

CORRESPONDENCE

Crisis Mortality

Dear Sir,

I am engaged on 'crisis mortality' in Bucks. in the period 1600-1750, necessitating parish register study of the county. I would be very grateful and pleased to hear from correspondents who have any knowledge of medical diaries of the time, clerical diaries or any information regarding epidemics/disease for parishes except Aylesbury, Wycombe, Stony Stratford, Little Marlow.

Yours sincerely,

John Skinner
109 Nasbeth Drive, Aylesbury,
Bucks. HP20 1NX.

1851 Census Studies

Dear Sir,

Having successfully completed the Open University course D 301 and moved on to other courses I wish still to retain my interest in Local Population Studies. As part of my course I made a study of the parish of Cowley for the censal years of 1851, 1861 and 1871, and reading through LPS 13 which has just reached me, I find that on pp. 54 and 56 there appears information on research into the parishes of Gravesend and Cardington for 1851. It had occurred to me that some other members had done work on parishes for these years and have information which I could use to test my own findings. I would welcome correspondence from members who have conducted surveys for the year 1851 in parishes adjacent to the conurbations of Liverpool, Manchester, Birmingham, Sheffield or even parishes close to London. Needless to say I would pass on my own findings to those who asked for them.

Yours sincerely,

R. G. Hyde
Central Council for Education and
Training in Social Work,
Clifton House, Euston Road,
London NW1 2RS.

The Smallpox Controversy continued

Dear Sir,

In view of the recent correspondence (*LPS* 13) regarding *The Smallpox Controversy* your readers might be interested to learn of my article which appeared in the *Kent Family History Society Journal* No. 1, Dec. 1974.

On the question of immunity the following comment by W. Gayton is interesting 'Except in the case of those protected by vaccination, immunity is rare. One attack does not invariably protect for life. The writer has observed ninety-two cases of recurrent smallpox out of some 12,000'.

In view of L. Bradley's comments² 'Practitioners of inoculation claimed considerable success, though there was always some risk of the "artificial" disease being fatal', the following item found in the *Kent Gazette* would seem to suggest that the surgeons mentioned below had never had a failure.³

Innoculation. Whereas it has been industriously propagated by ill natured prejudice, to serve some selfish end, or from a principle of a baser nature, that Messrs Porter and Perfect surgeons at Aylesford and Town Malling in Kent have lost patients by inoculation, both in the county and other parts of England. In justice to themselves and their partners in particular, and the public in general to shew how false such report is, they hereby offer a reward of two hundred guineas to any person who can prove that they, or any one of those gentlemen who have honoured them with their connections, both in England and Ireland, ever lost a single patient by inoculation; that any one had had the smallpox a second time; or that their patients in general have not passed through the disorder in as favourable a manner, and with as much safety, as those who have been under the care of any inoculation whatsoever.

Such persons who chuse it may be taken in and generally accommodated, during the short space of the inoculation, in their dwelling houses either at Aylesford or Malling.

Any party collected together may be immediately waited on and inoculated at places of their own providing, upon terms agreeable to distance and circumstance.

The poor of the parishes are undertaken and attended upon easy terms.'

Yours faithfully,

Duncan Harrington
1 Saint Augustines Court, North Holmes Road,
Canterbury.

Notes

1. *Quain's Dictionary of Medicine* 3rd edition, edited by H. M. Murray, London 1902, p. 1501.
2. L. Bradley, *Smallpox Inoculation: An eighteenth century mathematical controversy*, page 7. (University of Nottingham 1971).
3. *Kent Gazette* Wednesday 1 June to Saturday 4 June 1768, page 1. Also appeared again 11 June-15 June 1768.

The reliability of the Compton Census

Dear Sir,

On reading the Miscellany note on the Compton Census in *Local Population Studies* No. 10, 1973, pp.71-4, I was reminded of the case of a similar confusion in Leicestershire.

In the *Associated Architectural Societies' Reports and Papers* Vol. XXIX pt. i, 1907, pp.129-182, there is an article by A. P. Moore called 'Leicestershire Livings in the Reign of James I'.

Moore prints a letter, dated February 1675, from the Bishop of Lincoln to the Archdeacon of Leicester, ending:

'As for persons to be numbered in each parish I suppose children and women are not meant, and therefore if only men be reckoned and their numbers according to the directions of my Lord Grace of Canterbury's letter returned it will be sufficient'.

This was followed by another letter to the Archdeacon, from Henry Symmons (the Bishop's official?):

'Since my Lord's letter to you wherein I enclosed the Queries sent by my Lord's Grace of Canterbury to his Lordship and my Lord's directions to you how to proceed in the execution of those Queries wherein amongst other things you were told that the Returns you were to make were to be only of such men as were Nonconformists or Popish Recusants not including women and children his Lordship has received intimation from my Lord's Grace of Canterbury that women above sixteen years of age are to be likewise returned which his Lordship commands me to intimate to you that you may make your Returns accordingly, but he thinks it will be best to mention them by themselves if they be unmarried.'

Moore then printed the letter which the Archdeacon sent out to the Clergy and Ministers, which included the original letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Bishop of Lincoln, together with the three enquiries, and he mentions the letter from the Bishop of London.

All this is similar to the provisions at Peterborough; only the confusion appears to have been a different one. As Moore adds:

'Dr. Foster, the Archdeacon's official, drew up a model form which was sent to every parish and used with more or less adaptation in the Returns. It is to be regretted that the form makes no provision for a separate return of unmarried women as suggested by Mr. Henry Symmons. Such a return would have been interesting. In two or three parishes the Minister and Churchwardens shared the view of their Diocesan that it was not worth while to count the women, and though they fulfill orders by adding women to make up the total, they subtract them again to arrive at the true figures.'

I do not know if these letters are well known, but they serve as another *caveat* in dealing with this Census. Fortunately the figures that have been published do not appear to be what Moore called 'the true figures'.

Yours sincerely,

Jno. Goodacre, jnr.
The White House, Ashby Parva,
Lutterworth, Leics.

Some useful sources

Dear Sir,

Although I am not a subscriber to *Local Population Studies*, we do subscribe to it in the library where I work, so I have recently read all the issues so far published. My main interest is family and local history rather than historical demography, but I have come across some archives that might be of interest to your readers.

All the following records are to be found in the Archives Department, Westminster City Libraries, Victoria Branch, Buckingham Palace Road, London S.W.1.

Censuses

1801 for the parish of St. James Piccadilly, Westminster. (D1742)

1801, 1811, 1821 for the parish of St. Mary le Strand, Westminster. (G1050-2)

Funeral Day Books (A2343-5)

St. Anne, Soho, Westminster, 1814-1849, which give the date of the funeral, name of the deceased, former address, age, cause of death, where buried and dues.

Sexton's Day Books (419/229-245)

St. Martin-in-the-Field, Westminster, 1685-87, 1694-1703, 1747-55, 1767-1812, 1817-53. These volumes give for all entries: date, cause of death, age, whether male, female or child, name and address, and the amount of the burial fee.

In order to give you some idea of the terms used to describe the cause of death I have copied them verbatim from the entries for part of October 1700 and for part of August 1810. The terms naturally become more specific as time goes on and such vagaries as 'tooth' and 'gripes' are gradually superseded by more precise terms.

October 1700 — fever, tooth, fever, consumption, stoppage, fever, consumption, convulsions, evil, cancer, fever, consumption, smallpox, consumption, consumption, fever, stillbirth, aged, dropsy, tooth, tooth, gripes.

August 1810 — measles, convulsions, consumption, consumption, consumption, inflammation, smallpox, smallpox, (illeg.), smallpox, convulsions, convulsions, consumption, age, measles, inflammation, measles, jaundice, measles, convulsions, dropsy, consumption, gout.

It would seem that the St. Martin-in-the-Field's sexton's day books, containing so much information for such a large number of deaths for the dates given, are a considerable rarity particularly as they begin as early as 1685. It is such a pity that there are not any (surviving) volumes for the first half of the eighteenth century.

These records would seem to provide a wealth of material for many studies, such as the infant and maternal mortality rates which Audrey Eccles is interested in (but for an earlier period) as expressed in her letter to *LPS* 12.

I do hope that the above information is of use and interest to your readers.

Yours faithfully,

Miss Janice Capewell
25 Lane Court, Bolingbroke Grove,
Battersea, London. SW11 6EW.

A GLOSSARY FOR LOCAL POPULATION STUDIES

L. Bradley

Part 1 — Demographic terms

Part 2 — Statistical terms

Part 3 — Sources

A 'Local Population Studies' Supplement
to be obtained from

The Subscription Secretary, Local Population Studies,
9 Lisburne Square, Torquay, Devon

Price 65p (Members of the LPS Society 50p)