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EDITORIAL

Fees for Searches in Parish Registers

In the last number of this magazine we reproduced the text of a letter concerned with proposed increases in fees, and sent by a number of persons representing learned societies, academic and teaching institutions and bodies concerned with archive administration together with some distinguished individuals – as the result of a meeting called by LPS and chaired by David Avery of our editorial board.

Although the earliest news we received about the reception accorded to the letter by officials in Church House gave us some grounds for hope, time passed and the momentum seemed to have been lost.

Dr. Alan Rogers, a member of the Synod (who had been away in Australia at the time of the discussions organised by LPS) then produced on behalf of the executive of the Standing Conference for Local History – which had felt unable to subscribe to the letter – a detailed series of proposals aimed at providing both for the proper care of a wide range of parish records (not just registers) and also the provision of proper access to them at moderate fees where these are now chargeable and which most users of parish records would find acceptable.

The SCLH then circulated these proposals to a number of interested bodies and persons for comment, and in consequence of the replies received has called a meeting which will take place while we are going to press and which will be attended by a member of our editorial board.

Meanwhile the council of the British Records Association has given further thought to the matter and is preparing a paper to be submitted to Synod in early June, commenting further on the proposals contained in the original Church report which sparked off this controversy and offering assistance to resolve the problems presented by the care and custody of parochial records.

We cannot of course reproduce or comment (at this stage) on the SCLH or BRA draft proposals. Nor can we anticipate the final outcome in Synod. We are pleased, however, that many organisations and individuals have expressed sympathy with the views which were first expressed in LPS and have felt able (either in co-operation with others or individually) to register their protests at the proposed new scale of charges and to suggest alternative ways which the Church can adopt in trying to tackle the problems caused by its trusteeship of parish records. We hope that the Church of England will respond to these initiatives. A further report will be given in the next issue of LPS.

David Avery
Colin Barham
Christopher Charlton
Roger Schofield
Derek Turner
Richard Wall
Postscript to the problem of fees and parish-register searches

Since the above item was written, a meeting has been held, called by the Standing Conference on Local History, to consider proposals contained in a paper written by Dr Alan Rogers of the University of Nottingham and a member of the Synod of the Church of England. Attending the meeting were Dr Rogers (in the chair) and representatives of the Society of Antiquaries (Dr Taylor), the Institute of Historical Research (Professor Pugh), the Society of Genealogists (Mr Camp), Local Population Studies (David Avery), the Local History Tutors Conference, (Christopher Charlton), the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure (Dr Roger Schofield), and the Council for Places of Worship (Mr Mandeville). In addition the British Records Association sent two observers (Miss Sinar and Dr Parker), and Miss Betty Miller of the SCLH acted as secretary.

Dr Roger's paper (written for the SCLH) considered the whole range of parish records, the problems facing the Church and clergy as well as those facing the user-historian, and contained a number of recommendations which the Standing Conference was thinking of making to the Synod. These were:

(a) that clergy should receive training in the care of parish records and their significance for the historian;

(b) that all parishes whose records have not been deposited in an approved repository should be asked to deposit them or to make out a case for their retention in the parish accompanied by a statement about the provisions to be made for their care and access;

(c) that where a parish wished to keep the records in its own keeping then they should be listed by a designated archivist and a microfilm of such records as the archivist recommended should be deposited with the repository;

(d) that where records are deposited, the parish should be encouraged to acquire a facsimile copy to be retained in the parish;

(e) that in order to finance these proposals small fees (in the region of 25p to 50p a day should be charged for consultation of records kept either in the parish or in a record office;

(f) that records retained in parishes should be subject to compulsory inspection every five years and that additional articles should be added to the archdeacon's triennial visitation to ensure that such inspections are carried out.

In the course of the discussion at the meeting it emerged that, unless the Synod reconsiders the matter, then by February of 1975 it is highly likely that the proposals contained in the controversial report to Synod (suggesting increased fees amounting to as much as £5 a day for parish register consultation, with the express intention of deterring historical research) will have come into effect, with any question of exemption from fees being left to the discretion of individual dioceses. The view was expressed that any attempt to legislate for compulsory deposit of records would be resisted strenuously by the Church and also result in the records passing into private hands within parishes in an attempt to avoid their deposit.
It was emphasised that 50 per cent of parishes have already deposited their registers and that in the majority of cases no fees are charged for searches in these. Any attempt to force such fees on the record offices where they do not exist would, it was felt, be opposed by the archivists who already provide the Church with a free service in caring for deposited records. Moreover it was argued that it would be illegal for the Church to attempt to collect any fees for searches into the civil papers which constitute a large bulk of parish records.

The great problem, the majority of those at the meeting felt, lay in the matter of micro-filming records. Archivists would be opposed to removing the bindings of registers to enable microfilming to be done, and the raising of the large funds necessary for the purpose presented difficulties which (it was suggested) could not be met by the imposition of consultation fees. It was agreed that various charitable bodies might well be approached to be asked to finance this work where it can be done without damaging the original records.

Those attending the meeting were completely agreed on the need to resist the exploitation of scholarship and welcomed the proposals of the SCLH for visitations to enquire into the keeping of records and five-yearly inspections. It was also agreed that every encouragement should be given to individual parishes to deposit their records and that this matter should be drawn to the attention of the annual conference of the diocesan advisory committees this summer. It was also felt essential that there should be consultation by the Church with a wide number of bodies representing the users of these records, to provide a formula whereby the needs of the clergy and historians can be reconciled in the best interests of both; and that in order to give time for such consultation, the Synod should be asked to renew the existing measure with effect from next February rather than to introduce the controversial proposals which are now under scrutiny.
NEWS FROM THE CAMBRIDGE GROUP
FOR THE HISTORY OF POPULATION AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE

Since the last issue of Local Population Studies the Cambridge Group has undergone an important change in status and in its relation with the Social Science Research Council. In the middle of 1974 it ceased being a research programme financed ad hoc by the SSRC and became a Research Unit of the Council. A unit is an ongoing research institution, established for work in a field where long-term commitments are a major ingredient and where service functions to other persons may be performed by its members. Those directing the research of such a unit, and taking part in its operations, are relieved of a substantial part of their teaching duties if they are in universities, and become professional employees of the Council itself.

In the case of the Cambridge Group Tony Wrigley and Roger Schofield will now be working full-time on the Group's undertakings, while Peter Laslett will continue to divide his time between the University and the Group. The form which the organisation will take under this new dispensation will, however, remain almost entirely as it now is for the full seven year period for which our lease of life has been initially guaranteed, and thereafter if it should be renewed.

There are only a few research units under the SSRC, and they have been modelled to some extent upon the successful, and in some cases world famous, units which have been run for the last generation or so by the Medical Research Council. Apart from the very important asset of permanency the change of status will mean that our research will go on at a faster pace, that it will embrace topics which so far we have only been able to define or touch upon superficially, and that everything we do will have greater resources devoted to it.

It has been a complicated process to develop from a very modest beginning in the early 1960s, when we were receiving £100 or so in a year for the part-time research activities of a handful of people, into a fully-fledged institutionalised research organisation. It will take a little while, therefore, before we can fill out the greater space which we are now to occupy, and plan our research, publications and other activities accordingly. But it is certain that our relationship with people working in the field of historical demography and social structure will be intensified, as will the services which we make available to them either directly or through the pages of Local Population Studies.

We fully recognise that to a large extent we owe this success to the voluntary efforts which have made our current research programme a possibility. We should like to thank everyone who has supplied us with information, or who has contributed analyses of parish registers and other materials to add to our files. We shall go on being the body of persons we now are, although further appointments will be a possibility for us and these will be made during the course of this year.
One of them will be a replacement, if such a thing is possible, for Karla Oosterveen, who was the first person employed in the research work of the Cambridge Group, and who has now retired from full-time duties with us. She will, we are glad to say, be continuing to work in the office and her particular job is looking after our side of Local Population Studies. Apart from her invaluable contributions to the Group’s research, she has been responsible for organising our research materials and for administering our multifarious activities. We are much in her debt. Apart from her successor we shall also appoint a demographer with mathematical interests and a historical social scientist.

There are two further items of information which the readers may like to know about, and both of them concern conferences. There will be this summer a meeting concerned firstly with what is called microsimulation by computer, and secondly with mathematical applications to historical sociology in general. This will take place in Cambridge in early July, under the auspices of the SSRC, and will be run by a close associate of the Cambridge Group, Kenneth Wachter of St. Catherine’s College, Oxford. This topic is of growing significance to all those with our interests, professional or otherwise, and it is hoped that a straightforward description of how it fits into the work in which we are all engaged will be published in a later number of Local Population Studies.

The second conference is a more ambitious affair, which is at the moment only in the early planning stage. It is to be a meeting, to be held again at Cambridge, probably in the late summer of 1975, on the topic of biological history. It will also be international and will be concerned with such things as nutrition in relation to fertility, the age and pace of physical maturation, and epidemics in relation to population fluctuation. Many of those attending will be biologists and medical scientists as well as historians and social scientists.

Peter Laslett
Roger Schofield
E.A. Wrigley
SOCIAL STRUCTURE FROM TUDOR LAY SUBSIDIES AND PROBATE INVENTORIES
A Case Study: Richmondshire (Yorkshire)

R. Fieldhouse

Roger Fieldhouse was a WEA Organising Tutor in Northwest Yorkshire during the years 1964–70. He is now Lecturer in History with the Department of Adult Education of the University of Leeds. His main interests are Yorkshire local history, demography and agrarian history, particularly sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

The aim of this article is to demonstrate a method of investigating social demography in the sixteenth century through a case study of the North Riding market town of Richmond and the surrounding wapentakes of Gilling East and West which represent the lowland area of the Vale of York and the Pennine dales (see map). The study is based on two main sources: the Tudor lay subsidies and probate inventories.

Lay subsidies were a tax on property first levied in the thirteenth century. They were widely used during the early fourteenth century but then declined as a means of raising revenue. They were revived in the sixteenth century by the Tudor governments. The subsidies were voted by Parliament for specific purposes, such as war, to be levied at so much for every pound which each person was considered worth in goods and real estate. Everyone was assessed by special commissioners and then taxed according to the rate of the subsidy in the same way that modern local government rates are levied. (A further similarity between the subsidies and modern rates is that the assessment or valuation was notional, reflecting but not actually representing true market values). The rate in the pound not only varied from one subsidy to the next: it also varied for different levels of assessment and between assessments on land and goods. Moreover, the subsidies were frequently collected in two or three instalments and were sometimes levied at a different rate for each instalment. These variations will be illustrated in the case study below. The subsidy acts can be found in the published Statutes of the Realm: the subsidy rolls with the lists of taxpayers are in the Public Record Office exchequer records, listed by counties.

One Tudor lay subsidy stands out from all the rest: that of 1524/5. Unlike all others, this tax was levied on an assessment of wages as well as property. Partly for this reason, it is generally the most comprehensive of all the Tudor lay subsidy lists, although for reasons explained below, this is not true for Yorkshire. (It should also be noted that certain parts of the country were normally exempt from the subsidies. These included Ireland, Calais, Jersey, the Cinque Ports and the four Northern counties).
There have been a considerable number of demographic studies of the sixteenth century lay subsidies which have attempted to use the subsidy rolls to estimate population size, plot the distribution of wealth, and depict the social structure. The general picture that emerges is not surprisingly a social pyramid with a very broad base of poor and propertyless people, rising to a 'needle like point'. But it is also becoming clear that the actual shape of the pyramid varies considerably from place to place. This seems a significant factor for the understanding of sixteenth century society. It is hoped that this article may stimulate further local demographic studies of the Tudor lay subsidies, so that the significant variations in social structure come to light.²

It is always advisable to test the validity of an historical source whenever possible, so one of the main objectives of this case study is to investigate how the tax assessments can be compared with probate inventories to discover how accurately they reflect a man's true wealth and social status. There are certain difficulties in making such comparisons which will be explained below. The basis of the exercise is to find probate records for as many of the taxpayers listed in the subsidy roll as possible. One problem which will arise when using the 1524/5 subsidy is that probate records are generally less prolific for the early sixteenth century. They become increasingly common during the later sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

An inventory was made of a man's movable goods and chattels immediately after his death by three or four appraisers, and then filed with the man's will in the appropriate ecclesiastical court for reference in the event of a dispute over the administration of the will. It was thus hoped to prevent movable items from disappearing before the distribution of the estate. At best they provide a comprehensive list of all the items in the deceased man's house, room-by-room, together with details of his clothing, work equipment, farm stock, credit and debts. But not all are so comprehensive, and the only real test of their accuracy must be derived from wide personal experience of this type of record. They may be found in various record repositories, and there are also numerous published selections.³

In Yorkshire there was considerable opposition to early Tudor taxation⁴ and this militant tradition may account for the fact that the 1524/5 lay subsidy, which has proved the most comprehensive for most counties, is of very limited use for Yorkshire. For a more reliable and comprehensive tax list for Yorkshire we must turn to the lay subsidy of 1543/5 (but what follows could equally well be applied in other parts of the country to earlier subsidy rolls, providing a selection of probate records for the period is available). In 1542/3 Parliament granted a subsidy to the Crown to pay for the wars against the Scots. It was levied in three instalments between autumn 1543 and autumn 1545. People were assessed either on the value of their movable goods or their real estate, whichever was the greater, but not on both. The definition of movable goods included all coin, plate, jewellery, merchandise, corn, household stuff and good credit. It excluded clothing and debts. Real estate consisted of the yearly profits from freehold, leasehold or copyhold land and tenements. Those assessed at less than £1 for both goods and land were exempt from taxation.⁵ The rates of tax in the pound are shown in Table 1.
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessed Value</th>
<th>Rate of tax per £</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) of goods</td>
<td>1543</td>
<td>1544</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1 to under £5</td>
<td>2d.</td>
<td>1d.</td>
<td>1d.</td>
<td>4d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£5 to under £10</td>
<td>4d.</td>
<td>2d.</td>
<td>2d.</td>
<td>8d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£10 to under £20</td>
<td>8d.</td>
<td>4d.</td>
<td>4d.</td>
<td>1s. 4d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£20 and over</td>
<td>8d.</td>
<td>8d.</td>
<td>8d.</td>
<td>2s. 0d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) of land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1 to under £5</td>
<td>4d.</td>
<td>2d.</td>
<td>2d.</td>
<td>8d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£5 to under £10</td>
<td>8d.</td>
<td>4d.</td>
<td>4d.</td>
<td>1s. 4d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£10 to under £20</td>
<td>8d.</td>
<td>8d.</td>
<td>8d.</td>
<td>2s. 0d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£20 and over</td>
<td>1s. 0d.</td>
<td>1s. 0d.</td>
<td>1s. 0d.</td>
<td>3s. 0d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are certain problems in using these tax lists to illustrate the social structure of the community. Peers were separately assessed before the Lord Chancellor and therefore do not appear, whilst ecclesiastical property was of course exempt from a lay subsidy, although the clergy were liable for their temporal possessions. A further omission will have resulted from some degree of tax evasion which probably occurred despite the heavy penalties sanctioned by the act. These factors will cause the tax lists to be somewhat less than fully representative of the community. A more crucial factor is the unstated number of people who were exempt on the grounds of poverty. These must be accounted for in any analysis, as will be shown in section III below.

Finally there is the question of under-assessment. It is well known that the lay subsidy assessments represent a notional rather than real valuation of property. The wealth of the gentry class is likely to be especially underestimated because the tax commissioners who prepared the certificates of assessment were drawn from this class. There is no knowing how accurate the assessments were for other people but 'it is probably safe to assume that apart from the wealthier gentry, conditions were much the same for everyone.' As long as the inaccuracies are relatively the same for everyone, they will not alter the social picture. However this concept of notional value makes direct comparison with valuations from different types
of record such as probate inventories dangerous. Such comparisons are made even more
difficult by the exclusion of clothing and debts from the subsidy assessment whilst they are
normally included in an inventory. Therefore direct comparisons of total valuations from such
different sources (as opposed to the relative distribution of wealth) should be avoided.

The 1544 subsidy rolls for the wapentakes of Gilling East and West⁸ are very detailed.
Unfortunately the Gilling West roll only states the tax paid, not the assessment. Because of the
different rates of taxation it is not possible to classify people according to the tax they paid⁹
but it is possible to deduce their assessments from the tax by applying the rates shown in
Table 1. This has been done for the Gilling West entries, which include the borough of
Richmond. The result is that we have the assessments, either stated or deduced, for all the
people named in the 1544 lists, and from these assessments a picture of the social structure
emerges.

There were 170 taxpayers in the borough of Richmond and East Applegarth in 1544. All
were assessed on goods rather than land. Their distribution is shown in Table 2.

**Table 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deduced Assessment</th>
<th>Taxpayers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£10 - £12.5.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£7 - £9.19.11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£5 - £6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegible</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This suggests a social pyramid with a very sharp point and wide base. But this is only half
the picture. In a census of households taken for the privy council in 1563 there were 340
households in the parish of Richmond.¹⁰

Once again, a direct comparison between such different types of record is problematical.
Firstly, was the borough of the lay subsidy identical with the parish of the household survey?
To this we can safely answer that there was no significant difference: the parish and the
borough were not identical but there were very few houses outside the borough and those
few were in East Applegarth which was included with the borough in the subsidy roll.
Secondly, do the sources aim to record comparable information? Here the answer is no. The
household survey obviously records the number of *households*: the subsidy lists ‘persons and orphans’. Clearly the lay subsidy could include more than one person per household, although whether the commissioners really assessed every person and orphan is doubtful. However, the possibility exists that the subsidy will include more than one person for some households and therefore exaggerate their number. Thirdly, there is the question of any change in population size and number of households between the two dates. The 1540’s and 1550’s seem to have been decades of rapid population growth, but the rate of increase probably slowed down after the mid 1550’s, partly as a result of the heavy mortality during the period 1557–59 which the earliest Richmond parish register suggests was felt in the borough in 1559. Nevertheless, there must have been a continuing growth in the number of households as the children of the large families of the earlier decade married and set up home. Therefore some of the difference between the totals of 1544 and 1563 must be attributed to an increase in the number of households during that period. But how much? In 1547 the chantry certificate stated there were 1,200 ‘howseling people’ (i.e. communicants) in Richmond, but this is unhelpful because apart from the unreliability of such a round number, we do not know how many communicants there were per household. But even if we generously allow four per household, this suggests a figure in the region of 300 households in 1547. It seems unlikely to be less than that. The apparent increase of approximately ten per cent by 1563 is not an accurate calculation by any means, but it is as good an estimate as the records allow of the population growth between the lay subsidy and the survey of households.11

If we further recall that some households may appear more than once in the subsidy roll, it is not unreasonable to postulate that there were at least 140 untaxed households in Richmond in 1544 in addition to those represented by the 170 taxpayers. The tax structure for the whole town, including those who do not appear in the subsidy roll, is shown in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Structure in Richmond: 1544</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£10 and over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£3 - £9.19.11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1 - £2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is the aim of this study to delve deeper than the mere tax structure: to test the validity of the tax assessments as a guide to wealth and social standing in real terms. This has been done by matching probate inventories to the tax returns, so that a man’s tax assessment can be compared with the valuation of his goods at the time of his death.

Only twenty-eight of the 170 Richmond taxpayers were traced amongst the probate records for a twenty-five year period after 1544.12 Above the £2 assessments it was possible to trace one-third of all those listed, but amongst those assessed at £1 – £2, only nine out of 112 (eight per cent) appeared amongst the probate records. This in itself was significant, suggesting that the lower taxpayers were less prone to leave wills: many of them had insufficient property to make a will worthwhile. This was the first sign that the tax assessments
did have some correlation with actual wealth. The following analysis is based on the twenty-eight lay subsidy payers whose inventories were found. These records were scrutinised to evaluate the extent of a man’s property; his occupation; the quality and quantity of his farm and trade stock and equipment; the size of his house; the standard of comfort within the house; and the total value of all his movable goods.

As the probate records had to be sampled over a twenty-five year period (1544–69) even to obtain twenty-eight examples, some allowance has to be made for the effects of inflation which were considerable in the mid-sixteenth century. The price index of a composite unit of foodstuffs and industrial consumables published by Professor Phelps Brown and Miss S.V. Hopkins in 1956 shows an approximate fifty per cent increase in prices between the 1540’s and 1560’s. In a more recent summary of the evidence of Tudor inflation Dr. Outhwaite suggests that ‘at its most rapid, in the middle decade of the sixteenth century, it aroused great concern...Once underway...inflation proceeded rapidly,’ causing agricultural prices to almost double between the 1530’s and 1550’s and industrial prices to increase by seventy per cent. ‘From about the year 1544 to 1551 prices rose markedly above previous levels to a new plateau running from then to the early ’70’s...’

The rate of increase in the value of household utensils and furniture (which accounted for approximately thirty-five per cent of all the goods listed in the sample inventories) was probably less rapid than that of agricultural produce and stock. Nevertheless all values undoubtedly reflected the general inflation to a greater or lesser extent and therefore a steady one per cent annual increase in values for the whole period has been assumed, so that all inventory values have been reduced at the rate of one per cent per annum for each year they post-date 1544 to bring them all down to 1544 prices. These adjustments have been made to all inventory valuations in Table 4.

Another problem arising from comparing the subsidy with inventories taken some years later is that some men may well have experienced a significant change of fortune in the interim. This renders comparisons for individuals very risky but in seeking an average picture from a larger sample, the ups and downs of fortunes should do something to even out the discrepancies.

The sample of twenty-eight Richmond probate records is small (sixteen per cent of the taxpayers), and of course does not cover that half of the population which was not taxed. Nevertheless, although there was no absolute correlation between tax paid and wealth revealed in the probate records, a social graduation does emerge. The lay subsidy assessments certainly do not reflect total wealth, but they provide an indication of relative wealth. This can be illustrated in a number of ways. Firstly by the average total valuation of all goods listed in the inventories and the value of household goods (all values adjusted for inflation) as shown in Table 4. The total valuation of all goods includes every item listed in the inventories except credit and debts. The value of household goods includes all furniture, clothes and utensils used in the house, but excludes work gear, stock and cash. This latter figure is probably the more reliable guide to the status of the man concerned.
Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1544 Tax Assessment</th>
<th>Mean average value of all goods at 1544 prices. (nearest shilling)</th>
<th>Mean average value of household goods at 1544 prices. (nearest shilling)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£80</td>
<td>£ 588 18 0</td>
<td>£ 212 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£10 - £12. 5. 0.</td>
<td>89 12 0</td>
<td>26 19 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£6 - £7</td>
<td>29 16 0</td>
<td>15 16 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£4</td>
<td>16 17 0</td>
<td>4 18 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£3</td>
<td>14 6 0</td>
<td>3 9 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1 - £2</td>
<td>5 10 0</td>
<td>2 14 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of taxpayers for whom adequate inventory details were available was not large (twenty) and within the sample there were some fluctuations. Nevertheless, the evidence indicates that on average the tax assessments did relate to individuals’ wealth as revealed in their inventories of movable goods.

Apart from the total values of the goods listed in the inventories, the individual items show that by-and-large, the higher taxpayers enjoyed a higher standard of comfort. Ralph Gower, who was said to be worth £80 in the lay subsidy, owned £109 worth of silver, £51 worth of pewter, glass and other household implements, and £35 worth of linen when he died. (Valuations not adjusted for inflation.) Amongst the others who made up the top 17½ per cent of Richmond’s population (assessed at £3 or more), there were plenty of signs of relative affluence: hangings around the walls or beds, carpets on the tables or floors, shelves of pewter and cupboards full of linen, spare bedding and spare clothes, extra chairs in the bedrooms and cushions on the chairs. Although impossible to measure exactly, all these possessions tended to be more plentiful amongst the higher taxpayers. So did servants, and silver, ready cash, credit and debts. The importance of debts as a measurement of a man’s credit-worthiness and, by implication, his social standing, should not be underestimated.

The lowest taxpayers in the sample certainly possessed far fewer belongings and their houses were furnished with the bare minimum of essentials. At times they bordered on a subsistence existence. This contrast can best be illustrated by two inventories.

   28 August 1560.

   The Great Chamber
   6 fedder beds & bedd stockes & teasters furnished with their bowlsters
   blanketts and coverletts  8 0 0
   5 mattresse beds and bedd stockes furnished with their bowlsters
   & blanketts and coverletts & 3 single mattresses  3 0 0
   3 carpetts, one table, 4 formes, 2 chares, one little
   cupbourde & a great chiste  1 3 4
   Olde hangings about the chambres and 12 olde quishings
   The halie
   One table, one counter, 2 formes & 3 chares, 2 long setles
   & one chiste & 2 cupbourdes  1 13 4
One pair of iron gallowes, 4 hokes, one pair of tongs, one scumbre & 3 pair of pott hokes
15 candlesticks & 4 latten basynnes & 2 lavers & a scumbre
5 chawfynye dishes, 4 chargers, 3 pudens basynnes,
3 powder potts and a great flowred candlestick

The Kitchyne
12 brasse potts, 2 cawldrons, one pane & ten brasse pannes
2 pair of gallowes, 4 spetes, 2 pair of racks,
2 fryinge panns, a dreeping pan & a call for vessell to stand in
One brewing leadd, one maske fatt, one gilefatt,
3 sayes, 5 barrelles, 7 skeltes, 2 ale potts & 12 drinking potts
2 kymiletts, 4 barrelles, a bowting ton & 2 knedinge
browes with a brasing morter
51 peces of powder, 3 saltts and 12 silver spones
salt fishes
17 pair of shetes & 6 towles & 4 boursclothes
and 12 table napkynes
12 codds and the pyllabs
a lyme, a pair of skayles & the weightes
his apparell
hay in the barns, one carre, wodde, colos & lyng
a seastron of lead
4 bourdus

Summa Totalis 68 14 4
(sic)

Debita que testator debet
To Arthur Johnson 16 0 0
To Master Gower 5 0 0
To William Pepper 8 0 0
To William Dowson of Grinton 1 16 0
To Francis Manfeyd 10 0 0
To Mr. Parson 8 0 0
To Christopher Greathead for a pare of butes 3 4 0
To Thomas Barker 5 0 0
To Lawrence Moyser 3 16 8
To Raufe Aykrygge 4 4 0
To Richard Thompson 1 3 4

Summa 46 16 8

2. Peter Wryght. Assessed at £1 in 1544. Inventory.
8 March 1564.

£ s. d.
4 bras potts 8 4 0
a caldron 6 0 0
an other caldron 9 0 0
10 peces of powder, 3 sawcers, a salt 6 8 0
a chafynge dish & 3 candlesticks 2 4 0
a cupbord, a cawile, an ambry & 2 chares 10 0 0
2 beds, a chiste, a presse 3 0 0
a ton, a bacaris bourd with other tubbs 2 0 0
5 lynnyng shets with 2 codwares 6 8
5 hardyn shets & 3 codd 4 0
3 coverletts, 3 qwysshynnes, 2 blanketts & a bolster 6 0
Summa 7 4 0

Debts which the said Peter doth owe
To John Heard 11 0
To William Johnson Wyfe 1 0 0
To Uxor Clarkson 12 0
To my sister Elizabeth Jackston 9 0
To Thomas Willance 2 8
To Raufe Ewebanke 1 1
To Henry Langedale 6 0
To Elmer Nicholson 15 0
For hay pound 5 0
To his Mayd 5 0
Summa 3 16 9
(sic)

Johnson clearly had more of everything, and what few possessions Wryght did have were plainly of an inferior quality and of little value. His credit worthiness was demonstrably on a smaller scale, yet it should be noted that he was of sufficient wealth and social status to employ a maid.

What the other half of society, (who were exempt from taxation), possessed, we can only surmise. But as the lay subsidy was a tax on movable goods, it is reasonable to assume that they had less than men such as Peter Wryght.

Only five of the sample inventories indicated the size of the house, but these suggest that higher taxpayers lived in larger houses. (See Table 5).

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>1544 Assessment</th>
<th>No. of rooms in house</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Gower</td>
<td>£80</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Binks</td>
<td>£12. 5. 0.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Johnson</td>
<td>£7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Skot</td>
<td>£4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Neylon</td>
<td>£1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is virtually impossible to arrive at an accurate assessment of the extent of a man’s real estate from his probate records. We just do not know how much is not mentioned. But most of the taxpayers appear to have owned or leased some such property and at least down to the £3 level, they could quite often boast of property beyond the minimum requirements. For example, Henry Collyng, assessed at £3, owned two burgage houses. The lesser men tended to be leaseholders rather than owners, but no very clear picture emerges regarding real estate.
There was little apparent differentiation in occupations amongst the sample of taxpayers that could be related to their assessments. Ralph Gower was a wealthy mercer, farmer and landowner who had done very well out of the share-out of dissolved monastic lands. Below him there was a scatter of yeomen, farmers, cappers, drapers, tanners, millers; an auditor, forrer, slater, glover, fuller, painter, swordsmith, butcher, limeburner, fishmonger, and currier. But amongst the lowest taxpayers we begin approaching the less-skilled work population: men who had a less distinct work-role, who might alternate or change their jobs. Some appear to have had no obvious trade, such as Peter Wryght whose inventory is quoted above. It seems likely that some of the small tradesmen and craftsmen at this level hired out their labour at times. Francis Neylson, a smallholder and probably a fishmonger (although less wealthy than the fishmonger Charles Johnson), also possessed three horses, two saddles, a waind with wheels and a pair of panniers for carting and carrying. But not all the men assessed at £1 were labourers. Particularly, there is some evidence to suggest that farmers were taxed more leniently, and may fall into this category, John Sanderson, a farmer and possibly a miller, was assessed at only £1, but he was sufficiently well off to employ wage labour. When he died he owed twenty-eight shillings in servants’ wages. They may have been farm servants, domestic servants, or assistants at the mill.

It is very obvious that the higher taxpayers had more stock and work gear - the wherewithal to make more money. For example, Robert Collynsyn, a tanner who was assessed at £20, possessed eighty pieces of leather and 125 cloths (old or irregular pieces of leather used for repairing leather goods, especially shoes) valued at £45, 13. 4d. at the time of his death in 1550. He also owned some lead and wooden vessels in his barkhouse worth another £4. Thomas Skot was a tanner assessed at £4, which puts him above the minimum, but some way below Robert Collynsyn. When he died in 1565, Skot had sixty calf skins, eight clot hide and five pieces of leather worth £9, 18. 4d., in his barkhouse, plus four old tubs and a lead, valued at 19s. 4d., and £2 worth of bark. Thomas Skot was assessed at one-fifth the amount of Robert Collynsyn in 1544; he owned about one-quarter of the amount of skins, leather and tanning equipment.

All the evidence from this comparative analysis suggests that the 1544 lay subsidy is no guide to the total value of a man’s movable property but it does reflect the relative wealth and social status of the top half of the social pyramid which existed in Richmond in the middle of the sixteenth century. There was a small comfortably-off substantial class and a rather larger number of craftsmen and tradesmen who lived above subsistence level and who could afford some luxuries, but were not wealthy. Together, this group accounted for about one-sixth of the population. Below them was the larger group (one-third of the population) assessed at £1 - £2 worth of goods. They consisted more of jacks-of-all-trades, jobbing craftsmen and some wage labourers. They were not all bowed down by poverty, but their general living condition was bleak compared with the upper class, and their comforts were minimal.

At the base of the social pyramid was the fortysix per cent who paid no tax. We know very little about this group because they leave virtually no records of their existence. But from the analysis of the probate records of those who did pay tax, we can make the legitimate assumption that those who were too poor to pay were living at a very low level of subsistence. These were the wage labourers and destitute poor. It seems probable that the real social division lay between those who paid tax - at whatever level - and those who were exempt. Exemption was the hallmark of poverty and social inferiority: the have-nots of Richmond’s society. They constituted nearly half the population.
Turning to the rural area which falls west, east and north of Richmond the 1544 lay subsidy lists for Gilling East and Gilling West wapentakes have been analysed in conjunction with the 1563 survey of households to obtain a socio-economic structure comparable with Richmond's. The analysis has been made by parishes and chapelries as listed in the 1563 survey. Where these were omitted (in the case of certain peculiaris) or where it has proved impossible to match the subsidy townships with the survey parishes, the whole parish has been excluded from the analysis. For this reason only twentyone of the twentyeight parishes in the two wapentakes are included.

The twentyone parishes have been divided into highland and lowland zones (see map). The highland zone, lying to the west of Richmond, consists of the parishes of Romaldkirk, Bowes, Startforth, Rokeby, Wycliffe, Brignall, Marrick, Marske and Grinton, with the chapelries of Laithe, Keld and Muker: approximately 220 square miles in all, in Swaledale and Teesdale. The lowland zone to the east of Richmond drops down into the Vale of York: it includes the parishes of Gilling, Manfield, Easby, Melsenby, Cleasby, Middleton Tyas, East Cowton, Danby Wiske, Great Langton, Ainderby Steeple, Kirby Wiske and part of Catterick, with the chapelries of Hutton Magna, Forcett, Barton, Eryholme, South Cowton, Colton-on-Swale and Yafforth: some 105 square miles. The total population of the combined areas was in the region of 10,000.
In the highland zone there were 530 taxpayers, ten of whose entries were illegible in the subsidy roll. All but two per cent were assessed on goods. In the lowland zone there were 690 taxpayers. Four entries were illegible. Ninety-seven per cent were assessed on goods. The tax structure of the two zones is compared in Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Highland Zone taxpayers</th>
<th>Lowland Zone taxpayers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£95. 5. 0d.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£26 – £30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£20 – £24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£18</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£10 – £13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£7 – £9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£5 – £6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£2</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegible</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But as in Richmond, the lay subsidy tells less than the whole story. In the 1563 survey there were 1,031 households in the highland parishes and 1,134 in the lowland region. After making the same adjustments as for Richmond, to allow for a ten percent increase in the number of households between 1544 – 1563, we find there were 43½ per cent households exempt from taxation in the highlands and 33½ percent in the lowlands.

VI

In the highland area the pattern is similar to Richmond’s: there was a very broad base to the social pyramid consisting of nearly one half of the population too poor to pay any taxes. These were the poor and destitute: the wage labourers, peasants and unskilled craftsmen for whom few records remain, but on whom the economy depended for labour and man-power. Table 7 and Figure 1 illustrate this pattern and also show that the base of the pyramid was not so broad in the lowland area where a third of the population might be regarded as very poor. This corresponds more nearly with the pattern in the West Riding. The remainder of the social structure climbed from this ‘poverty’ base to its narrow summit.
Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Highland Zone</th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Lowland Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£20 and over</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£10 – £18</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£7 – £9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£5 – £6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is equally noticeable that whereas the lowland area had less exempt people, it boasted more in the £4 – £9 bracket, suggesting a larger group of better-off farmers and husbandmen in the Vale of York. By comparison, in the Yorkshire dales the majority of farms were very small and the average size was still less than twenty acres at the beginning of the seventeenth century, probably reflecting the practice of partible inheritance and the prevalence of customary tenure, which inhibited the amalgamation of holdings.23

Of nearly 2,300 households living in the area surveyed (including Richmond), only some three per cent were assessed at £10 or more. These were the substantial middle class: the largest farmers, most prosperous craftsmen, merchants, yeomen and gentry. At the lower level this class was more numerous in Richmond (the £10 – £18 group), but above that they lived mainly in the rural areas, especially the lowlands. The highest assessments were John Woodall of Marrick (£100) and Sir Thomas Hilton of Gilling (£95. 5. 0d.)

FIG. 1
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Figure 1 confirms some of the findings of Professor Hoskins and Dr. Smith.24 There appears to be a higher proportion of poor and a greater contrast in the distribution of wealth in the towns than in lowland rural areas (if we ignore the few wealthy gentry and nobility in the countryside). But the more marginal uplands, such as the Pennines, did not enjoy the same advantages. Wealth was distributed far less liberally in the highlands: poverty was far more common. It will be interesting to see whether further local studies confirm or vary this picture.
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Notes

1. This article is based on research undertaken with a WEA tutorial class in Richmond. I am indebted to the members of the class for all their work on the probate inventories, and also to members of the University of Leeds School of Economics graduate seminar (to whom this paper was read in December 1970) for several helpful suggestions. I am also very grateful to J. Sheail, D.W. Crossley and R.S. Schofield for their valuable advice.


5. *Statutes of the Realm*, 34 & 35 Henry VIII, c.27, I, II, III & IX.

6. Ibid, VII & XII.


11. Statutes of the Realm, 34 & 35 Hen. VIII, c.27, I; North Riding C.R.O., PR/RM, Richmond parish register; Yorkshire Chantry Certificates, Surtees Soc. Publications, vol. 92 (1895); p. 517, I am grateful to D.W. Crossley for drawing my attention to the probable continued growth in the number of households after c.1550. R.S. Schofield feels that the increase in population between 1544 and 1563 may have been considerably in excess of 10%, but the writer believes it is as accurate an estimate as the fragmentary sources will allow.

12. Leeds City Libraries Archives Dept, Probate Records: Archdeaconry of Richmond wills and inventories. All subsequent probate records quoted are amongst this collection which was searched for the period 1544–1569 for all Richmond inhabitants listed in the 1544 lay subsidy.


15. Ibid., pp. 9–14.

16. R.S. Schofield suggests that it might be preferable to use the appropriate annual price index from series such as those of Phelps-Brown and Hopkins, rather than a smooth 1% p.a., because price changes were far from smooth. However, the writer believes that the value of second hand goods, such as those listed in inventories, fluctuates less than the price of manufactured goods or food, and therefore the 1% p.a. scale is equally if not more appropriate for goods listed in inventories. At best it can only be a crude make-weight to counterbalance the effects of inflation.


18. P.R.O., E.179/212/165 & 181. The vill of Grinton, within Hang West wapentake, has been added from E.179/212/166 to complete the returns for Grinton parish.


20. The excluded parishes are Stanwick-St-John, Kirby Ravensworth, Barningham and Hope, Arkengarthdale and New Forest, Croft, Great Smeaton and Richmond, Part of Catterick parish is excluded.


23. Evidence on the size of holdings, partible inheritance and customary tenure derives from extensive research undertaken by members of the Richmond history class. A full account of these findings will be published in the group’s ‘History of Richmond and Swaledale’ at a later date.
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In an article in Local Population Studies of Autumn 1970 Mr. L. Bradley drew attention to
the difficulty of establishing a representative interval between birth and baptism which might
be valid over a long period in different parishes. It was suggested in this article and in
subsequent correspondence that custom might have an effect on baptismal practice. In this
context some of the problems encountered by reforming Anglican clergy in nineteenth
century Lincolnshire may throw light on some of the attitudes and customary practices
which had developed around baptism. Apart from their intrinsic interest to students of Church life
they also show some of the factors which could have an effect on the interval between birth
and baptism.

The rubric of the 1662 prayer book before the service for The Ministration of Publick
Baptism of Infants states the conditions under which baptism is to be administered. ‘The
people are to be admonished, that it is most convenient that Baptism should not be admin-
istered but upon Sundays, and other Holy-days, when the most number of people come
together ...... Nevertheless, (if necessity so require) children may be baptized upon any
other day.’ The conditions for private baptism are laid down before the service for The
Ministration of Private Baptism of Children in Houses. Here it stated that ‘The Curates of
every Parish shall often admonish the people, that they defer not the Baptism of their
children longer than the first or second Sunday next after their birth, or other Holy-day
falling between, unless upon a great and reasonable cause, to be approved by the Curate.
And also they shall warn them, that without like great cause and necessity they procure not
their children to be baptized at home in their houses.’ Only in cases of need is this to be
done. After the Private Baptism service the rubric states that ‘if the Child which is after this
sort baptized do afterwards live, it is expedient that it be brought into the Church, to the
intent that if the Minister of the same Parish did himself baptize that Child, the Congregation
may be certified of the true form of Baptism, by him privately before used.’ The form of this
certification is stated and a series of questions is laid down to be asked by the Minister to
determine whether a child not baptised by himself has had baptism administered according
to the correct form. These questions are followed by the promises of the godparents on the
child’s behalf and the reception of the child into the Church.
However, by the nineteenth century it seems that the rubrics were no longer adhered to in many parts of Lincolnshire from evidence in correspondence on baptismal custom and practice to John Kaye, who was Bishop of Lincoln from 1827 to 1853. The Revd. J. Tunstall Smith of Whaplode Vicarage wrote to the Bishop on 17 January 1845 referring to the problems which the size of his parish brought and the difficulties he encountered in arranging for the prompt baptism of infants as laid down by the prayer book. 'The length of the parish, which is twelve miles, would provide a serious inconvenience to the distant residents when many of the appointed Sundays proved successively inclement. They would be compelled to defer the baptism month after month.' In the past the practice had been to bring infants to the clergyman's house 'generally on or about the third day.' This promptness was not, Smith suggested, motivated by any desire to promote the spiritual welfare of the children, 'The service and the bell were the real attraction, and they dreaded lest their infants, of whom a vast number die in this parish, should be committed to the earth "like dogs".' Even in towns, where distance from the church presented no great difficulties, public baptism was neglected. The Revd. T.B. Lancaster of St. Michael's Stamford reported to the Bishop that private baptism was used in all cases. Unless he conformed to the wishes of parents the children would be baptised by dissenters. Some of the parents said that they had no intention of bringing their children to church to have the ceremony completed in accordance with the rubric.

The reception of the child into the Church following private baptism seems to have been referred to as 'christening'. At Waltham, near Grimsby, the Revd. Richard Fenton would only 'christen' on Sundays and Holy-days. His parishioners were said to mistake this for 'an unaccommodating spirit'. He had, he stated in 1828, been obliged 'to baptize children at all hours of day or night whether in case of danger or not' and he had been asked to perform the 'christening' at various times and dates. 'The object of those who make the request I allude to is not a religious one but merely for the sake of having a feast which too commonly leads to excess and gambling.....'.

As at Whaplode, in other parts of the county children were brought to be baptised at the clergyman's house. The Revd. W.H. Apthorpe of Bicker described in 1849 how in that area it was 'the normal custom among the clergy...... to have them brought to the house or the church and baptising, without requiring the aid of sponsors......'. The form of private baptism was also used in church and because it did not require the presence of godparents this raised problems for the clergyman anxious to combat dissent in his parish. Dissenters with objections to the practice of having godparents could dispense with them by only having private baptism administered. The Revd. John Otter's comments on the way this was done at Ranby are also relevant for the light they throw on registration practices, for he found 'that many dissenters have taken advantage of this irregularity to get their children entered in the register without bringing them to be received into the Church......' when godparents would have been necessary.

The Revd. George Maule, of South Ferriby, writing to the Bishop on 2 December 1840, attributed the practice of private baptism to the non-residence of the previous curate. It was 'an evil...... necessarily attendant upon such circumstances', which was no longer necessary when Maule regularly occupied the parsonage and was personally available at the proper time to perform baptisms as laid down in the prayer book.

The pastoral problems which faced reforming clergymen who wished to end the private baptism of both healthy and sick children provide additional evidence of how widespread the
practice was and the length of time over which it had taken place. In 1844, the Revd. W. Fox of Marshchapel said that he had found in his parish 'a number of individuals now advanced in years ...... who have never yet been, what is commonly called christened. Two middle aged men of this description, have already offered themselves and have been publicly admitted into the Church; and others, I have reason to expect, will shortly follow their examples.\textsuperscript{11}

The clergyman who wished to take a firm line against dissent could find his position compromised by the laxity of his predecessors, which had also made it easier for nonconformists to gain a foothold in the parish. The Revd. W.S. White of Horncastle found in 1838 that he was being asked to christen a child which had been baptised previously by a Methodist preacher\textsuperscript{12} and the Revd. T.B. Wright of Wrangle found himself in a similar position. Here the superintendent 'Ranter' minister had baptised the children of one of his parishioners, and, without any alteration of his religious views having taken place, the father had then brought the child to be christened.\textsuperscript{13} At Dalby, near Spilsby, the Rev. John Cheales said that his dissenting parishioners would only allow their children to be baptised, either at church or at home, because of their refusal to have sponsors.\textsuperscript{14}

The distinction which was drawn between baptism and christening and the widespread practice of private baptism either at home or in the church, gave rise to a series of customs and practices not provided for by the prayer book rubrics and private baptism conducted in church was completely contrary to their spirit. All these practices are indicative of attitudes to baptism and as such are relevant to local population studies. They make the task of formulating a representative interval between birth and baptism more difficult because of the variety of local custom and practice which often took no account of the Church's formularies and could also depend on the attitude of the officiating minister. Such local factors as the distance of the church from the centre of population in areas where church building had not kept pace with land drainage and settlement, as in the Lincolnshire Fens, also seem to be relevant. Further study of registration practice in the light of these local customs could probably throw further light on them and also help to determine whether in fact it was baptisms or 'christenings' which were registered by the clergy.

Notes


3. Deposited at the Lincolnshire Archives Office, Class Cor B5 References to this correspondence given as L.A.O. Cor B5.

4. L.A.O. Cor B5/4/54/1

5. ibid

6. L.A.O. Cor B5/4/97/6

7. L.A.O. Cor B5/4/61/8

8. L.A.O. Cor B5/4/64/1

9. L.A.O. Cor B5/4/89/3

10. L.A.O. Cor B5/4/123/4

11. L.A.O. Cor B5/4/115/10

12. L.A.O. Cor B5/4/104/17

13. L.A.O. Cor B5/4/87/2
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PEAS AND FERTILITY

A. Newman

Mrs. Anthea Newman, a graduate of St. Hugh’s College, Oxford, spent the early years of working life in the then L.C.C. before her marriage. While her family was young, school teaching and local history kept the rust off the machinery. Now, after three years as a post-graduate at the University of Kent at Canterbury studying population, social structure and their inter-relation with the Old Poor Law in East Kent under the guidance of Dr. A. Armstrong, she is a lecturer at Christ Church College, Canterbury.

An English family reconstitution record — twentyone children born to one marriage in twentyfour years. This is the achievement of John and Ann Cook of Ash, married at the end of the 18th century. Although the prime purpose of family reconstitution as pioneered by French and English historians is to recover demographic statistics about average families rather than to discover the exceptional, a marriage which produced twentyone offspring is worthy of more careful study; in a sense it is grandly atypical, and demonstrates in a dramatic and compact form the probable implications of high fertility to an English family living in the early nineteenth century.

John Cook married Ann Sackett on 12 October 1797. At the time John was nearly twentythree and his bride was twenty. He had been born in the parish of Ash-next-Sandwich in East Kent, where he also settled on marriage, but Ann came from Thanet, though the marriage register shows her as a resident of Ash, probably as a servant in one of the households. Their first child, Elizabeth, was born seventeen months later. Thereafter children were born at frequent intervals; nineteen months was the longest gap until Ann was in her forties.

John Cook’s father, Thomas, had founded the family’s fortunes in Ash. Until the later eighteenth century the family do not appear to have had any connection with the parish, until Thomas and James Cook, who may well have been brothers, appear in the records. Both were cottagers occupying no land other than perhaps small domestic gardens, paying an annual composition for the maintenance of the parish’s roads at a standard two shillings per head. James, after baptising one child, disappears from the records; Thomas however baptised two children, John and Thomas, and ten years after his marriage moved from the cottage at Paramore Street, one of the numerous outlying hamlets in the parish, to a small-holding at Westmarsh valued at £10 by the parish rate collectors. The property was owned by one Mrs. Cleveland. It was a modest property of about 10 acres; however this soil is renowned for its fertility, and a considerable amount of market gardening is carried on.
Here Thomas Cook stayed until his death in 1805 aged 59. The burial register states: "A suicide, lunacy". One of his grandchildren also died insane.

The tenancy of the small-holding in Westmarsh was thereupon taken over by his son John Cook, who at that time, after eight years of marriage, had five children aged five and under. The other son, Thomas, married soon after his father’s death and left the parish. Perhaps he had been living at home helping to run the farm for his parents; if so he was then ousted by his older brother. Of the death of the mother there is no record. At her marriage she came from Wingham, a neighbouring village, so it is possible she returned there when widowed, or that she was buried there.

The change in John Cook’s fortunes caused no interruption in the regular sequence of Cook baptisms. When the eleventh was born, the Cooks had lost only one child, the first-born Elizabeth, who had died at the age of eleven. But from thence forward infant mortality began to take a toll. The twelfth child, a boy, died at eight months. The fourteenth, another boy, at two months; the sixteenth, a girl, at three months. At the age of forty this remarkable woman had had eighteen children, of whom three had died in infancy and one as a child—fourteen were therefore still living and the oldest surviving was not yet nineteen when Samuel, the nineteenth, was born. Twentyseven months elapsed before Ann Cook, at the age of fortyfour finished her child-bearing with twins, Hester and Julia; Julia died at three months and Hester at ten months. In the meantime the couple had lost one more daughter at the age of twelve. When Ann reached fortyfive and her husband fortyeight they still had fourteen children living.4

The children of John and Ann Cook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Age of mother</th>
<th>Child</th>
<th>Birth interval months</th>
<th>Child deaths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11½ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Sampson</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Vincent</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Zecharia</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Hester, Julia</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How remarkable is such a family? In the numbers of parish registers reconstituted for the Cambridge Group none has produced a family with more than sixteen children.\(^5\) Furthermore Ann Cook did not achieve her numbers of children with multiple pregnancies — only one set of twins was born and then at the end of her child-bearing period, when the probability of twins is increased. Such a feat of reproduction has not been recorded amongst groups of people with quite exceptionally high fertility, like the Hutterites in North America, where the largest individual family size was sixteen,\(^6\) or the French-Canadians who underwent a demographic boom during the eighteenth century, but the largest family was eighteen children.\(^7\) Amongst these two groups it was not uncommon, as with Ann Cook, for a wife to have a child every year — it was the extended length of time in her case that was unusual. It is obvious that overall high crude birth rates may occur without any families as large as the Cook’s and conversely that one such exception can occur when overall birth rates are low. However in fact the Cooks were not so isolated a phenomena — the crude birth rate in the parish of Ash was 38.1 per thousand in the decade 1801–10 and 44.2 in the decade 1811–20.\(^8\) In some way they were part of a demographic explosion.

Larger numbers of pregnancies have been reported, though how reliably it is hard to say. One British mother is alleged to have had thirty-nine children (in the seventeenth century) and another forty-one in the same century. More reliably, the wife of a poor Viennese linen-weaver had thirty-two children all but four of whom were born alive, though this was achieved in twenty-three confinements.\(^9\) Ann Cook with twenty pregnancies resulting in live births must be near the maximum possible, and is certainly well-attested. Indeed the twenty-one children are still remembered by her descendants so that “oral history” verifies the record.

This family showed a remarkable amount of ability and started a minor farming dynasty in Ash. Apparently on the death of Mrs. Cleveland, the owner of the small-holding, John Cook had had the opportunity to purchase it, for he appears from 1807 onwards as both owner and occupier in the parish records. In the parish tenant farmers were the rule, though in the hamlet of Westmarsh (later in the century to be elevated to the status of an independent chapelry), there were more owner-occupiers than elsewhere, a point of some historical interest which may well be linked with the period and method of colonisation of the marshland. In 1822 John Cook added a further small piece of land to his holding, and in 1826 purchased a cottage in which his own son, John, the first to get married, set up house. The move into his father’s cottage took place three years after his marriage. Thence begins a process fascinating to observe of the establishment of Cook sons in independent holdings.

John Cook Junior lived in his father’s cottage until 1829, that is for three years, and then he became the tenant of a holding of approximately fifteen acres, in the same part of the parish as his father. William followed, marrying in 1833 and simultaneously starting out independently as a tenant of a similar-sized holding. The following year saw Thomas, unmarried, the oldest of the family, set up in a much larger farm of forty-one acres, again as a tenant and in the same area, with his sister Charlotte as housekeeper. He never married. In 1835 James, also as yet unmarried, acquired the tenancy of the Charity School Farm at Guilton, on its vacation as the “parish farm” used for the employment of the surplus labourers, and with the
Poor Law Amendment Act considered superfluous. The farm, which had been given to the parish as the endowment for the school, was thirty acres; the farm-house is a most attractive brick and gabled house dated 1699 and still standing at the side of the road into Ash. This was a compact holding in which James and his son and grandson after him were to stay for the rest of the nineteenth century. Then in 1838 Charles married, but he only tenanted a very small holding; possibly the family capital had been exhausted, or else the resourcefulness of the sons.

Thus far the hard work of a large family, in true peasant style, produced enough capital to set up four sons in farming, and meanwhile two of the daughters were also married. None of the sons had purchased their farms. It must have been the labour input to John Cook’s farm by all his sons that enabled him to prosper: the registers show his changing status as he brought his twenty-one children to be christened, from “labourer” in the early days, through “gardener” to “fruiterer”, and after his death his wife could describe herself as “landed proprietor”.

Not all the children stayed in Ash; George and William who married two sisters, both moved away and are lost sight of. Edward, Zechariah and Samuel remained unmarried, living at home with their mother. John Cook senior died at the age of sixty-nine, but Ann outlived her husband by twenty years and died aged eighty-nine in 1888. In the 1851 Census there were five Cook households farming in Ash, Charles (thirty-three acres) and Vincent (sixty-five acres) and now married, were next door to each other, James (thirty acres) at the School Farm, Thomas (fifty acres) still single and looked after by a servant, and Ann Cook the widow, with Edward, Zechariah and Samuel, of whom Edward is stated to be farming only eight acres.

The strongest continuity for the family was provided by James at Gulton. There his son Henry gained fame for raising a fine early pea “Day’s Early Sunrise”. “He is naturally proud”, wrote the Dover Illustrated in 1899 “of the fact that the cost of the comfortable house he has built for himself at Cup Street, and which he has called “Sunrise Cottage”, has been entirely defrayed out of the proceeds of this particularly fine vegetable”. The house is a gracious example of a minuscule Victorian country residence, with opposite it two labourers’ cottages called “Sunset Cottages” in the same style. Moreover Henry’s two sons, Arthur and Albert, continued the family tradition with soft fruit and vegetables which the Dover Illustrated assured its readers found a ready market in London, Canterbury and Hastings. Arthur Cook had succeeded his father at School Farm, Gulton, when Henry moved to Sunrise. Just as John Cook senior may have been given his chance while still young to run his own holding by the insanity and death of his father, so perhaps with Henry, for his father James spent many years in Chartham Asylum. Despite all the many children, however, no member of the family bearing the name of Cook still remains in the village of Ash, though some of their descendants do.

On a larger than average scale the Cook family demonstrates an explosive demographic trend in the early nineteenth century, the profits to be made in farming during the Napoleonic War period, and the restless shifting pattern of farm tenancies in the area. A family of this size and vigour is so striking that it may well exaggerate the large Victorian family in the popular imagination. Of all the families reconstituted for a period of 200 years in a parish of approximately 1,500 to 2,000 people, the Cooks are the only one to exceed sixteen children and require two Cambridge Group forms. Their achievement is remarkable.
Notes

1. A family reconstitution of the registers of the parish of Ash-next-Sandwich, Kent, is being undertaken by a class in the village with the kind permission of the Vicar and with the support of the Cambridge Group for the history of Population and Social Structure. All the demographic information on the Cook family is drawn from the forms filled in by the class.

2. 1851 Census. Thanks to an energetic member of the Ash Local History Class and to Mr. D. Scurrrell, the baptism of Ann Sackett at St. John the Baptist, Thanet, has been found. The date was 26 June 1777, thus confirming the accuracy of the age given in the Census.

3. Information from the rating lists of the parish in the parish church.

4. The pattern of increasing infant mortality and higher probability of twins in the later life of a woman are both well illustrated by this family.

5. Information from Roger Schofield.


7. J. Henripin, La Population Canadienne au début du XVIIIe siècle (France 1954), 50.

8. For the Hutterites the crude birth rate was 45.9 in the period 1946–50; for the French Canadians it was considerably higher, ranging from 47.3 in the decade 1681–90 to 65.2 in 1761–70.


10. John Cook’s will made provision for the estate to be sold by trustees and the proceeds to be evenly distributed between his children; so there was no particular feeling that the holding which had been built up in the family for some years should be retained. In a codicil a further provision relates to Zecharia whose share of the estate was to be administered for him by a trustee. It appears that in some way Zecharia was incapable. “The Cooks are all as mad as hatters!” is the local opinion. John also took particular care to stipulate that none of the children should live with their mother without her permission and without working for their own living. K.A.O./PRC/32/71/48.
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NOTES AND QUERIES

John Huxham’s Medical Diary: 1728–1752

Dr. John Huxham was a Devonian who spent the whole of his professional life as a medical practitioner in Plymouth. He had been trained at Leyden, under Boerhaave, from whom he seems to have derived his conviction that the seasons and the weather were of the greatest importance “as an exciting and, yet more, as a modifying cause of disease.”¹ He had been born at Totnes in 1692, and died at Plymouth, in August, 1768. He was a flamboyant personality, and might have seemed little more than a quack were it not for his considerable corpus of published works.

His medical reputation is based mainly on “An Essay on Fevers” (1755). This work went through several editions, and was translated, according to Munk, into most European languages. The writer has, however, found evidence of only Latin, French and Portuguese editions. From 1728 until some date in the 1750's Huxham kept a diary in which he recorded both the weather and the incidence and severity of disease as he experienced them in Plymouth. The first ten years, digested into monthly summaries, was published in Latin in 1739,² and this was followed by a similar diary for the next ten years, which appeared in 1752. An unauthorised translation of the first was published in 1759,³ and his son, John Corham Huxham, translated and published the second volume in 1767.⁴

Huxham continued his meteorological and medical observations at least until 1752. I have not been able to find a copy of the original edition of this last section of the diary,⁵ but the text is available, in Latin, in the two German editions of Huxham’s collected works,⁶ and a summary of it appears (in English) in his treatise on diphtheria.⁷

This note is concerned only with the medical sections of the diary. Huxham’s medical record is concise and in general states clearly the nature of the prevailing complaints and the degree to which they were fatal. Occasionally he uses expressions which are somewhat less than clinical, such as the “great Lowness of Spirits” which marked the beginning of 1728. The principle difficulty is the uncertainty regarding his medical terms. “Peripneumonies” is to be interpreted as bronchitis; angina, as quinsy; the ulcerous sore-throat, as diphtheria, and morbilli, as measles. Fevers of one kind or another were rarely absent, though it is not in every case easy to identify the names given them by Huxham. Cholera appeared not infrequently, and was generally associated by Huxham with the arrival in Plymouth of a ship from the tropics. But the commonest of the more serious complaints was unquestionably variolae, or smallpox. A not infrequent complaint was the “Devonshire colic”. Huxham published a short treatise on the illness, which he linked with an overconsumption of cider. He failed, however, to discover its cause, which was lead-poisoning, brought about by fermenting cider in leaden vats.

Many of these diseases grew in virulence until they became epidemic, and then subsided. As a general rule, Huxham traces these movements with considerable care, so that one can trace their course. This is especially so with smallpox. It is, of course, difficult to translate his qualitative statements into comparative expressions of the severity of an epidemic. It is, however, evident that terms like “here and there” (passim) or “some”, as applied to the manifestation of a disease, implies a lesser degree of severity than “everywhere” and “severe”, and the latter terms probably indicate something a good deal short of “epidemic”.

It is tempting to compare Huxham’s record with the burial registers of the Plymouth
parishes. There were three: St. Andrews, Charles and Stoke Damerel, in the last of which the naval dockyard of Devonport was at this time being developed. The burial register of St. Andrews indicates "child" burials throughout the period under consideration; this is particularly important because Huxham refers more than once to the severity of measles and other illnesses amongst children.

The registers allow one to distinguish a series of mortality crises, of which the most severe occurred in 1729, 1734–5, 1739–41, 1746–7, 1749 and 1752. Those of 1729 and 1740 were, by and large, summer crises; the others occurred in winter and spring. The period of abnormally high mortality in 1729 (August–December) coincides precisely with that when smallpox "rages" or was "epidemic". In 1734, mortality increased steadily during the autumn months. In September, Huxham noted that smallpox was "slight", but in the following months it became "epidemic" and indeed remained so until March before it was downgraded to "pretty common", and in late summer ceased to appear in the diary. Again, the rise and decline of the epidemic coincides exactly with the duration of the period of high mortality, though this latter must have owed something to fevers. Huxham wrote that "epidemic fever" had caused a heavy mortality in the summer of 1734, while a year later "many die of fever."

The crises which lasted from the beginning of 1739 until the early months of 1741 was more complex. It began with epidemic measles, "fatal to many children." The St. Andrews register shows a high child mortality for this period; 51 out of 84 burials in the first four months of the year were of "children." Thereafter smallpox prevailed. By October, 1739, "the small-pox now reigned every-where." Until 1742 there was not a month in which Huxham did not record smallpox more or less serious. The most severe mortality in the period studied was recorded in the spring and summer of 1740. That this was not entirely due to smallpox is clear from the diary. In March there was "a very terrible Asthma;" in April, "a most terrible kind of Pleurisy." In July, "pestilential fever destroyed many," and "the common Burials were increased to at least six Times." but by September, fevers were "less violent", and the most severe mortality crisis of the period covered by the diary was at last passing, though the following winter was marked by "terrible Asthma," and the smallpox still lingered on. Indeed, Huxham wrote in May, 1741: "I scarce ever remember the Small-pox to have been everywhere more rife."

The mortality crisis of 1746–7 was less intense than that of 1739–41, but, like the latter, was marked throughout by epidemic smallpox. Measles were common, and pneumonia, pleurisy and bronchitis, acute. In July, 1746, Huxham wrote: "not only Small-pox, but almost every other Disorder, was now of a worse kind than during the Spring." This situation continued until the summer of 1747, when mortality fell to a low level, and in July and August Huxham was able to record "very few disorders".

Mortality was high in late 1749, bordering the crisis level, but the only other severe crisis during the period was in the last three months of 1752. Both these periods were marked by epidemic smallpox. Other illnesses do not seem to have been unduly serious, though chest complaints were common. In December, 1752, he wrote plures phthisici moriuntur. With this the portions of the diary now extant come to an end.

One dwells on the periods of crisis mortality. They were, however, interspersed with periods when serious illnesses were relatively few. 1731–3 was such a period. Huxham several times comments on the "exceeding healthy" conditions, with "very few diseases". Much of 1737 and 1738 were "not unhealthy" or "far from sickly", and the later 1740's were relatively healthy, with "very few disorders."
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For a period of 25 years we thus have a record of what, in the opinion of a highly intelligent and perceptive practitioner, were the most important causes of illness and death. It does not allow us to say what fraction of all deaths was due to smallpox, pneumonia or measles; it does permit us to say what, in each of the mortality crises, was the predominant cause of death. Throughout the record this appears to have been smallpox, with measles an important cause of death amongst children.

N.J.G. Pounds

Notes


2. Observationes de Aere et Morbis epidemicis, ab anno 1728 ad finem anni 1737 Plymuthi factae. His accedit opusculum de Morbo colico Damnoniensì, London, 1739.


5. See Edward E. Meeres, “Plymouth in the Eighteenth Century, from a Medical Point of View,” The Western Antiquary, VI (1886–7), 89–92, who claims to have searched in vain for this volume. The British Museum does not have a copy.


3. The registers are held in the Plymouth Record Office, and the writer acknowledges the help of Mrs. B. Cluers, archivist of Plymouth, in making them available.
Burials in the three urban parishes of Plymouth and Devonport, 1728–41, with the incidence of major ailments. The year is shown as beginning in January.
Hawkshead (Lancs.) Mobility (geographical and occupational) as shown by the reconstitution of the parish from the registers, 1585–1840

The baptism and burial registers of Hawkshead give place of residence within the parish frequently from 1585–1699, consistently from 1700–1840; they give occupation occasionally between 1585–1699, increasingly from 1700 until the middle of the century and consistently from then onwards. The marriage registers give the place of residence of the groom if he came from outside the parish — occasionally between 1585–1699, frequently between 1700–1840.

In carrying out the manual reconstitution of the parish a total of 4,432 family reconstitution forms (FRFs) were filled in, 2,779 for marriages registered in the parish, 1,653 based on the baptism of children, that is, where the marriages took place outside the parish. Over the period 1585–1840, therefore, some 4,432 families were dealt with, a slight overstatement as a new FRF was filled in whenever the husband remarried. As the work proceeded it became clear that the head of the family frequently changed his place of residence and sometimes his occupation, for a different place of residence and a different occupation were given at the baptisms of successive children. It was thought, therefore, that an investigation into the geographical and occupational mobility of Hawkshead people might prove interesting.

Searching through the whole body of 4,432 FRFs would have been too lengthy an exercise and it was decided to take a 30% sample. About 1,500 FRFs were considered and of these about 900, 20% of the total number provided the requisite data. For this sample families with names starting with “S” to “Y” were used and to make up the number the “Ls” were added. Using these names gave an interesting range of families from large groups bearing the same surname (though not the two largest — Braithwaites and Rigges) to quite small groups, and including every variety of occupation from gentlemen and yeomen to the lowly labourers and slaters. For the purpose of the exercise the full span 1585–1840 was divided into two periods: 1585–1699, the years for which the registers gave little detail and 1700–1840, the years for which full detail of residence and occupation was given with reasonably consistency.

Let us look first at the bridegrooms who came from outside the parish to marry Hawkshead girls. In the period 1585–1699 three only were mentioned; they came from Langdale, Lowick Green and Patterdale to claim their brides. In the years 1700–1840 a total of seventy-eight grooms came from outside the parish; fiftynine took their brides back to their own parish; nineteen would appear to have settled in Hawkshead as children of the marriage were baptised in the parish church, though in some instances only one child was baptised there. It would seem that it was the custom in some families to have the first child baptised in the mother’s parish. The largest number of grooms — twentythree — came from the nearby parish of Ulverston, about ten miles south of Hawkshead: seven were miners or slaters, six farmers or husbandmen, one carpenter, a cordwainer, a tailor, a sadler and a shopkeeper among their number. Next came Colton just south of Furness Fells with eight grooms: three occupations only were given, two husbandmen and one tailor. After this came Grasmere, just north of Hawkshead with six grooms, two blacksmiths, one husbandman, one miller and two unidentified, followed by Kendal (Kirkby Kendal) with five. Then we have three parishes each producing four bridegrooms — Windermere, Cartmel and Crosthwaite followed by Kirkby Ireleth with three. The remaining twentytwo grooms came from twentytwo different parishes, some from as far away as Liverpool, Salford and Warrington, but mostly from places further afield in Westmorland, Cumberland and North Lancashire, such as Broughton, Millom, Cockermouth, Wigton and Bootle.¹
A number of strangers or sojourners had their children baptised in Hawkshead: two in the period 1585–1699, a Scotsman who settled in the parish and an Egyptian or gypsy; ten in the period 1700–1840: four soldiers (one a Captain in the Sixth Regiment of the Madras Cavalry), one mariner, two Scotsmen, a vagrant, a student and a surgeon. In addition excisemen or gagers are mentioned a number of times and it would seem that these officials stayed in the parish for a short period and then moved on.

We must now consider mobility within the parish itself and it should be pointed out that Hawkshead was a very large parish of lowlands and hills, fells and forests, lakes and tarns, bordered on the east and south by Lake Windermere and the river Leven, on the west by the Crake, Coniston Water and the Yewdale Beck and on the north by the Brathay flowing through Elterwater into Lake Windermere. According to the 1831 Census the whole parish which included the townships of Hawkshead, Claife, Monk Coniston with Skelwith and Satterthwait Chapelry occupied 22,220 acres and had 2,060 inhabitants. Of these inhabitants there were first of all those who spent their whole married life in one place, that is, those for whom the register gives the same place of residence at marriage, at the baptisms of successive children and at burial: there were 103 of these immobile heads of families in the period 1585–1699, ninetytwo in the period 1700–1840. For the years 1585–1699 fiftythree heads of families had more than one place of residence within the parish, 155 in the years 1700–1840. These two sets of figures taken together suggest that mobility within the parish was considerably greater in the period 1700–1840 than in the earlier period.

When we come to look at occupations we find that we have to ignore the first period: occupations were given only in ten instances: a gentleman, two bailiffs, a parish clerk, two smiths, a horsecopper, two hatters, an husbandman and a carrier. From now on we shall therefore deal only with the years 1700–1840. For these years the registers assign one occupation only to 300 heads of families. Breaking down this number we have thirtyone instances of one occupation registered at more than one date linked to the same place of residence registered at more than one date. We thus have a small core of heads of families of whom we know with certainty that they were stable both in residence and occupation throughout their lives. Next we have thirtyeight heads of families who registered the same occupation but more than one place of residence throughout their lives, whilst only eighteen registered different occupations but the same place of residence. Finally there were fortyfive heads of families who registered both more than one occupation and more than one place of residence. It is this group which is of special interest.

Twentyeight of the fortyfive, more than half, gave their occupation variously as labourer, husbandman or farmer. It would appear that these terms were interchangeable. These labourers-husbandmen-farmers moved about a good deal, not just within their own quarter of the parish but from Satterthwait to the Sawrey, to the Skelwith, to the Coniston district. Occasionally they were attached to the great houses and moved between Hawkshead and Graythwaite Hall. This applied also to the gardiners, sometimes called labourers or husbandmen, who seem to have been attached to the two Halls or to houses in Hawkshead Town. Millers too changed their abode being either attached to Hawkshead Hall or working independently in the Town, Skinnerhow or Gallobarrow: one must have been a man of some substance for he died a ‘householder’. They did not often change their occupation though one became a maltmaker, whilst John Taylor of Town turned from being a miller in 1823 to being a grocer in 1832, a shopkeeper in 1834, a Relieving Officer in 1839 and back to shopkeeper in 1841. The term "yeoman" does not often occur in the Registers, the supposedly typically Lakeland term "Statesman" never. However, Mathew Wilson of Hollinbank was a farmer in 1829, a
yeoman in 1835, George Watson of Hollinbank, an husbandman in 1800, a yeoman in 1811; William Towers of Sawrey changed from husbandman to farmer and was upgraded to yeoman between 1830–36. John Sawrey of Town was a butcher from 1752–65 but died a yeoman in 1799, and lastly, William Taylor was a yeoman of Briers in 1780 but a Gentleman of Colthouse in 1799. The last entry would seem to confirm the impression one gains from working through the registers that the more substantial farmers were often referred to as “Mr” and were considered to belong to the lesser gentry.

Sometimes there is a change from a farming to a non-agricultural occupation or vice-versa. Five labourers-husbandmen became colliers. One of these, Edward Walker was married, a husbandman of Hawkshead in 1797; he was a collier of Briers in Sawrey from 1798–1802; by 1808 he had moved to Town and between 1808–17 he was successively described as carrier, labourer and woodcutter. Robert Wallas of Colthouse was described in 1783 as farmer, and carrier. Edward Smith was married as a husbandman of Hawkshead parish in 1779, later that year he was a carrier of Colthouse and in 1781 he joined the army. There were two swillers who turned farmer and husbandman respectively, one husbandman became a slater, one a weaver and one a boatman. Two husbandmen were butchers for some years of their lives and one of them died a yeoman. More unusually, George Ullock of Fieldhead was an husbandman in 1821, a taylor in 1827 and William Towers of Near Sawrey was a hatmaker from 1785–93 but was registered a yeoman and gentleman in 1797 and as such was buried at Near Sawrey in 1836. Finally, James Sarjinson was married, an husbandman of Hawkshead parish in 1805 but the next year was a footman at Keenground and by 1811 had risen to be the butler at Hawkshead Hall.

On the whole wallers seem to have stuck to their craft; occasionally they were called stonemasons or plasterers, but one waller turned slater and one took up weaving. They certainly seem to have moved all over the parish to build their cunningly contrived drystone walls. Slaters and miners also mostly stayed in their occupations with the exception of those husbandmen and labourers who temporarily took up mining or slategetting. They mostly came from the Coniston district though quite a few came from Ulverston and then settled in the Satterthwaite part of the parish. Then there were the colliers who burnt the charcoal which formed the basis of the iron smelting industry mostly in the wooded southern part of the parish. Colliers sometimes turned to the allied occupations of cooper and swiller for all these trades were connected with the different uses of the widespread coppice which was so important a feature of the surrounding landscape. Finally there were such oddities as the cooper who turned collier and then became a potter; the slater who finished his life as a shoemaker in the Sandground poor-house and a stonemason from Colthouse who became an innkeeper in the town.

It remains to look at the village crafts and at the merchandising occupations. These too usually stayed the same throughout the man’s life, though there are exceptions: a candlemaker of Town combined the business of tallow Chandler and seedsmen; another of the same family and also of Town was within a ten year period a tallow Chandler, a draper and a postmaster; one taylor was also a staymaker and another a cordwainer; a swiller became a cooper and a fiddler a weaver.

Finally, the burial register sometimes describes the deceased as “householder”, indicating, it would seem, that he owned or at least occupied a house. There were thirty-nine householders between 1700–1840. For a number of these no occupation was given, but those for whom occupations were given were men of some standing and substance for they included two
mercers (also described as Mr), a taylor, a tanner, two joiners (of the same family), a carrier, two weavers or websters, a shoemaker and a miller. At the opposite end of the scale were the poor or paupers, twenty-nine in all, and these included labourers, husbandmen, slaters, a farmer, a butcher, two shoemakers and a joiner; one pauper was also a householder. Then there was a little group of five old men who were boarders at the time of their death, among them Mr. Samuel Sands, Gentleman, who at his death in 1684 was a boarder at Graythwaite Hall. The Sands were the armigerous family, but Ullocks, Whinfields, Vernons, Thompsons, Tatham, Smiths, Setons, Sadlers and Stricklands counted gentry among their number. In all thirty-two men were described as Gentleman, Esquire or Mr. over the whole period 1585–1840.

To conclude: it would appear that during the years 1585–1840 most of the people of Hawkshead lived in the same place throughout their lives, though the method of registration has only allowed us to establish this with certainty for a much smaller number. What is more, the reconstitution indicates that families continued to live in the same place from generation to generation and members of large family groups tended to congregate in the same district. But there was a small minority who were footloose and wandered all over the parish and their number increased as the years went by and was greater by some 10% in the period 1700–1840 than in the earlier period. The great majority of Hawkshead men did not change their occupation during their lifetime but lack of registration in the early period only allows us to make this assertion for the later period. And most of those who continued in the same occupation also remained in the same place, though a small number moved about the parish. Of those who had more than one occupation the majority also had more than one place of residence and most of these were to do with the land, either as labourers-husbandmen-farmers or as wallers-slaters-colliers.

The intriguing question to which the registers unfortunately give no answer, is whether this mobility was one of inclination or of economic necessity. On balance it would seem that labourer, husbandman and to a certain extent farmer were synonymous and that these men moved to where their services were required. But the term farmer was sometimes associated with the ownership or at any rate the tenure of land and the farmer might become a yeoman or even a gentleman. The wallers too moved to where the work was and the same applied to slaters and miners. The boundary between all these occupations was very indistinct and was crossed by all the workers as necessity and/or inclination demanded. It is less easy to determine or even to guess at the reason for changing from an agricultural to a craft or merchandising occupation, though almost certainly the inability to make a living must have reinforced ambition or the desire for change, as witnessed in the history of the man who progressed from husbandman to footman to butler. Even the change from husbandman to carrier to soldier may not have been entirely due to a roving disposition.

Karla Oosterveen

Notes
1. See also Mrs. Kathleen Leonard’s analysis of grooms from other parishes: p.58 Transcription of the Register of Marriages in the parish of Hawkshead (Lancashire) 1754–1837.
2. ‘Baptised 2-12-1829 George Arthur, son of Captain George Sandys and Sarah Teresa, his wife, of Graythwaite Hall and the Sixth Regiment H.C. Madras Cavalry. Born 15-6-1826, privately baptised at Jaubrah on 27 July 1826 by Lt. Col. C. Deacon, there being no ordained Minister at the station according to the certificate of William Roy, Senior Chaplain for Fort St. George, transmitted to me, Robert Bell, officiating Minister.’ (Hawkshead Baptism Register).
3. I am indebted to Mrs. Kathleen Leonard for this information.
The Smallpox Controversy

As a part of the debate about the importance of smallpox inoculation during the eighteenth century, I will try to comment on Mr. Bradley's remarks on my review of his work in the sequence of those remarks. (LPS 10 page 67)

As a first part of his argument, Bradley reiterates the belief that during the eighteenth century smallpox carried off "a thirteenth or a fourteenth part of every generation" and supports this conclusion by invoking the authority of a Dr. K. Dietz, a medical statistician. It is obvious however that a conclusion of this kind can only be scientifically reached through a detailed examination of all the available evidence. As far as I am aware, the only place where this has been done for England and Wales is in my doctoral thesis, The Role of Smallpox Inoculation in the Growth of Population in Eighteenth Century Britain. The statistics which form the basis of the conclusion quoted by Bradley are almost exclusively derived from the experience of the larger towns (in which only about a fifth of the population lived by the end of the eighteenth century), which as I mentioned in my review are fundamentally suspect. This is a point later raised by Bradley and I will return to it as it is perhaps the key part of this particular debate.

Concerning the degree of importance of the reduction in smallpox mortality in the general growth of population due to inoculation, my position has changed since I wrote the Economic History Review article in 1965. This change was brought about by my work on the reliability of parish registers published in the March, 1972 edition of Population Studies which is also referred to by Bradley. In that article I calculate national death rates for the period 1801–1841 which indicate that there was a sharp fall in mortality during these forty years. As this period was, on my earlier evidence, after the virtual elimination of smallpox as a major disease from this country, there were clearly other factors at work during the Industrial Revolution period other than smallpox inoculation bringing about a growth in population. In a new forthcoming article in Population Studies I argue from a review of all the evidence for this period that the fall in mortality was due to a marked improvement in personal hygiene as measured by an increase in per capita consumption of soap and perhaps more importantly by the dramatic utilisation of cotton goods for clothing (cottons were much more easily washable than traditional woollens). The details of this argument are of no importance in the present debate, but the general conclusion obviously means that I am no longer claiming that pre-inoculation smallpox mortality was of such a high order that its elimination could have accounted for the whole of the population increase during the latter half of the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth century. In this respect Mr. Bradley and I are now in agreement.

Where we do still seriously disagree is over the reliability of parish register data as a basis for conclusions about the mortality from particular diseases or in fact about any demographic conclusions whatsoever, without a substantial correction factor. My work on the reliability of Anglican baptism registers suggests that only about two-thirds of all births were registered and this figure could rise to over a half in urban areas like Hackney and Kingston, Bradley believes that there are serious flaws in the method I use for calculating the numbers of unregistered births; the only such flaw that he specifically mentions is my assumption that "baptism has always been performed by the Anglican church in the parish of residence". I concede that this was a mistaken assumption inasmuch as since I completed this work the Cambridge Group have discovered a number of births which took place in Colyton but were registered in the baptism registers of adjoining parishes. However, it is unlikely that this
practice took place on any scale: after 1812 it was required by law to record the parish of residence at the time of baptism and a cursory examination of a number of registers for the post-1812 period suggests that baptism in parishes other than that at birth was very rare. Dr. E.A. Wrigley has counted the number of such discrepancies in the Colyton parish register and according to a personal communication the proportion of such cases during the period 1812–1850 was under three per cent. This is an important area which requires much further research, but the very limited evidence available to date does not suggest that flaws in my assumption about the place of baptism would materially alter the conclusions reached in my Population Studies article.

Whatever the outcome of future research into the reliability of parish registers in general, there can be no doubt that baptism registers for parishes within large urban areas such as London were seriously deficient during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. According to my calculations, the Hackney register recorded under thirty per cent of all births in the parish during the last forty years of the eighteenth century; whatever adjustments had to be made to this proportion on account of baptisms outside of the parish of birth, they are bound to be minor in the context of this scale of under-registration. Hackney was a part of the Bills of Mortality area and so its statistics would have formed a part of the basis of the figures used by contemporaries to calculate the mortality from various diseases, including the ones referred to in Bradley’s pamphlet. This scale of under-registration would make the mathematical calculations of Bernoulli and d’Alembert not worth the paper that they were written on.

It is also likely that problems in the accuracy of parish data were not confined to urban areas: I found sharp variations both over time and between different parishes in my work on register reliability. The main reason why so many parish registers were unreliable was probably a function of the system of registration. There was always a delay between the actual performance of a baptism and its registration in the register; also the registers were often kept by semi-literate parish clerks or by clerics who relegated the onerous task of making the entries in the register to moments of “leisure, whenever he had nothing better to do, and perhaps has never entered them at all”.

But there were other sources of error other than the system of registration: there is a limited amount of evidence to suggest for example that smallpox victims were often buried in private burial grounds and not entered in the burial register. Bradley states that I only refer to two examples of this out of a total of about 15,000 parishes; this is in fact not the case, as one of the two examples refers to a general statement by the eminent eighteenth doctor, T. Dimsdale, that often “due care is taken to bury the dead (from smallpox) privately” in the burial grounds attached to pest houses. A specific example of this is presumably an entry to be found in the Maidstone parish register: there were 102 children who died from smallpox in Maidstone during the year 1760 and were buried “out of town” — their burial was not registered in the list of Anglican burials, although their total number was mentioned in passing in the parish register.

The deficiencies in parish registers mean that they should be used with extreme caution by historical demographers and others in order to arrive at reliable conclusions. In the case of pre-inoculation smallpox mortality, I prefer to rely on direct contemporary statistics of case fatality rates than on changes in the number of burials during epidemic years such as those referred to by Bradley. The most important example of such direct statistics is the nation-wide survey of smallpox mortality during the 1720’s conducted by Jurin and others: of the 13,192 cases of people who had caught smallpox in the sample, 2,167 died — a case-fatality rate of
16.5 per cent. As smallpox was a universal disease at this time — everyone sooner or later catching the disease — the level of mortality would have been somewhat lower than the case-fatality rate, some people dying from other causes before catching the disease. In my original work on smallpox inoculation I assumed that smallpox mortality overall would have been higher than that suggested by the evidence on the case-fatality rate — and I assumed this because of a number of possible reasons for under-registration of mortality, such as the existence of fulminating smallpox which is a particularly fatal form of the disease only recently discovered with the aid of sophisticated laboratory techniques. I am now inclined to think that pre-inoculation smallpox mortality was about the same level as the case-fatality rate, i.e. 16.5 per cent. These estimates will have to be carefully re-considered in the light of all the surveys of case-fatality during the eighteenth century when all the demographic work by the Cambridge Group and others has been completed.

Finally, there is the question of the extent of inoculation in different areas of the country at different points of time. This is a topic which L.P.S. readers could certainly make a very useful contribution as very often contemporary sources give very detailed figures of the numbers of people inoculated out of the total who required such a form of protection. Most of this evidence is scattered in parish papers, such as the accounts of the overseers of the poor or of the churchwardens. In the context of the more general argument however, the precise amount of inoculation practised is less important than Bradley appears to believe. Inoculation was supplemented by vaccination by the beginning of the nineteenth century, and although in Great Britain inoculation probably remained the more important of the two until the 1840’s, between them they more than protected the population against smallpox (some people were both inoculated and vaccinated). The detailed evidence known to me still suggests that smallpox had been virtually obliterated in most parts of the country, particularly in the countryside. As for Mr. Bradley’s final question, may I be permitted to ask him one myself: has he read my doctoral thesis on the subject?

P.E. Razzell

Notes


2. For this quote and other similar kinds of evidence see Ibid, p. 141.


4. See my doctoral thesis The Role of Smallpox Inoculation in the Growth of Population in Eighteenth Century Britain (Oxford University), pp. 224–238. The universality of smallpox is indicated by the age-incidence of the disease: even before the introduction of inoculation it was mainly a disease of childhood. It is difficult to see on what grounds Bradley rejects the argument about the absence of extreme mortalities such as that which occurred in the Orkney Islands and Iceland — I repeat, if smallpox had been entirely absent from communities for very long periods of time, the result would have been massive mortalities from very infrequent but highly fatal epidemics.
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MISCELLANY

Some European marriage rites

The extracts printed here are taken from a volume published in 1724 with the title 'A critical essay concerning marriage' by 'A Gentleman'. Richard Wall, who contributed this item, has not been able to find out anything about the book so far but from preliminary enquiries it seems likely that it is extremely rare. He purchased it in a secondhand bookshop in Colyton.

Marriage rites, etc. in MUSCOVY

The Man is not permitted to see his Mistress before the Marriage, but employs some of his Relations to view her from Head to Foot; and upon their Report he forms a Judgment of his intended Bride. Upon the Day appointed for the Solemnization, the Bridegroom goes, in the Evening, to the Bride's House, the Priest marching before him on Horseback: And even then he is not permitted to see his Spouse, but a Piece of Taffeta is held between them: Being both richly dressed and painted, according to the Custom of the Country, they go to Church, where a Canopy is placed over them; and when they have made the usual Offerings, the Priest blesses them, holding certain Images over their Heads; then taking the Man by the right Hand, and the Woman by the left, he asks them, three times, if they are willing to be married? and both answering, Yes, the whole Company join Hands, and the hundred and twenty eighth Psalm is sung, the Priest repeating one Verse, and the Company the other. If they have been married before, the Priest puts a Garland of Rue upon their Heads, and about their Shoulders, and bids them multiply and increase, and adds, Whom God hath joined together, let no Man separate: Then one of the Company gives the Priest a Glass of Wine, who drinks to the married Couple: Afterwards the Bridegroom throws down the Glass, and he and his Bride trample it under their Feet, saying, May they thus fall under our Feet, and be trod to Pieces, who shall endeavour to sow Division betwixt us, and the Women throw Flax and Hempseed at the new married Pair, wishing them Prosperity; others lay hold of the Bride's Gown, as loth to part with her; but she embraces the Bridegroom and will not part with him. As for the Transactions after the Bridegroom's carrying her home, they are not very decent, and therefore I choose to omit them. The wedding Day is said to be the last pleasant Day the Wife has, being never allowed to stir abroad afterwards; though they take no Manner of Care of the House, but spend their Time in embroidering and other Needle Works. The Husband exercises an absolute Dominion over his Wife, frequently proceeds to Blows, which she is said to take very kindly from him, and will hardly be persuaded he loves her, if she does not sometimes feel the Weight of his Hand.

The Men have no other Notion of Adultery, than the marrying another Man's Wife, though they have such a Veneration, it seems, for their holy Utensils, that they will not lye with a Woman till they have taken off the Cross and Images she wears about her, and veiled all the Images in the Room. The Women are never suffered to advance further than the Church Porch, being looked upon as too impure to enter the consecrated Place. The Men observe four Lents in every Year, in which they are not permitted any Commerce with their Wives.

The Muscovites Have more Monasteries for divorced Wives than for Mards, where they live under no Manner of Restraint, but prostitute themselves to any Man they meet. The Men here are far from adoring their Mistresses in the Manner they do in some Parts of the World; they waste but little Time in Courtship, and setting forth the Beauty and Accomplishments of
their Mistresses; though their Women, it is said, don't want their Share of Charms.

The Czar generally shuts up his Sisters and Daughters in his Court, or in Monasteries, and will seldom suffer them to marry, looking upon the Issue of all such as marry to those of another Communion, as no better than Bastards; and they may not marry any of the Czar's own Subjects, for these he esteems his Slaves; and he does not it seems suffer even his own Wife to eat with him.

The Inhabitants of the Province of Samoieda buy as many Wives as they can purchase for their Deer; Persons of Distinction generally have four or five, and he is esteemed the richest Man, who has most Daughters and Deer to dispose of, for they sell both to the best Bidder. They solemnize their Marriages by making a great Feast, which lasts several Days; after which, the Bride being adorned with Brass Rings, Bells, Fish Bones, etc. is delivered to her Husband: Then all their Friends leave them in his Tent till next Morning, and if he does not like his Wife after half a Year, or a Year's Tryal, he returns her to her Friends, and receives back the Deer he paid for her.

The Siberians marry as many Wives as they can keep, they buy them of their Fathers, but have no Priests to solemnize the Wedding; however, it seems they scruple to marry within the fourth Degree.

The Tartars are also remarkable for their Poligamy; and we are told of one of them that had no less than forty Children by his Wives within the Space of one Year.

Marriage rites etc. in POLAND

The Ladies in this Country are remarkable for their Modesty, which is looked upon as an Effect of that Liberty their Husbands indulge them in; it being a common Observation, that in those Countries where they are under the strictest Confinement, they seldom fail to violate the Marriage Bed as often as they meet with an Opportunity.

But they pay the Husband a Respect that is not known amongst us; for when they want any Thing of him, they ask it kneeling, embrace his Knees, and call him their Benefactor.

Their Weddings generally last three Days; and on the second all the Guests make Presents to the Bride, which is the best Part of her Portion. It is said that the Princess of Poland, who married the Elector of Bavaria, had not less than 100,000 Crowns presented her at her Wedding.

Among the inferior People, the Maids seldom marry till twenty four or thirty Years of Age, and before they have spun a good Quantity of Cloth, which at the Wedding is distributed among the Bridegroom's Friends. These Virgins are also obliged to serve their Mothers in all domestick Affairs for some Time before they marry, as the Sons do their Fathers, in their proper Business; and it is said, they make a much stricter Enquiry into the Character of their Mistresses, than into their Fortunes.

Marriage rites etc. in SWEDEN

Here the Parents, without consulting their Children, match them as they think fit, and Wealth is chiefly considered in the Affair: The poor Girls have not so much as an Opportunity of being courted and admired, or the Lover the Pleasure of communicating his Flame:
However, their Weddings are exceeding pompous and magnificent, in some, much that the Excess of that Day sometimes so involves them in Debt, as they do not easily extricate themselves. The Wives being all Submission, it is said, there very seldom happens any domestick Jars, and consequently but few Divorces. It seems, Cousin Germans are not permitted to marry without the King’s License.

Marriage rites etc. in DENMARK

It is sometimes three or four Years between the Espousals, and the Solemnization of the Marriage here; and during that Time they admit of all Familiarities. If the Marriage be but celebrated before the Wife is brought to Bed, all is well; and so it is in Holland, where half a dozen, or half a score Couple come to solemnize their Nuptials together, who have lived as Man and Wife from the Time of their Espousals.

Marriage rites etc. in Swedish LIVONIA

Their Ceremonies of Marriage are peculiar to themselves; when a Peasant marries a Maid of another Town, he makes her ride behind him, and before him rides a Bag-piper, and two of his Friends with naked Swords, who give two Strokes cross the Door of the Bridegroom’s House, and strike one of the Swords into a Beam over the Bridegroom’s Head, to prevent Charms. For the same Reason the Bride scatters many pieces of red Stuff on the High-ways, and on the Graves of unbaptized Children. The Bride sits at Table with a Veil over her Face, and when the Guests are seated, the Bridegroom and she rise and go to Bed, and return in two Hours; and the Feast is concluded with dancing and drinking, till they all drop down upon the Floor.

Marriage rites etc. in LAPLAND

The young Men court those Women whose Parents or Friends can give them most Rain Deer, and generally bribe her Relations for their Content: When he comes first he stands at the Door, and must not come in till her Father allow him. If the Father agrees, and afterwards breaks his Promise of giving him his Daughter, the Lover recovers all his Expenses and Gifts. When the Bride goes to Church, she is dragged along by her Relations, pretending the greatest Reluctancy to Matrimony. The Bridegroom must serve his Father-in-Law a Year, before he can take away his Wife, and her Patrimony of Rain Deer; when all the Friends give Presents to the new married couple.

Marriage rites etc. in Antient GERMANY

Tacitus says, these were almost the only Barbarians who contented themselves with one Wife apiece, except a few who had more, and those they had rather as a Mark of Nobility, than any Thing else.

He also observes, that amongst some of them Virgins were only allowed to marry, and that no Woman married a second Time: They reckoned it base to lye with Women till they were twenty Years of Age; and this Abstinence, it is said, contributed to the Strength and Stature of themselves and their Children.

Cluverius says the same was observed in his Time, and that young Men generally lived unmarried till above twenty. It was not their Custom for Women to bring Portions to their
CORRESPONDENCE

The Smallpox Controversy

Dear Sir,

Let me answer Dr. Razzell’s final question first (see Notes and Queries Section). Yes, I have read his doctoral thesis, and I have my voluminous notes on it beside me as I write. It was, in fact, my feeling that in his thesis he had drawn his conclusion about a very high degree of smallpox mortality from inadequate evidence which led me to contrast it with the evidence of contemporary observers such as Bernoulli — evidence which Dr. Razzell dismisses contemptuously as “not worth the paper it was written on”. Yet Dr. Razzell himself writes: “I prefer to rely on direct contemporary statistics of case-fatality rates”. He cannot have it both ways.

In any case, it would appear that he has justified my objections by abandoning the position which he took up both in the thesis and in his article in the Economic History Review. But now the ground has shifted from smallpox to the inadequacies of parish registers. That under-registration of baptisms occurred has never been in dispute. What is in dispute is the same kind of exaggerated claim as to that to which I objected in the smallpox discussion. Dr. Razzell writes “only about two-thirds of baptisms were recorded”. He bases this claim on a study of five parishes in the second quarter of the nineteenth century which he then proceeds to regard as typical of the whole country and, since he uses the argument in respect of smallpox mortality, the previous century. His generalisation proceeds from two statements:

a. “the registers were often kept by semi-literate parish clerks or by clerics who relegated the onerous task of making the entries in the register to moments of leisure” etc.

b. (of baptisms outside the parish of birth) “it is unlikely that this practice took place on any scale”, and he quotes one parish, Colyton.

He repeats, too: “there is a limited amount of evidence to suggest that smallpox victims were often buried in private burial grounds”. One must presume that Dr. Razzell is aware that there were great variations as between parishes and, in the same parish, at different periods and one asks: how often; how unlikely? My experience would lead me to different conclusions. But I don’t jump to the conclusion that my parishes are typical. The evidence is, at the moment, just not available, either to Dr. Razzell or to me. Generalisation is, of course, a legitimate process, but it has to be used with caution. It really will not do for Dr. Razzell to make generalisations for which the evidence does not yet exist and yet to talk about “conclusions... scientifically reached through a detailed examination of all the available evidence”.

Yours faithfully,
Leslie Bradley,

Sheldon Cottage, Elton, Matlock, Derbyshire.

Abortion, Infanticide and Pleading One’s Belly

Dear Sir,

I have recently seen the extracts from Willughby Local Population Studies 8 (1972) pp. 58—61, and note the editorial request for information on the legal point involved in the case of the idiot hanged, apparently, for not having a midwife present.
I am currently writing, under the auspices of the Wellcome Foundation, a history of Tudor and Stuart obstetrics and gynaecology, and have been enquiring into the legal aspects of abortion, infanticide and 'pleading one's belly'. This case is unique as far as I know, but there are others, some mentioned in printed works, one in the record office here, which afford material for study in this field. If you have not received any helpful information I will make a special point of exploring this problem and let you have the results (if any).

I also have in mind a study of the infant and maternal mortality rates, using the Bills of Mortality, but it seems such an obvious topic I wonder if it has not already been done?

Yours sincerely,
Audrey Eccles,

Westmorland Record Office, County Hall, Kendal, Westmorland.

Local Population Studies in Schools, Colleges and Groups

Dear Sir,

I would like to make a number of comments on your communal editorial in L.P.S. No. 10 (Spring 1973) entitled "Local Population Studies in Schools, Colleges and Groups."

My own experience is with the first two kinds of institution, particularly the second, in the form you imply, a college of education. The points I wish to make concern staff and students in both kinds of institution.

Your comment on the "remarkable paucity" of college lecturers and teachers who read L.P.S. is, I think, impressionistic. Your own records can supply the number of college libraries which subscribe to L.P.S. and this figure would be an interesting statistic and one that would provide some basis for opinion. Even if the number of subscribing college libraries is low, this would not necessarily be a good measure of the influence of the journal which is available in many libraries and presumably at all Record Offices. Publicity directed at any college library or archive office which does not already subscribe, would be more profitable than a critical lament. From the evidence of courses for college history lecturers run by the D.E.S. or the History Section of the A.T.C.D.E. there is apparently widespread interest in the use of quantification techniques and population study in colleges. Such studies are already a part of many college history courses. They need to be no more than a small part. As a method of approach to history they do not necessarily provide a better training in history for the potential teacher than the diplomatic or the political struggles of Anne's reign. These studies have the attractions of a fresh approach and are undeniably popular with some students but they can be vastly time consuming to do in any worthwhile way. As a tutor who has subjected various third year groups to two reconstructions, a dozen or more aggregations and various statistical analyses of local documents as part of a course on 18th century Social History I think it an admirable approach. The students who selected this option also seem satisfied, at least there was no academic mutiny, but they did have a choice between that option and ones on Roman Britain, Elizabethan England and Modern America, and even the 18th century group studied problems and topics not readily treated by quantificatory methods or related to demography.
Teachers, I think, must make the same kinds of choice. If their enthusiasm and knowledge lead them to emphasising world history, archaeology, local history, or twentieth century history, in which quantification and population study form merely a part, I personally would not fear for the future of history in schools, provided the approach was informed by enthusiasm, knowledge, and defined objectives. There is an intellectual austerity about quantitative history. This appeals to some adults, but, despite the "new" maths, many children find the arithmetic texture of such studies forbidding. The vital statistics of history are not necessarily vital to school children who have an old fashioned and, to my mind, a sensible desire, to learn something of people in the past from the more colourful primary, literary and visual sources available. History for them should be more than a story of the mere man or woman of the parish.

The kind of history for which you are pleading is new. The pedagogical and academic demands made upon teachers are experiencing their own kind of inflation; time for new work is shrinking. In the new areas of learning, such as quantified population studies, there must be a time lag between promulgation of an approach in university text books and associated journals and the acceptance of this approach in the classroom. This time lag is sometimes as long as thirty years. Population studies, as you define them, are less than a decade old, possibly the time gap in this instance could be reduced by the production of practical, interesting and unpretentious textbooks, pamphlets, archive units and kits directed at specific age and aptitude groups in schools. It is unrealistic to expect many teachers to have either the time to work up the primary source material in their own locality or to be in touch with library facilities good enough for them to master a growing corpus of published material. A popularising process for teachers who have the interest and lack the time, is a necessary process if this new approach is to become generally accepted. You are over pessimistic in your attitude towards the reception of these new studies in the classroom. On your own showing, if I express your statistics rather differently, nearly 20% of the history teachers' associations which answered your questionnaire were engaged in some form of demographic work. This is not bad progress for a fledgling branch of historical studies and one that, because of its very considerable educational and historical attractions, is growing and will grow, in and out of college and school classrooms.

Yours faithfully,
J.A. Johnston, M.A., Ph.D.,

Deputy Principal, Bishop Grossetest College, Lincoln.
Comment by the Editors:

We are glad to find that Dr. Johnston does not share our pessimism over the state of local population studies in schools and colleges and it is encouraging to discover that many colleges do include population study in their courses. Whilst accepting that many of the points that Dr. Johnston makes are valid, some require further comment.

Our complaints about the paucity of college lecturers and school teachers amongst our subscribers was not without statistical basis. Of subscribing educational Institutions and libraries, only about a quarter are colleges of education. Only one school and one teachers’ centre subscribe. It is difficult to identify teachers and lecturers amongst private subscriptions but ostensibly they form only one per cent of the total. This impression of limited enthusiasm is confirmed by the poor response to the questionnaire sent to teachers’ associations. Dr. Johnston is correct in stating that twenty-five per cent of those who did reply were engaged in population study but the fact remains that eighty-two per cent failed to reply at all.

On the basis of these figures our editorial comments were surely reasonable, yet it would be fair to concede that it is schools and teachers’ centres rather than colleges which seem to show particularly little enthusiasm for population study. It would be sad if the valuable training in historical demography, which Dr. Johnston and others like him have given to teachers, never reaches the school classroom for lack of any incentive or resources in school to apply it.

Dr. Johnston correctly points out the traditional time-lag between university research in a new field and its classroom acceptance, but it is precisely this unnecessary time-lag which LPS aims to diminish by making available to the lay reader, inexpensively and in non-technical terms, the results of researches in local demography, and by drawing attention to available sources and ways of using them. Publishers too have begun to produce demographic source material in kit form — one can instance Longman’s ‘Population’ pack in Social Problems arising from the Industrial Revolution. The support that the overworked secondary teacher requires to embark on a local population study already exists — provided schools and teachers’ centres are prepared to make a modest investment in the necessary materials.

Finally, it would be unfortunate if Dr. Johnston’s letter left the impression on teachers that population study in the classroom is necessarily intellectually austere, quantitative history. Using the more personal family history approach (see for instance ’Peas and Fertility’ in this issue) quantification is hardly required. Where it does play a larger part, the sorting, arrangement and presentation of statistical material can be achieved with the most elementary arithmetical skill.
Dear Sir,

Following the tabulations for Burton Joyce and Oswaldkirk in recent issues of LPS, I applied the process to the aggregations for Herne, Kent, and its neighbour parish, Reculver, both rural coastal parishes on the north coast of the county; I carried the tabulation down to the decade 1831–40, since through that decade the seaside resort of Herne Bay was developing, while its registration figures went into the Herne registers. With one exception, the change of population-balance would seem to have had little effect. I also recorded minima, so far as possible.

The striking marriage seasonality shown for November in both Burton Joyce and Oswaldkirk is firmly transferred to October here, while the spring baptism peaks are similar to Mrs. Massey's, compared with Mr. Rowley's more even distribution. The midsummer minimum which they found is borne out by the Herne and Reculver tables.

As regards burials, the minima show a distinct falling-off in midsummer which compares fairly with the apparent minima of the earlier findings. The exceptional August peak at Herne in the 1831 decade is almost entirely due to a cholera outbreak in Herne Bay in August 1834, which accounts for about half the total burials for that month in the decade.

As usual, the Commonwealth period produces unsatisfactory figures in both parishes, but at Reculver a further complication is introduced in the period 1808–1813, thus affecting two decades, when the church, which was threatened by coast erosion, was demolished, and replaced by another further inland. Notes in the registers confirm that parish incidents were celebrated and recorded in neighbouring parishes, mainly at Hoath, which was legally a chapelry of Reculver. Thus the totals for these two decades are incomplete, but the basic pattern is unchanged.

I must compliment all concerned on the new look which LPS has acquired — the readability has improved enormously (and I don’t simply mean legibility either).

Yours sincerely,

Harold Gough

141 Grand Drive, Herne Bay, Kent.
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SMALLPOX INOCULATION: an eighteenth century mathematical controversy. 1971.  £0.75

H.E. Meller (ed.)
NOTTINGHAM IN THE 1880's: a study in social change. 1971.  £0.50

J.F. Phillips
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J. May (ed.)
EAST MIDLANDS ARCHEOLOGICAL BULLETIN 1961. £0.10. 1962, £0.15. 1964, £0.25 1965, £0.25. 1966, £0.30. Vol. 10, £0.50.

A. Rogers (ed.)
SOUTHWELL MINSTER AFTER THE CIVIL WARS 1974.  £0.75

J.S. Hartley and A. Rogers (ed.)
RELIGIOUS FOUNDATIONS OF MEDIAEVAL STAMFORD 1974.  £1.75

All prices include postage. Publications may be obtained from The Librarian, Department of Adult Education, University of Nottingham, 14–22 Shakespeare Street, Nottingham, NG1 4FJ.
LOCAL RESEARCH IN PROGRESS

The Editors believe that one of the functions of *Local Population Studies* should be to enable readers to make contact with others working in the same field as themselves. They cordially invite readers to submit brief details of work which they have in progress.

Roger Fieldhouse is intending to establish an informal group which will meet occasionally to discuss demographic studies in Yorkshire. The aim is to keep people researching in Yorkshire demography in touch with each other, to exchange ideas and, perhaps, to co-ordinate such work.

Anyone wishing to join this ad hoc group should contact Roger Fieldhouse, Department of Adult Education, 33 Hyde Terrace, the University, Leeds 2.

AGGREGATIONS, LISTINGS, etc. known to the CAMBRIDGE GROUP.

WORCESTERSHIRE (continued)

**Literacy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broome</td>
<td>Dr. R.S. Schofield</td>
<td>Cambridge Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eckington</td>
<td>Mrs. G.M. Williams</td>
<td>1 Birchwood Road, Malvern Links, Worcs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt and Little Witley</td>
<td>Dr. R. S. Schofield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reconstitution**

---

**Listings**

Worcester, St. Andrews (1795)

**YORK**

**Aggregative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St. Martin Coney Street</th>
<th>Mr. G.M. Pearce</th>
<th>Little Leys, 52 Franklin Road, Headington, Oxford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Michael the Belfry</td>
<td>Mrs. J. Fox</td>
<td>57 Hareston Valley Road, Caterham, Surrey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Aggregative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aughton</td>
<td>Mrs. B. Maltby</td>
<td>Lawrenny, Denton Road, Middleton Ilkley, Yorks. W.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridlington</td>
<td>Mr. B. Ayre</td>
<td>27 Beresford Avenue, Hull, Yorks. E.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bubwith</td>
<td>Mrs. B. Maltby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottingham (1563–1650 only)</td>
<td>Miss M. H. Holt</td>
<td>264 Sigston Road, Beverley, Yorks. E.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drypool</td>
<td>Mr. G. Lea</td>
<td>Elmslea, Aldsworth Ave., Goring by Sea, Sussex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etton</td>
<td>Mrs. D. Squires</td>
<td>The School House, Nawton, York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howden</td>
<td>Mrs. B. Maltby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull, Holy Trinity</td>
<td>Mr. A. Newton</td>
<td>180 Summergangs Road, Hull, Yorks. E.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull, St. Mary’s, Lowgate</td>
<td>Mr. A. Newton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull, Sculcoats</td>
<td>Mr. A. Newton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull, Sutton &amp; Stoneferry</td>
<td>Miss M.J. Whincup &amp; Miss D. Veall</td>
<td>160 Perth St. West, Hull, Yorks. E.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunmanby</td>
<td>Mr. B. Ayre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skidby</td>
<td>Mrs. J. Fox</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Literacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Etton</td>
<td>Miss K. Oosterveen</td>
<td>Cambridge Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedon</td>
<td>Mr. J. Markham</td>
<td>28 Alpha Avenue, Molescroft, Beverley, Yorks. E.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilnwick by</td>
<td>Mr. B. Ayre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisset</td>
<td>Miss K. Oosterveen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Driffield</td>
<td>Mr. B. Ayre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nafferton</td>
<td>Miss K. Oosterveen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Frodingham</td>
<td>Mr. B. Ayre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sproatley</td>
<td>Mrs. J. Fox</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorganby with Cottingwith</td>
<td>Mrs. C. Roberts</td>
<td>5 Dore Road, Dore, Sheffield.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reconstitution**

---

**Listings**

---

**YORKSHIRE N.R.**

**Aggregative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allerston (1680–1860 only)</td>
<td>Dr. M.A. Morgan</td>
<td>10 Fernbank Road, Bristol 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easingwold</td>
<td>Mrs. B. Maltby</td>
<td>Lawrenny, Denton Road, Middleton Ilkley, Yorks, W.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easingwold, Raskelf Chapel</td>
<td>Mrs. B. Maltby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebberston (1720–1860 only)</td>
<td>Dr. M.A. Morgan</td>
<td>The Vicarage, Ampleforth, Yorks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Gilling</td>
<td>Rev. P. Rowley</td>
<td>26 Cambridge Road, Linton, Cambs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinton-in-Swaledale</td>
<td>Mr. R.L. Stevens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkdale</td>
<td>Mrs. D. Squires</td>
<td>The School House, Nawton, Yorks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Levisham
(1700–1812 only) Dr. M.A. Morgan
Lockton
(1713–1860 only) Dr. M.A. Morgan
Marske-in-
Cleveland Miss G.A. McNeil 20 Roseberry Flats,
The Causeway, Billingham, Co. Durham.
Oswaldkirk Rev. P. Rowley
Sessay Mrs. B. Maltby
Stainton-in-
Cleveland Mr. J.E. Stoney The Grammar School, & Scholars Yarm-on-Tee, Yorks. N.R.
Stokesley Mr. E. Legg 17 Napier Street, Fenny Stratford, Bletchley, Bucks.
Wensley Mrs. B. Grant 75 Twyford Avenue, (1538–1700) Acton, London, W.3.
Yarm Mr. J.W. Wardell Eastry House, Yarm, Yorks., N.R.

Literacy

Bossall Miss K. Oosterveen Cambridge Group
Easingwold Mrs. M.F. Pickles 78 Bolling Road, Ben Rhydding, Ilkley, Yorks, W.R.
Ebberston Mr. B. Ayre
Finghall Miss K. Oosterveen
Marston-in-
Cleveland Mr. M.F. McDonald Stockton/Billingham Technical College, Roseberry Road, Billingham, Co. Durham.
Osbaldwick Mr. B. Ayre
Raskelf Mrs. M.F. Pickles

59
Reconstitution

Easingwold  Mrs. B. Maltby

Listings

(To be continued)
Contemporary Issues series

This new series of volumes under the general editorship of Ben Whitaker has been specially planned to supply a widely-felt need. It provides the basic primary sources concerning the key contemporary issues of our society today. The books are designed for men and women who need to know the facts and background of the world's contemporary problems - be they teachers, students, journalists or all those who are interested in making up their own mind about current affairs. For each volume the basic documents and texts of the subject have been selected and linked by introductory essays and commentary written by an editor who has been chosen as a specialist in the particular field. This comprehensive collection is an essential service for everybody who needs - whether for study, discussion or information - reliable and easy access to the key sources and facts concerning the principal issues of today.

The Population Problem
by Stanley Johnson

No other issue - apart perhaps from peace itself - dominates people's thinking in this closing third of the twentieth century as much as the population problem. Using key documents Stanley Johnson presents a full-scale picture of the problem and of current efforts to find a solution to it. He examines the obstacles to action which are deeply rooted in social, religious and cultural attitudes from Muslim and Marxist viewpoints on family planning to Papal pronouncements. Vital background reading for this, World Population Year. £4.50

British Broadcasting
by Anthony Smith, £4.75

Eastern Europe Since Stalin
by Jonathan Steele, 27 June, £4.50

Privacy
by Mervyn Jones, £5.25

Trade Unions in Great Britain
by John Hughes and Harold Pollins, £4.25