0	(0) 0	(0) 0	(4) 100	(0) 0	(0) 0	(0) 0
	Second	(13) 65	(2) 10	(3) 0	(1) 5	(1) 5	(0) 0	(3) 15	(0) 0
	Third	(13) 18.10	(5) 6.94	(6) 8.33	(6) 8.33	(1) 1.39	(3) 4.17	(29) 40.28	(9) 12.50
Females	First	(0) 0	(0) 0	(0) 0	(0) 0	(0) 0	(0) 0	(0) 0	(0) 0
	Second	(6) 66.7	(0) 0	(0) 0	(0) 0	(1) 11.1	(0) 0	(1) 11.1	(1) 11.1
	Third	(22) 30.56	(3) 4.17	(2) 2.78	(3) 4.17	(1) 1.39	(1) 1.39	(24) 33.33	(16) 22.22

1. Type of move descendant tended to make over the course of his or her lifetime.

2. Includes descendants who lived past the age of 20.

3. Continue to reside in township or urban centre of birth.

N.B. Absolute numbers in brackets.

Source: see table 1.

Table 5 Inter-Generational Property Transmission Within Ontario: Denyes and Morden Families¹

Generational Transfer ²	Inheritance		Type of Transfer				No Transfer	
	No.	%	Gift No.	Gift %	Sale No.	Sale %	No.	%
a) Denyes Progenitor- 1st generation	2	66.7	0	0	0	0	1	33.3
1st generation- 2d generation	6	40.0	1	6.7	1	6.7	7	46.7
2d generation- 3d generation	1	3.2	0	0	4	12.9	26	83.9
b) Morden Progenitor- 1st generation	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	100
1st generation- 2d generation	0	0	0	0	4	22.2	14	77.8
2d generation- 3d generation	3	4.8	1	1.6	12	19.0	47	74.6

1. Patrilineal descent.

2. Transfers between father and surviving sons.

Source: see table 1.

Table 6 Percent Buying and Selling Land by Second Generation Patrilineal Males: Denyes and Morden Families

Kin Position	Sold		Bought	
	Denyes	Morden	Denyes	Morden
Parent	0	0	33.3	28.6
Sibling	20.0	36.8	33.3	50.0
Children	80.0	63.2	0	7.1
Grandparent	0	0	0	0
Aunt, uncle	0	0	33.3	0
Niece, nephew	0	0	0	0
Cousin	0	0	0	0
In-law	0	0	0	14.3
Grandchild	0	0	0	0
N =	5	19	3	14

Source: see table 1.

Table 7 Major Occupation and Occupation Rate by Migration Frequency:
Denyes and Morden Families*

Migration Rate**		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	1-2	3+
a) Denyes											
i Second generation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1	88.9	0	11.1	0	0	0	0	0	100	0
	2-5	20.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	0	0	0	0	57.1	42.9
	> 6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ii Third generation	0	41.7	0	0	16.7	0	8.3	8.3	25.0	88.9	11.1
	1	41.7	12.5	25.0	8.3	0	4.2	8.3	0	65.2	34.8
	2-5	10.0	35.0	25.0	25.0	0	5.0	0	0	72.2	27.8
	> 6	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
b) Morden											
i Second generation	0	83.3	0	0	0	0	0	16.7	0	100	0
	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	0
	2-5	75.0	12.5	12.5	0	0	0	0	0	87.5	12.5
	> 6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ii Third generation	0	67.6	2.9	0	14.7	0	2.9	8.8	2.9	88.9	11.1
	1	42.6	42.9	0	14.3	0	0	0	0	100	0
	2-5	50.0	9.1	0	13.6	4.5	22.7	0	0	90.5	9.5
	>6	50.0	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	0

Occupational Categories

1-farmer

2-semi-skilled and skilled trades

3-clerical/public service

4-business owner

5-manufacturer

6-professional

7-unskilled labour (farm and urban)

8-private, gentleman, speculator, etc.

* Includes male descendants who lived past the age of 20 and whose occupations are known.

** Number of moves.

Source: see table 1.