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Family history in Cambridge

The Local Population Studies Society residential conference was held in Clare College, Cambridge, on the weekend of 29 June to 1 July 1979 on the theme of ‘the family past and present’. There were lectures by Tamara Hareven, Peter Laslett, Jack Ravensdale and Richard Wall, and four working sessions of family reconstitution techniques, women in factory and home, families with children in the seventeenth century and household structure from the census returns, led respectively by John Landers, Judith Lown, Beatrice Shearer and Richard Wall. In between there was time for a visit to the library of the SSRC Cambridge Group, the business meeting of the LPS Society and to take tea on Peter Laslett’s pleasant lawn.

The workshops gave the participants (about forty in all) the opportunity to examine a number of topics, some of which have not yet been covered in the pages of Local Population Studies. The emphasis was very much on practical aspects. Time was set aside so that the members of various workshops could try out some of the techniques for themselves, for example reconstructing the demographic history of individual families by linking together baptisms, burials and marriages in the registers or experimenting with various ways of analysing the structure of the household using the revised set of tables that had been prepared by the SSRC Cambridge Group.

The lectures, on the other hand, extended our horizons in a different way. Jack Ravensdale took us back to the Middle Ages, persuading us that all was not irretrievably dark even though there were no parish registers. His exposition on court rolls showed that they could reveal much about the structure of land holding in its widest sense. From the incidence and level of fines exacted on land transfers it was possible to gauge the strength of the demand for land, fines being lower in a post-plague period. In the early fourteenth century widows were particularly important in the land market and many men acquired land by marrying a widow. In contrast to the 1390s, after the population had been substantially reduced by the Black Death and subsequent plagues, widows often refused to take over their deceased husband’s land.

Richard Wall spoke of the strong regional variations in the frequency of living with kin in the England of the 1970s. The presence of relatives in the household beyond the immediate nuclear family of father, mother and children was far more common in the west of the country than in the east (about 3-4 per cent in East Anglia compared with over 6 per cent in the South West, Wales and Cumbria). In 1951 the regional pattern was similar, even though the proportion of households containing kin was then very much higher, but it remained an open question whether the same phenomenon was present in the nineteenth century.

The theme of Tamara Hareven’s lecture was the adaptation of people to the industrial environment rather than the usual view of the development
of industrialisation and its effects on people. The background was the Amoskeag Corporation in Manchester, New Hampshire, ‘the world’s largest factory town’. Oral histories were checked against other evidence, for example, comparing records of employees, which permitted hypotheses to be reformulated about the adaptation of the family to the industrial setting. The family was the agent of both long and short distance migration — to the mill and between departments within the mill. Many of the migrants had originated in Quebec, where the role of kin had been to support the family in what were termed critical life situations, such as childbirth and bereavement. In Amoskeag, on the other hand, kin instructed new arrivals in the problems posed by an urban environment and taught them the tricks of machinery. In the mill it was family rather than union power which had the greatest influence. There may be parallels to this experience in England, particularly in textile towns. We hope that LPS readers will undertake such studies.

The general business meeting of the LPS Society was held at 5.00 p.m. on Saturday, 30 June under the chairmanship of Christopher Charlton. The Secretary, Helen Forde, reported that the Society had continued to grow and flourish since the last residential conference at Knuston Hall, and now comprised over three hundred members. Many were eager book purchasers and receipts from this source had made it possible to avoid raising the price of membership, although the price of LPS had been increased. Four one-day or afternoon, conferences had been held, in London, Birmingham and Manchester. There was a discussion of future plans, especially the location of one-day conferences. A number of possibilities were suggested and the committee agreed to explore them although it was recognised that there was the difficulty of ensuring an adequate response in terms of numbers. An LPS Society ‘newsletter’ informal in character was discussed and supported strongly by a number of members. However, it was felt that there would be many difficulties in implementing it at the moment.

To conclude our report on the Cambridge Conference we must extend our thanks to Beatrice Shearer who was responsible for most of the organisation and ensured that the weekend was not only stimulating but enjoyable.

THE PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE: THE SEARCH ROOMS IN CENTRAL LONDON TO BE CLOSED WITHIN TWO YEARS

No doubt by the time this reaches you the decision to close the search-rooms at Chancery Lane and Portugal Street, within the next two years, will be widely known and considered opinions on the implications will be two a penny. The news reached us a few hours before this issue of LPS was handed to the printer and we have not had time to clarify the situation with the Public Record Office or to ponder all the ramifications for record office users.
The decision appears to be the keeper’s response to a government demand for economies in the civil service which requires the Public Record Office to make a cut in staff of forty (10%). This will be achieved by natural wastage rather than redundancy and will begin immediately. Once these cuts have taken effect it will no longer be possible to man the search-rooms. It seems unlikely that anyone knows precisely how the new regime will work. It has been suggested that only the more popular records of those at present housed in Chancery Lane and Portugal Street, will be moved to Kew. The rest will remain in central London, but will be produced for readers at Kew. The system will operate on the same lines as the one which has been used for many years for material stored at Ashridge whereby documents are trundled backwards and forwards to the search-rooms by van; it will, no doubt be accompanied by the same delays and frustrations.

The search-room accommodation at Kew is thought to be large enough to handle the increased demands which will be placed upon it, but the strong-rooms would have to be enlarged substantially before the records now in central London could be rehoused there; and as the design of the new record office did not allow for such an increase in storage space, there would have to be another new building on the site. Despite rumours of an influential government department having its eye on the Chancery Lane premises, there is unlikely to be money available for further building at Kew. Thus a system which involves the use of at least two sites is inevitable if the keeper’s proposals are implemented.

The new plan has serious implications for those who are employed at the Public Record Office at whatever level and for the user whoever he or she may be. For the staff, consultative meetings have begun already; but what is to be done to consult the readers? We hope the keeper will adopt some method of formal consultation with organisations representing professional and amateur historians and in particular with the Records Users Group; but even this procedure may fail to identify the real extent of the inconvenience, expense and delay the system we have before us would cause readers; especially those who do not live within easy travelling distance of west London. In the end it may be that the only sure way the individual can make his views known is by writing personally to the keeper and to those who are forcing such policies upon him.

We hope such a campaign will not be required. For the moment there are a number of unanswered questions; it is not clear how firm the proposals are nor whether a timetable has been considered. Will they be modified by negotiation? The proposal to close the Portugal Street search-room, for instance, where an arsenal of sullen microfilm readers (fortunately attended by friendly and helpful staff) caters for the very substantial number of people who, despite the sale of microfilm to local libraries, still come to use the census enumerators’ material. Surely there must be somewhere more central than Kew to house and produce a microfilm collection such as this? At the heart of the matter is the arithmetic which underlies the whole issue. If cuts have to be made even to a sector of the public service which in the good years has been so understaffed that it has little or no fat to shed, we must be clear that this radical step is not
a miscalculation; an over-reaction in a difficult situation. Might readers not be better served by some compromise solution which keeps at least a single search-room open in central London? Amongst the staff at certain levels the friction generated by the first move to Kew has scarcely cooled and who can wonder if the new proposals are seen as part of a long-term strategy to force upon them, sooner or later, a complete removal to Kew.

We end where we began; by the time this reaches you it is likely to have been superseded by many column inches of informed comment in the serious press and you will wish we had used this space as we had intended for our thoughts on the Blake report and on the disheartening news we have received from several of the county records offices where local government cuts are beginning to take their toll. We will return to all these topics in our next issue.

Christopher Charlton
Michael Drake
Terence Gwynne
May Pickles
Roger Schofield
Richard Wall

December, 1979
NEWS FROM THE CAMBRIDGE GROUP FOR THE HISTORY OF POPULATION AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE

The remarriage conundrum: a plea for information

When the Registrar General first began to make up official returns of births, deaths and marriages in the mid-nineteenth century, remarriage was a comparatively rare event. Taking all brides and grooms together, almost nine out of ten were marrying for the first time. Remarriage was rather uncommon amongst men than women but for both sexes first marriages were predominant.

In earlier centuries it was different. Remarriages formed a much higher proportion of all marriages. In the sixteenth century, indeed, it is likely that between 25 and 30 per cent of all those marrying were making a second, third or higher order marriage. This is a phenomenon of great interest from many points of view. For example, baptism/marriage ratios have often been used as an approximate measure of fertility, but a rise in this ratio at a time when the proportion of remarriages was falling might simply reflect a fall in the average number of marriages made by each woman rather than an increase in the number of children she was bearing. Or again, changes in the propensity to remarry, other things being held constant, may be associated with major shifts in individual and social views about the propriety of remarriage, provisions for orphaned children, the economic functions of the family unit, the creation of alternative institutional sources of support in old age, and so on. And there is some indication that within the general decline in remarriage there were differences of pattern between the sexes. Three different combinations of bride and groom may involve remarriage; widower/spinster, bachelor/widow, and widower/widow. Of these, the second appears to have become less and less common relative to the other two, on the very sketchy evidence at present available.

Herein lies the difficulty for the present evidence is sketchy indeed. English parish registers are in many ways a uniquely fine source of information about population history. They afford a tolerably complete coverage of vital events in England over a far longer span than comparable sources for other European countries. National series of births, deaths and marriages based upon them can be constructed from the mid-sixteenth century onwards, whereas it seems improbable that comparable series for any other country can be constructed until almost the end of the seventeenth century. But although registration coverage was good from an early date, register entries are usually very brief. In marriage registers it is normal simply to name the bride and groom. If marital status is given, it is usually only mentioned when the bride was a widow. Occasionally the marital status of every bride and groom was consistently given over long periods of time, notably in the registers of Landbeach (Cambs.) and Beccles (Suffolk). In both these registers the information is given with relatively few omissions from about 1600 onwards.

Recently, in the course of work on the aggregative volume, the great strategic importance of improving our knowledge of remarriage in the past became very clear, not only for the general reasons to which
reference has already been made, but also in making the most effective use of the results of the technique of back projection devised to convert a knowledge of totals of births and deaths into quinquennial estimates of population size and age structure, and of general measures of fertility and mortality (the gross reproduction rate and expectation of life at birth). For example, if it is possible to establish the proportion of all marriages which were remarriages period by period, the other data yielded by back projection allow the proportions never marrying in each generation to be estimated. Changes in the proportion never marrying combined with changes in age at marriage largely controlled the level of fertility in early modern England.

After 1754 with the coming into use of pro forma marriage registers under the provisions of Hardwicke’s Marriage Act, many English registers provide consistent evidence of the marital status of bride and groom. The problem is chiefly confined therefore to the preceding 200 years. We would be very grateful indeed to learn from any LPS reader of a marriage register in which marital status is regularly recorded for every bride and groom (that is, not just widow or widower but also bachelor and spinster, or synonyms such as singleman, etc.) for any substantial period (say ten years or more) before 1754. Ideally, of course, continuous recording of such detail over the whole marriage register from its commencement is desirable, but all registers which have a period of consistent recording will be valuable. If any such register is known to you, please write giving details to E. A. Wrigley at the SSRC Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure, 27 Trumpington Street, Cambridge CB2 1QA.

NOTE

1. This volume, based on the aggregative returns provided by local volunteers for 404 English parishes, is now in press. It gives details of the national totals of births, deaths and marriages and of the manner in which these were derived from parish register data; provides estimates of measures of fertility, mortality and net migration; and discusses the relation between demographic change, both long and short term, and changes in economic, social and environmental circumstances. (E. A. Wrigley and R. S. Schofield, The population history of England 1541-1871. A reconstruction).
AN EXERCISE ON HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION FOR USE IN COURSES IN HISTORICAL DEMOGRAPHY

John Knodel

John Knodel is associate professor in the Department of Sociology and research associate at The Population Studies Center, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA. He teaches a proseminar in historical demography to graduate students at the university.

The study of population history has been going on for centuries. The emergence of modern historical demography as a discipline in its own right, however, is much more recent and has largely been the result of the application of new or modified techniques to sources of data not originally intended for demographic analysis. Indeed, in some respects it seems fair to conclude that historical demography is defined as much by its methods and sources as by its area of substantive interest.¹ Thus a major goal of any course in historical demography should be to convey a familiarity with its special sources and techniques of analysis. I attempt to achieve this goal in the course I teach by having students participate in exercises through which they apply some of the basic methods to actual data from the past. The exercises serve as a valuable complement to the rest of the course which consists of readings and lectures on substantive findings as well as on methods and sources. One such exercise, the subject of the present article, deals with analysis of household composition from listings of inhabitants. It is simple to administer and has been received enthusiastically by the students. The task of the exercise is to apply Peter Laslett’s household classification scheme to the listing of the inhabitants of the village of Ealing made in 1599.

Before describing the exercise in detail, a few words on the choice of the Ealing listing are in order. Actually, any household listing could be used and I do not mean to imply that the Ealing listing is the only appropriate one. It does have several advantages, however. The listing has been transcribed and published and thus is readily accessible in a legible form. It is of moderate length providing sufficient cases to yield a reasonably reliable picture of household composition and yet is not too long to become tedious to students doing the exercise. The list contains a reasonable amount of information about most of the inhabitants including their ages which adds to the interest of doing the exercise. Finally, the results of a previous analysis of the Ealing listings are published in a volume edited by Peter Laslett and Richard Wall, permitting the students to compare their results with those obtained by the experts.²
The exercise as distributed to the students consists of (a) a cover sheet with general instructions, (b) a household composition analysis form to be used for tallying the results of the analysis, (c) a description of the definitions and the classification scheme as well as the ideograph scheme adapted almost verbatim in an abridged form from Peter Laslett's introductory essay in the Laslett and Wall volume, and (d) a copy of the transcribed listing of the inhabitants of Ealing. All parts of the exercise are reproduced in Appendix A of this article except that only a few households from the Ealing list have been transcribed to illustrate the classificatory system. The copy of the Ealing listing can be obtained easily from its published source.3

The administration of the exercise is very simple and straightforward. About a week or so before the exercise is to be discussed in class, copies are handed out to the students and instructions are reviewed. The students are told to do the exercise independently of each other since part of the purpose of the exercise is to demonstrate that different judgements can be made by different analysts looking at the same material. Students are instructed to classify all households in the listing but to make ideographs only for the first ten households. Since the first ten households included in the Ealing listing are among the most complicated ones, they serve as useful examples for doing ideographs. Students have reported that it takes between one and a half and two hours to do the entire exercise including reading the introductory material. Students are also asked to read a selection of readings on the general topic of household structure and dynamics from the literature of historical demography. The purpose of these readings is to introduce the students to the general issues being debated within the field on this topic. A suggested list of articles to be assigned to students is included in Appendix B of this article. They are divided into higher priority and lower priority readings. Other sets of readings than those suggested in Appendix B could undoubtedly serve just as well but I believe it is important to combine the exercise with some set of readings which introduce students to the substantive findings and types of issues being debated.

At the class session during which the exercise is discussed, I have found it useful to start by having students draw on the blackboard the ideographs of the first ten households. Generally I try to have each of the ideographs drawn by a different student. It is also useful to list on the blackboard each of the households (which can be easily identified by the person number of the household head) and to have different students fill in the list with their results of how they classified the particular household. The number of households listed on the board by each student will, of course, depend on the number of students in a class. For example, if there are ten students in the class, each student will have to put down about eight to nine households on the board to complete the entire list. I have started our exercise by focussing on the ideographs and asking if all students agree with each of the ideographs on the board. Invariably there are disagreements which are then discussed. The resolution of the disagreements is generally achieved through discussion and has proved to be quite instructive to students who are
applying the scheme for the first time. After all the ideographs have been reviewed and agreement achieved, the discussion focuses on the remaining seventy-five households. Students compare their classification of each household with the one written on the blackboard. Again, disagreements are mentioned and discussed. About forty five minutes seems to be an adequate amount of time for discussion of both the ideographs and the comparisons of classification of the remaining households. It should be stressed that it is the disagreement among different students about how to classify a particular household that is the most instructive part of the entire exercise. Thus it is important to stress to students that they do the exercise independently prior to the session in which it is discussed.

After the class has agreed on classification of each of the households, a final tally is made and then compared with the results published in Table 1.15 of Peter Laslett's introductory essay in the Laslett and Wall volume. This will also prove interesting since it is very likely that the final results obtained by the class will not agree with those published by Peter Laslett. This helps underscore the point already evident from the previous discussion that to some extent arbitrary judgements must be made and that the solution of questions which arise from looking at specific listings must remain ambiguous because of the lack of information on certain household members. Since the results published in Peter Laslett's introductory essay do not show the classification of each individual household, but rather the final aggregate distribution, it is not possible to compare household by household. However, in our comparison it was clear that there was disagreement concerning the household in the listings headed by a person listed as 178. It seemed clear to us that this household should be classified as type 5a while in the published results there are no households listed under this type.

I found it useful to plot a single year age distribution for the entire population of Ealing. This can probably be best done simply as a bar graph with the length of the bar corresponding to a particular age proportional to the number of persons in the population at that age. Before showing this bar graph representation of the age distribution to the students, I asked if they felt there was any evidence of 'age heaping' (i.e., preferences for certain digits) in the listing. The students may or may not have noticed that there actually is substantial digit preference evident in the listing from Ealing. Showing them the bar graph demonstrates this age preference quite conclusively. There seems to be a great deal of heaping at ages ending in zero for adults aged twenty through sixty. This helps generate some scepticism about the precision that can be attributed to age reporting in documents from the past. There is also an unusually large number of youths aged fourteen. It is not clear to me whether this is a question of digit preference or a genuine peculiarity of the Ealing population at the time of the listing. On the other hand, the age distribution shows that substantial numbers of young children were also included in the listing although, of course, it is impossible to know whether the enumeration was complete in this respect or not.

Each time a different group of students does the exercise, a new set of questions will undoubtedly arise concerning specific households or
specific persons. Some of them can be clearly resolved while others cannot. The fact that some ambiguity must remain is certainly one of the more important lessons to be learned from the exercise. Yet, despite these ambiguities, the general picture that emerges from the Ealing listing is quite clear. Simple family households predominate overwhelmingly. Servants, including those in husbandry, are very common. The larger and more complex households tend to be those of the more prominent villagers.

In my experience, a discussion of the general issues currently under debate in the literature on household structure and dynamics follows quite readily from the discussion based on the exercise. Because the students are able to gain some appreciation of the basic source of the data, i.e., the household listings, as well as the classification scheme being used for its analysis, they seem to be able to offer more informative criticisms of the literature than would otherwise be possible. It also seems clear in my experience that doing the exercise increased their interest in the subject.

NOTES


APPENDIX A

I. General Instructions

The purpose of this exercise is to replicate the analysis of households by structures reported for the English village of Ealing in P. Laslett and R. Wall, *Household and Family in Past Time* (Cambridge University Press, 1972). To do this you are provided with:

a) a Household Composition Analysis Form;

b) a copy of the transcribed listing of inhabitants of the village of Ealing made in 1599 as reported by Keith Allison, "An Elizabethan Village 'Census,'" *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, Volume XXXVI, May 1963;

c) an abridged version of section II (Definitions, methods and scheme of analysis) from Peter Laslett's introductory essay in the Laslett and Wall volume.
## II. Household Composition Analysis Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Classes</th>
<th>Number of households</th>
<th>% of households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Solitaries</td>
<td>1 a) given as widowed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 b) given as non-married or of unknown marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sub total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 No family households</td>
<td>2 a) coresident siblings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(coresidents not constituting conjugal family</td>
<td>2 b) other coresident relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>units)</td>
<td>2 c) coresidents with no familial relationship given</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sub total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Simple family households</td>
<td>3 a) married couples without children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(conjugal family units)</td>
<td>3 b) married couples with children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 c) widowers with children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 d) widows with children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sub total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Extended family households</td>
<td>4 a) extension upwards (of which — fathers — mothers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(conjugal family units having kin-linked</td>
<td>4 b) extension downwards (of which — grandchildren)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individuals)</td>
<td>4 c) extension sideways (of which — brothers — sisters)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 d) combinations of 4a-4c, or any other form of extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sub total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Multiple family households</td>
<td>5 a) households with secondary units disposed upwards from head (of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(two or more kin-linked</td>
<td>which — also extended)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conjugal family units)</td>
<td>5 b) households with secondary units disposed downwards from head (of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>which — also extended)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 c) households with secondary units disposed sideways from head,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>parent or parent-in-law of head being present and not part of a clu.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(of which — also extended)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 d) Frèresèches, households with secondary units disposed sideways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from head, parent or parent-in-law of head absent. (of which — also</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>extended)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 e) combinations of 5a-5d or any other multiple household arrangement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(of which — also extended)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sub total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Indeterminate</td>
<td>households whose kin-linkages are insufficient for classification in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>any of above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sub total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Your basic task is to fill in the Household Composition Analysis Form based on the 85 households included in the listing. The following steps are suggested:

1. Read through the “Definitions, methods and scheme of analysis.”
2. Make ideographs for the first 10 households.
3. Go through the entire listing noting the appropriate classification category (e.g., 1a, 3c, 4a, etc.) in the margin next to each household.
4. Fill in the Household Composition Analysis Form.
   (Note: Filling in numbers in the spaces provided for in bracketed phases in categories 4 and 5 on the form is optional.)

III. Definitions and Scheme of Analysis


This section lays down suggested definitions and ways of exploiting the data provided by lists of inhabitants. It proposes a scheme of classification, as well as a method for the pictorial or ideographic representation of domestic groups.

1. DEFINITION OF THE DOMESTIC GROUP

   All we have is some knowledge of the law and custom of our chosen areas and a few documents left behind by a handful of the myriads of communities which have consisted of such domestic groups. These documents consist of lists of inhabitants, and the task is to exploit them in such a way that the exactest possible comparison can be made. For this purpose it is essential to lay down who is to be included in the coresident domestic group and who excluded from it.

   In doing this no theory of domestic group organization is being advanced, simply the rules which have to be observed if surviving documentary evidence is to be made usable for comparative domestic group analysis. If faced with the challenge to answer the question what exactly is meant here by the terms family and household the only appropriate response would be an appeal to the past persons who created that evidence. The lists they left behind them consist of series of names of individuals in blocks, with clear indications of where one block ended and the next began; unless they made out exactly such lists their evidence has not been admitted. It requires no great perspicuity to see that these blocks of names must have been families, or households, and we know that the men of the past called them by these titles. Nevertheless we have to assume that in order to qualify for such descriptions the shape of these blocks was very far from being arbitrary, and in fact was determined by three main considerations. Persons would only appear together within those blocks if they had the three following characteristics in common: they slept habitually under the same roof (a locational criterion); they shared a number of activities (a functional criterion); they were related to each other by blood or by marriage (a kinship criterion).
Location, shared activity and kinship

The first two criteria are taken to be universal. Everyone recorded as belonging with a block of persons in a list is supposed to have been living together with the others, and is assumed to have cooperated in many directions with them, to have had a relationship of support or dependence with some or all of them, perhaps relationships of both kinds. But not all such persons are taken to have shared the third characteristic, that of kinship, because some individuals, always a minority but not an unimportant minority, are known to have shared in the activities of the domestic group in which they lived though not related by marriage or blood to any other member. These were the servants, the visitors, boarders and lodgers, who appear along with other members of the family or household within the blocks of names which we are discussing.

Members of the household

In the first place come the man, his wife and their socially recognised children. In the second place come all other resident relatives, as we shall call them in general; that is, all those connected by blood or marriage and living with the family. In the third place come all servants, those individuals who are now rare in modern society, but who were so common at all times up to those of our parents. They were commoner in England than in most other countries for they made up something like an eighth of the whole population in pre-industrial times.

*But though we can be reasonably clear on membership of the domestic group up to this point, there were, and are, certain occasional or even semi-permanent residents in the household in an ambiguous position. These are the visitors, guests of the family, the lodgers and the boarders.*

Once more the consideration has had to be the state of the evidence, which in its crudest exploitable form (and this is unfortunately the most usual), seems not to take separate account of visitors, lodgers and boarders, or lodging and boarding households.

2. TERMINOLOGY AND SCHEME OF ANALYSIS

Although we have to assume that the men of the past thought as we do when they gave boundaries to the domestic group, we must not suppose that they made any careful distinction of terms. In England, the word family was the ordinary term for what we should call, and call here household, but the word household was itself sometimes used and even the expression "family and household."

Types of family household

The terminology and classification recommended for the exploitation of lists of inhabitants should now begin to be clear. It must be strongly stressed that in this vocabulary the word family does not denote a complete co-resident domestic group, though it may appear as an abbreviated title. The word household particularly indicates the fact of shared location, kinship and activity. Hence all solitaries have to be taken to be households, for they are living with themselves, and this is the
case when they have servants with them, since servants are taken as household members. In fact, because servants always modify the membership of households, we can allot all domestic groups to one of two classes: those with and those without servants. Nevertheless servants can hardly be said to affect the final structure of households, and when it comes to the more significant types of domestic groups, the form of description is by the title of the composition of the family in question, followed by the word household. Hence the descriptions "simple family household," "extended family household," "multiple family household." These terms require a little discussion.

The expression simple family is used to cover what is variously described as the nuclear family, the elementary family or (not very logically, since spouses are not physiologically connected), the biological family. It consists of a married couple, or a married couple with offspring, or of a widowed person with offspring. The concept is of the conjugal link as the structural principle, and conjugal linkage is nearly always patent in the lists of persons which we are using. For a simple family to appear then, it is necessary for at least two individuals connected by that link or arising from that link to be coresident: conjugal family unit (CFU) is a preciser term employed to describe all possible groups so structured. The first mentioned person in the household is always taken to be the head, and simple family households can be classified along with the rest as with or without servants.

An extended family household in our nomenclature consists in a conjugal family unit with the addition of one or more relatives other than offspring, the whole group living together on its own or with servants. It is thus identical with the simple family household except for the additional item or items. If the resident relative is of a generation earlier than that of the conjugal family unit, say, a married head's father or a spouse's mother, or a widowed head's aunt, then the extension is said to be upwards. The headship of the household is irrelevant here. The resident relative may be head, or the child of the resident relative may be in that position.

Similarly the presence of a grandchild (without either parent) or a nephew or niece creates downward extension, and that of a brother, sister or cousin of the head or of his spouse, implies sideways or lateral extension. Some groups are extended vertically and laterally, and it should be noted that the presence of any kin or affine of the conjugal family unit creates extension however distant the relationship, though the relatives of a servant do not do so. It is particularly important that the whole phrase 'extended family household' be used for this category of domestic group, because the words 'extended family' by themselves have a highly significant but quite separate further meaning, which covers all relatives in habitual contact with a person, irrespective of whether they live with him.

Multiple family households comprise all forms of domestic groups which include two or more conjugal family units connected by kinship or by marriage. Such units can be simple or extended, and can be disposed
vertically and laterally. The disposition of a secondary unit, that is, of a constituent unit which does not contain the head of the whole household, is said to be UP if its conjugal link involves a generation earlier than that of the head, as for example when his father and mother live with him. Such a secondary unit can include offspring of the head’s parents other than the head himself, that is, his resident unmarried brothers or sisters, and the presence of such persons keeps this secondary unit in being if one or other of the head’s parents dies. A secondary unit is disposed DOWN if, for example, a head’s married son lives with him along with his wife and perhaps offspring, with similar implications about siblings and widowhood. Where more than one secondary conjugal family occurs, these principles are intended to apply to any number. Unless there is specific contrary indication, servants are regarded as attached to the simple, extended or multiple family household as a whole, and not to any individual or to any conjugal family unit within it.

Classificatory table
It can be seen that the analysis of the structure of coresident domestic groups can get very complex, especially when it comes to differing forms of multiple family household. The various types which we have found it necessary to distinguish and define in order to arrive at a scheme making it possible to use lists of inhabitants and to compare the familial structure of different communities at different times are set out in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 Structure of households: categories and classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Solitaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 No family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Simple family households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Extended family households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Multiple family households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Indeterminate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Stem families’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frérèches, alternative definitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. DOMESTIC GROUPS AND LIVING SPACES

The household and its dwelling; inmates, lodgers and lodging

At this point, questions such as the following arise. If a solitary, or any other householder, should take in a lodger or lodgers, are such lodgers to be regarded as members of his household? If not, and the very word lodger seems to imply that no other connection than the sharing of a dwelling should be inferred, then what assumption is to be made about the structure and status of a domestic group composed of landlords and lodgers? How is the relationship between households sharing a building to be defined?

We have found from experience that most of the complications about the exact structure of the domestic group, at least in Europe, arise from the occasional presence of persons in this variegated class of those casually rather than permanently connected with households (i.e. lodgers). This seems to have been recognised at the very outset of the study by Gregory King, who used the word inmate for all these persons, as we shall do. Many of the persons living in domestic groups in the second category of Table 1, those lacking familial structure, must have been related to each other in a similar way, though brothers and sisters living together, and more distant relatives too, may have formed more stable domestic groups than those consisting entirely of persons who can be regarded as “inmates” in respect to each other.

A houseful means all persons inhabiting the same set of premises, and premises is another word we have found useful to endow with a restrictive usage for our purposes. Premises in our system denotes the accommodation provided by a building, or in certain cases of a number of conjoined or contiguous buildings, say in the case of Western Europe a farmhouse with a yard surrounded by outhouses which can be made suitable for occupation by people.

The application of the concepts we are describing to the placing of inmates is quite straightforward. Inmates are thought of as being members of the same houseful as the one in which the household to which they are connected is to be found, and as having no other relationship with their landlords or hosts.

4. AN IDEOGRAPHIC NOTATION FOR DOMESTIC GROUPS

The attempt has been made to convey the classification system in its essentials, though not in detail by prose explanation only. The use of diagrams can make what was meant much clearer. The ideographic system adopted was devised by Eugene Hammel as an extension of that already in use by social anthropologists, with certain additions and modifications, particularly in respect to the drawing of boundaries round the various units. Figure 1 gives examples of the pictures for the more important domestic group structures.
Fig 1. An ideographic notation for domestic groups

- **Δ** male
- **○** female
- **◊** sex unspecified, or unknown
- **Δ** servant (all types)
- **○** lodgers (inmates of all kinds)
- **Δ** brother and sister
- **Δ** married couple
- **○** widow
- **○** widow with child
- **→→→** adoptive link
- **-----** inferred link, unspecified in source

- **Δ** widower, widow with children
- **Δ** married couple with children

- Conjugal family units (second involving remarriage)
  - NB. curved boundary

- Simple family households, with classification given, second with servants; solid black for head
  - NB. squared boundary for household, upper and lower lines for houseful.
Extended family

1. Extension upward
2. Extension upwards and laterally.
3. Extension downwards with servant and lodgers.

NB Where source names relative(s) etc., and linkage cannot be fully specified, word describing relevant person(s) is reproduced and inferred linkage indicated.

Multiple family household
secondary unit DOWN, units numbered (secondaries all after 1), with lodger (inmate) specified in source as visitor.

Frèreche

A. Multiple family household, secondary unit UP, with adoptive link.
B. Laterally extended family household, with 2 male and 3 female servants. Note that resident kinswoman not specified as to which spouse she is related to is shown as attached to conjugal link.
C. Solitary widow.
Fig 2. Selected examples from the Ealing Census of 1599 with indication of the appropriate classification in the ideographic system.

Note: The student is to draw the ideographs and fill in the appropriate classification. They are given here only as guidance on how to use the ideographic scheme.

1) Richard Phillips, gent., 61 or thereabouts
   Marie Phillips, his wife, 50 or thereabouts
   Rose Phillips, their daughter, 11
   John, their son, 16 or thereabouts
   Anna Steevens, servant, 24
   John Wiggins, servant for husbandry, 50
   John Mort, servant, 16
   Moyaes Thomas, servant for husbandry, 26
   Richard Smith, servant for husbandry, 18

Fig 2. Continued

2) Elizabeth Rowlan, a poor woman, 35
   John, her son, 4
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PARISH LISTINGS AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE: PENNINGHAME AND WHITHORN (WIGTOWNSHIRE) IN PERSPECTIVE.

R. A. Houston

R. A. Houston is a research student at Peterhouse, Cambridge. He is working on a comparison of local communities in early modern Scotland and England.

Until the recent publication of *Scottish Population History* (edited by Michael Flinn) the history of demographic and social structures north of the Border had been little explored. Those who had made tentative enquiries into that field were more concerned to estimate the total population of Scotland and its geographical distribution at various dates than to examine the structure of that population. Though some attempts had been made to derive measures of the socio-economic distribution of the population from Poll and Hearth tax returns, these sources have not been subjected to detailed demographic or social structural analysis.

Even the valuable pioneering work of Flinn *et al* has passed briefly over nominal listings of inhabitants and ‘censuses’ prior to the nineteenth century, discussing only the circumstances of their compilation and offering some suggestions on their qualitative and quantitative coverage.

If the study of Scottish social history is to progress, some initial work on Scottish listings is required both to assess their uses and limitations and to allow some preliminary comparisons with the work already done for England by the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure. Indeed, at a time when considerable interest has been aroused by efforts to interpret the apparently unique socio-demographic experience of England, it seems incongruous that no attempt has been made to look at areas which were geographically contiguous but which were supposedly very different in the past.

The parish lists of Wigtownshire and Minnigaff were published nearly sixty years ago by the Scottish Record Society, and comprise listings of ‘all the inhabitants above the age of twelve years’ in seventeen parishes of south-west Scotland in 1684. Compiled by the minister of each parish for military reasons associated with the Covenanting movement, the lists were, it seems, intended to give an idea of the fighting strength of the area and the number of politically reliable and unreliable persons. They vary widely in the amount of information provided.

All inhabitants above the age of twelve are named, their names being grouped under the landholding unit on which they lived. None of the listings gives more than an occasional indication of occupation or social status, though Glasserton appears to have a list of cottars or sub-tenants
associated with each land unit. Unfortunately, for the parishes of Glasserton, Kirkinner, Kirkmaiden, Leswalt, Mochrum, Sorbie, Stoneykirk, Stranraer and Wigtown, no relationships are given which would enable us to link the named persons. Some relationships are given for Glenluce, Inch, Kirkcowan, Kirkcolm and Minnigaff, but these are insufficient for any detailed analysis. For the parish of Portpatrick the list gives the name of the male family head, but often no detail for the rest of the family: for example, at Piggieoch Little in Portpatrick ‘Quantin Kilpatrick and his wife and servants’ or, at Cragoch ‘Pat Malvolian and his wife and children’. Only for the parishes of Penninghame and Whithorn are marital status and relationship to the family head explicitly stated for nearly every person, and it is upon these two communities that the following discussion is based.

There are however a number of general problems associated with the lists. Firstly, it is not clear whether they were drawn up from memory, or from a special survey of the parish, or whether indeed the incumbent has simply updated an existing ecclesiastical examination roll of those liable for catechism. Those noted as ‘withdrawers from worship’ or ‘fugitives’ may have been added from memory as persons who had dissociated themselves from the Church of Scotland. Secondly, it is uncertain whether the minister listed only those people who were actually present, or whether he included those who should have been resident?

The amount of information which can be derived even from those listings which provide relationships on a consistent basis is strictly limited. While only those above the age of twelve years were included, ages were not specified for any person. No distinction was made between dwelling houses or domestic groups and we cannot analyse household size or composition. It might be possible to break down the groups of names within each landholding unit or ‘farm-toun’ (hamlet), but this might well misrepresent household size and composition. The following examples of the sort of grouping found in the listings illustrate the problem.

**Ochiltree**

- Bernhard Stewart h.
- Marion McKie w.
- Joh. Stewart s.
- Rob. Stewart h.
- Marg. McComb w.
- Joh. McIlmulleroch h.
- Marion Stewart w.

**Dunnance**

- Patrick Fergusone h.
- Jane Houstoune w.
- Hugh Dunce sv.
- . . . Donaldsone sv.
- Alexr. Black h.
- Janet Clugstoune w.
- Agnes Black d.
- Janet Maxuell sv.
- Samuel Black h.
- Jane Quoid w.
- Robert Burnie h.
- Margarett Minoch w.
- Alexr. and William Burnies s.
- Isobell Burnie d.
- John McClellane h.
- Jane Martine w.

**Markland**

- Joh. McRutter h.
- Jonet McTier w.
- Joh. McRutter s.
- Marg. McRutter
It is clear for the Markland holding that we are dealing with a household, but in the other two cases the internal composition of the unit can only be speculated upon. This, plus the narrow range of familial designations provided as a key to the lists — husband, wife, widow or widower, son, daughter, servant — necessarily limits the number of comparisons which can be made with those English listings which present inhabitants on a nominative basis, and which give ages, marital status and relationship to the household head. Even in England such listings are extremely rare before the nineteenth century, and only a handful can be used for comparative purposes. Some idea of the demographic and social structural characteristics of the two Scottish parishes can however be gained and some simple analyses conducted to determine how similar those characteristics were to the pattern obtaining in certain contemporary English communities. All the settlements to be considered are indicated on the map (Figure 1). The listings of inhabitants for Chilvers Coton, Lichfield
and Stoke on Trent were chosen for comparison as the only lists contemporaneous with those for Penninghame and Whithorn which offer information on age and relationship for most persons. Ardleigh and Wembworthy were included as late eighteenth century examples of almost wholly agricultural communities which might be thought to bear a closer resemblance economically to the Scottish parishes. In fact the English parishes were probably not very similar to Penninghame and Whithorn: Chilvers Coton and Stoke on Trent had significant elements of mining and cottage industry, Lichfield was a city of some 3,000 people, and Wembworthy and Ardleigh were both highly commercialised agricultural communities quite different to the primitive pastoral farming which seems to have obtained in pre eighteenth century Wigtownshire. Finally it should be realised that the English listings were compiled for a variety of reasons which bore little similarity to the politico-military purposes which occasioned the Scottish ones. The lists for Wembworthy and Chilvers Coton were probably compiled for estate management purposes, Ardleigh in connection with the fear of a French invasion, Lichfield and Stoke on Trent under the 1694 Marriage Duty Act.*

Despite these differences, a comparison of the seven parishes can not only show the variations between English parishes with widely differing economic structures, but also give some idea of the relative similarity of the demographic and social structural features in the Scottish and English parishes. The following tables provide a summary indication of this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Total population aged thirteen and above and sex ratios in two Scottish and five English parishes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penninghame, Wigtownshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whithorn, Wigtownshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilvers Coton, Warwickshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoke on Trent, Staffordshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lichfield, Staffordshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wembworthy, Devonshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardleigh, Essex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows the total population aged thirteen and above in the seven parishes, and the sex ratio in that population: i.e. the number of males per 100 females. The mean sex ratio for all seventeen parishes in Wigtownshire included in the printed lists is 90.7, the median 89.6 and the standard deviation 14.9. This is not markedly out of line with our English examples. There is however no way of knowing without more detailed study of this area whether the numerical preponderance of females was due to a greater male propensity to migrate, of the sex ratio at birth or of differential mortality. Generally more males than females are born, but this is counterbalanced by heavier male infant mortality, and in a situation where population is stagnating or falling the age structure of the population may become older and thus have contained more females. This may well have been the case in late seventeenth century Scotland. At the same time, both pastoral agricultural
regions and towns in England tended to have a surplus of females and this was probably also true of Penninghame with its cattle and sheep based economy, and of Whithorn which, as a royal burgh, performed many of the functions of a small market town in addition to farming in the landward part of the parish. These possibilities are considered more fully below as part of the more detailed discussion of population structures in the selected parishes.

This discussion is based on the sort of issues raised by John Hajnal in his paper on 'European Marriage Patterns in Perspective' as a means of identifying the distinctive socio-demographic characteristics of northwestern Europe. Hajnal showed that since the sixteenth century this part of the world had displayed a demographic pattern marked by late age at marriage and a high proportion of women who never married. This he felt had profound implications on social organisation, fertility and the standard of living which made northwestern Europe unique. No direct comparison with Hajnal's work is possible here since, firstly, the Scottish listings do not permit any estimate of the proportion of women never married by the end of the childbearing period, and secondly, since we do not know the age at marriage of those in the listings. We can nevertheless derive some (admittedly crude) measures which will allow some simple comparisons between our Scottish and English parishes while remaining within the broad framework of Hajnal's important discussion. One such measure is of the proportion of the population aged thirteen and above who were married at the time the lists were compiled.

Table 2. Proportions married and widowed of total population aged thirteen and above in two Scottish and five English parishes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Married No.</th>
<th>Married %</th>
<th>Widows No.</th>
<th>Widows %</th>
<th>Widowers No.</th>
<th>Widowers %</th>
<th>All widowed No.</th>
<th>All widowed %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Penninghame</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whithorn</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chivers Coton</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoke on Trent</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lichfield</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wembworthy</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardleigh</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows that the proportion married at Penninghame and Whithorn was appreciably higher than in any of the seventeenth and eighteenth century English parishes. This does not necessarily imply that the socio-demographic structure of these communities was fundamentally different. It must be recognised that a high proportion married may imply a low age at marriage or a low proportion never marrying. In certain demographic situations both may be possible. As noted above, the stagnation or even decline of population in the late seventeenth century may have tended to produce a situation where there were proportionally more older people, more married and widowed persons and thus fewer servants and children.

It is also possible that the lists may be biased against unmarried people, and especially spinsters, since they were not seen as constituting a
political threat. Indeed, the Scottish lists are distinguished by the almost total lack of persons specified as unmarried who were not either servants or children. There is for example no equivalent of "spinster" and in only one case, that of John and Gilbert Herron 'single persons and brother tenants' in Grainge on Cree, Penninghame are any inhabitants of (assumed) adult status described as unmarried. Further suggestion of this possible shortcoming in the listings — or perhaps simply in the key to relationships provided — is given by the authors of Scottish Population History who find that a very high proportion of women dying over age fifty were unmarried: a mean of 20.7% in eleven eighteenth century parishes. It is difficult to conceive of changes which would have produced a shift from a situation where it appears that virtually all women married to one where one fifth did not — a circumstance still more improbable in view of the prevailing female surplus suggested by the sex ratios above and by other eighteenth century evidence. Of course without more detailed study these remarks must remain speculative rather than conclusive.

Table 3. Proportion of servants in total population aged thirteen and above and sex ratios in two Scottish and five English parishes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Male servants No.</th>
<th>Male servants %</th>
<th>Female servants No.</th>
<th>Female servants %</th>
<th>All servants No.</th>
<th>All servants %</th>
<th>Sex ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Penninghame</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whithorn</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilvers Coton</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoke on Trent</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lichfield</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wembworthy</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardleigh</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>106.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Summary ratios of children and servants per married or widowed person, and the ratio of servants to children in two Scottish and five English parishes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Ratio of children per married and widowed</th>
<th>Ratio of servants per married and widowed</th>
<th>Ratio of servants per child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Penninghame</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whithorn</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilvers Coton</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoke on Trent</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lichfield</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wembworthy</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardleigh</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Turning to servants and children, table 3 shows that the proportions of the former in our Scottish parishes fall within the range shown by the English examples, and are indeed within a few percentage points of all but Wembworthy. In England most servants were in the age range fourteen to twenty five, another important feature of its society but one with which we cannot compare our Scottish examples due to lack of information on ages. The distribution of servants by 'household' cannot
be determined accurately, but table 4 shows the ratio of servants per married or widowed person, and also the ratio of servants per child, again in the population aged thirteen and above. The latter suggests that the Scottish parishes had more servants per child than all the English parishes except Wembworthy, though the differences were not very great, while the former implies rather fewer servants per family at Penninghame and at Stoke on Trent. This last point may have been due less to any cultural differences than to identifiable economic factors. If, as seems to have been the case, variations in occupational structures and wealth distribution can have marked influences on the number of servants in individual households, then the same may be true of variations at the regional and village level. Indeed, Richard Wall of the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure has discovered significant differences in household composition in different areas of England in the period around 1700, and most notably in the number of servants and, to a lesser extent, children per household. In Wiltshire for example 14% of households had servants, while in London that figure rose to 58%; the former had a mean of 0.3 servants per household, the latter 1.3.13
The rather lower proportion of sons and daughters aged thirteen and above residing with their parents in our Scottish parishes can perhaps be explained in much the same way.

Table 5. Proportions of children in total population aged thirteen and above and sex ratios in two Scottish and five English parishes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Sons No.</th>
<th>Sons %</th>
<th>Daughters No.</th>
<th>Daughters %</th>
<th>All children No.</th>
<th>All children %</th>
<th>Sex ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Penninghame</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>142.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whithorn</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilvers Coton</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoke on Trent</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lichfield</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wembworthy</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>106.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardleigh</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>105.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If one accepts that the number of coresiding children tends to be low for the poor and for farmers of low and middling socio-economic status, rather higher for the rich and the better off farmers, and highest for tradesmen and craftsmen, then it is quite possible that parishes which were poorer overall, and which had a higher degree of economic polarisation would have a lower number of coresident children as a matter of course.14 Certainly the hearth tax returns for this area show that nearly all those taxable paid on only one hearth.15

Finally we can consider the sex ratios of children (Table 5) and servants (Table 3) in our Scottish and English parishes. The sex ratio for servants shows a disproportionately large number of females in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century examples, and this may reflect the greater demand for female servants in both pastoral agricultural regions and in towns. In the more highly commercialised agriculture of the late eighteenth century there may have been a greater need for male servants.
The evidence is not unequivocal. Penninghame shows a large number of coresident sons relative to daughters, and these may have been used in place of male servants by farmers in this parish.16

While we have been able to draw some tentative conclusions about the socio-demographic structures of these Scottish and English parishes in comparative perspective, it is very difficult to extrapolate much from the listings about the social conditions of life obtaining in those communities, and especially the Scottish ones.17 The inability to determine the size and composition of the household has, for example, repercussions on how we shall interpret the groups of names associated with each landholding unit. It is generally thought that married 'servants' would live separately from their employers while single men and women would live in the same house, eating and sleeping with the family.18 Problems arise however when we try to estimate the size and composition of the units of production and consumption in the Scottish communities. Was the landholding unit the basis of a communal enterprise? Did some of the inhabitants other than those designated servant work for the principal tenant in the same way as married wage labourers in England or did they farm separate plots and give labour services to the tenant from whom they rented land? In short, did the conjugal family units which can be detected in the listings exist for social, economic and cultural purposes as separate and distinct entities, or were all merged in a communal effort for subsistence? The family is a social rather than a purely biological unit, and it is with these real forms of social interaction that we should be concerned. Aggregate figures tell us little about these vital aspects.

There are clearly interpretative difficulties in all that has been said, created by the admittedly poor quality of the Scottish lists, and the severely limited choice of English lists for comparison. Nor can we safely generalise from two Scottish examples and five English ones to compare the two nations. Yet in terms of statistically observable features, the main point to emerge from this study is that the parishes considered here are not greatly dissimilar. Such differences as did exist may have been occasioned by economic variations, and by short term demographic fluctuations which nevertheless occurred within a framework of shared socio-demographic characteristics. Furthermore, it may be posited that the socio-demographic structures which obtained in England (and much of northwestern Europe) varied considerably both over time and even between contiguous areas, and that those structures varied only within a range of experience which made them unique. If this is so, it must be recognised that on the basis of the information provided here it is at least possible that Scotland shared in that experience.

NOTES
Semple (ed.) The Poll Tax Rolls of the Parishes in Renfrewshire for the Year 1695, Paisley, 1864 (published privately; copies available at the British Museum, Scottish Record Office and Paisley Burgh Library.) A notable exception to this pattern can be found in N. Tranter 'The Reverend Andrew Urquhart and the Social Structure of Portpatrick in 1832' Scottish Studies, 18, 1974, pp. 39-62.

5. P. Laslett and R. Wall, (eds.), Household and Family in Past Time, Cambridge, 1972. This experience was not of course confined to England but characterised most of northwestern Europe.
7. Ibid. pp. 2-5 provides a short introduction to the lists, but is probably incorrect on some points. I am grateful to Mr. A. E. Truckell of the Dumfries Burgh Museum for this information and for his valuable comments on this subject. A fuller discussion of listings in general and the problems arising from their means of compilation and overall completeness can be found in Peter Laslett's 'The Study of Social Structure from Listings of Inhabitants' in E. A. Wrigley, (ed.), An Introduction to English Historical Demography, London 1966.
8. Xerox copies of all the English listings used here are held by the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure. Comments on the economic structures of the English parishes are based on the 'Parish Characteristics' files kept by the Cambridge Group. For the Scottish parishes information furnished by Mr. Truckell was augmented by use of the Statistical Account of Scotland published by Sir John Sinclair in twenty-one volumes at Edinburgh between 1791 and 1799. Material on Penninghame can be found in volume 3, pp. 339-43, and on Whithorn in volume 16, pp. 275-98.
9. I am grateful to Dr. Roger Schofield of the Cambridge Group for this information. Flinn p. 192 suggests the same was true of Scotland.
11. Flinn, p. 280; cf. p. 251 which shows that the population of the annexed estates in mid-eighteenth century Scotland had a sex ratio of 91.1.
13. Richard Wall, 'Changes in English Household Structure 1650-1971', paper presented to the Joint Meeting of the British Society for Population Studies (Royal Statistical Society) and the Population Geography Studies Group (Institute of British Geographers) at the University of Liverpool 21-23 September 1977, pp. 281-2. I am grateful to Mr. Wall for his permission to quote from this paper and for his generous help in the preparation of this article.
14. Flinn, p. 194 shows from the Poll Tax schedules for the 1690's that as social status declined so too did the number of resident servants; the relationship is less clear in the case of children.
15. Scottish Record Office E/69/25/1, 'List of Hearths within the Shire of Galloway' deposited 31 January 1695. The schedules are arranged by units different to those found in the listings and cannot be directly compared.
16. Even for Penninghame and Whithorn, some relationships are not given, and these cases are treated as unknown. They comprise 12.3% of the total of named persons at Penninghame, and 49.3% at Whithorn. For the English parishes whose age, sex and relationship is not stated are included in this category, but so too are those categories in the English examples which are not found in the Scottish lists. The figures are: Chilvers Coton 3.5%, Stoke on Trent 8.8%, Lichfield 11.5%, Wembworthy 5.8% and Ardleigh 5.9%. The lack of resident kin, lodgers or spinsters described as such may have been due to the fact that there were none to record in the Scottish parishes. Alternatively, the lack of a sufficiently expanded key to familial relationships may mean that certain important designations were suppressed. It is however interesting to find a descriptive terminology so firmly based on the nuclear family in a society where kinship was allegedly so important.
17. There appear to be few other documents with which we can check or augment the information provided in the listings. Parish registers in this area rarely commence before the eighteenth century. Poll tax lists do not survive for this region. Kirk Session registers and estate papers do survive and may repay further study.
NOTES AND QUERIES

BOOK OWNERS IN EIGHTEENTH CENTURY SCOTLAND: A NOTE ON SUBSCRIPTION LISTS IN BOOKS EDITED BY JOHN HOWIE

R. E. Jones

In *Local Population Studies* No. 3 (Autumn 1969) Peter Laslett published a note on the discovery of two subscription lists, printed in mid-eighteenth century Scottish editions of theological works, which gave details of the subscribers' occupations. His note was intended to encourage further discoveries of a similar type. However, nothing further seems to have appeared in print on the subject since that note, subsequent letters in *LPS* Nos 4 and 5, and Laslett's comments in the second edition of *The world we have lost* (1971). Other lists have in fact come to light since then and it is the intention of this note to draw attention to a particularly interesting group of printed eighteenth century Scottish subscription lists recording names, occupations and places of residence.

It is not my intention in this note to give a full analysis of these subscription lists but rather to outline the background of the lists and the books containing them, and to indicate the broad conclusions that can be drawn from a superficial analysis of the information on subscribers given in them. The lists certainly merit a great deal more investigation and analysis than that given here.

The first important feature of this group of lists is that they can be firmly attributed to a single source and to one that enables a considerable amount of background information to be collected. The six lists considered here are all attached to books written or edited by John Howie of Lochgoin (near Fenwick, Ayrshire) between 1775 and 1793. The short titles — the full ones usually run to several dozen words — and dates of publication are:

- **The Scots worthies** (first edition) 1775
- **Faithful contendings displayed** 1780
- **The Scots worthies** (second edition) 1782
- **Faithful witness-bearing exemplified** 1783
- **Reformation principles re-exhibited** 1787
- **John Brown; a mirror; or looking-glass for saint and sinner** 1793

All were published at Glasgow except for **Faithful witness-bearing exemplified**, which was published at Kilmarnock.

John Howie (1735-1793) is remembered today mainly as the author of *The Scots worthies*, a collection of brief biographies of the most prominent figures on the reformed side of the struggle within the Scottish church in the period between the Reformation and the Glorious Revolution and, in particular, of the Covenanters martyrs of the persecutions between 1660 and 1685. From its obscure beginnings, *The Scots worthies*, in many editions and reprints, took its place as one of the great books of nineteenth century Scots Presbyterianism.

Howie was one of the most prominent lay members and propagandists
of the Reformed Presbyterian church in the eighteenth century. This church was the oldest dissenting body in Scotland, composed of the spiritual descendants of the minority of the Cameronians or 'hill people' which alone refused to accept the Scottish church settlement of 1690, on the grounds of the erastianism and impurity of the established church. On paper at least, it remained the only organised group in the British Isles that was opposed to the whole basis of government as constituted in the eighteenth century, still prepared to justify the theocratic experiments of seventeenth century Scotland and the rebellions intended to overthrow the enemies of the 'crown rights of the Redeemer'.

The six books listed above vary in tone. The Scots worthies and the John Brown work belong much more to the mainstream of eighteenth century evangelicalism than do the other three books listed. These are mainly documentary collections of a strongly sectarian nature — long, heavy and, to most twentieth century minds, infinitely tedious. They are works which cannot be said to have been purchased for show, as Laslett suggested might have been true of more standard works of theology. These are works written for sectarians who took their dissent and its basis seriously and whose literacy must have been of a very high standard.

For such groups subscription clearly offered a viable form of publication in eighteenth century Scotland. Subscribers were collected in various ways. Relevant books carried advertisements for future books to be published by subscription. For instance, Faithful contendings displayed contains proposals for the publication of the second edition of The Scots worthies by subscription. The printed proposals include the following conditions:

I. The Book will be printed on a fair paper and new type, the same with the address to the Public, the whole to consist of above 500 pages.

II. The price to Subscribers will only be two Shilling and Sixpence neatly bound.

III. Those who subscribe for twelve copies, shall have one gratis.

IV. The book will be put to the Press as soon as a competent number of subscriptions are obtained, and a list of Subscribers names will be printed, unless forbid.

V. The price to be paid on the delivery of the book.

VI. Such as intend to encourage this undertaking, will send in their names to the Printer without loss of time.

Subscriptions are taken in by John Bryce, Printer and Bookseller in the Salt-market, Glasgow, the Publisher; and all others entrusted with Proposals.

The names of subscribers were therefore collected by the publisher or, much more commonly, 'given in' by local agents, whose names appear in the subscription lists, at the head of the names they have given in (except in the first edition of The Scots worthies). In Faithful contendings displayed — and this is typical — the thirty three givers in include not only three booksellers, two chapmen and one weaver and bookseller, but also six other weavers, a schoolmaster, a shoemaker, a smith, a wheelwright, a tailor, a sewer, a mason, a farmer and a land surveyor. They also include a woman.
This spread of occupations is not untypical of the subscribers as a whole. There are in fact two striking points about the subscribers to this series of books; the first is the sheer numbers collected; the second is that the majority of them are artisan by occupation. *Faithful contendings displayed* records over 1,600 subscribers, *Reformation principles re-exhibited* and *A Mirror* just over 1,000 each, *Faithful witness-bearing exemplified* around 800, the first edition of *The Scots worthies* around 700 and the second edition just over 300. These are respectable numbers of subscribers by any standards, just as the first printing of *Faithful contendings displayed* — a minimum figure of 1,800 copies including multiple copy subscriptions — is a good size for any ordinary eighteenth century book. There were clearly very many keen artisan book-buyers in eighteenth century Scotland, willing to pay 2s.6d. for a sectarian book, when artisan earnings were unlikely to exceed 10s. a week.

There is a problem with the occupational data in that roughly a third of the names on the subscription lists do not have occupations attached. However, in many cases the omissions appear to be simply the result of blocks of names being given in with no occupations attached. If this is so, then it is reasonable to generalise from the two-thirds of names with occupations given, a total of roughly 3,700 for the six books together. Among these approximately three-quarters can be described as artisans. Half the remainder are farmers, while there are generally no more than a dozen persons of higher rank than farmer or merchant named in the lists. On average four occupations account for nearly half the names listed; weavers (about 20 per cent of all names with occupation given), farmers (12 per cent), shoemakers and wrights of various sorts (8 per cent each). Smaller but significant numbers of masons, tailors, merchants and printers (including those in the textile industry) also appear. Altogether nearly 200 occupations appear in the various lists.

In geographical terms the subscribers come predominantly from South West Scotland and the Borders, with large numbers in Glasgow and the surrounding industrialised towns and villages. Smaller groups subscribe from larger towns elsewhere in Scotland and some from Northern Ireland and from London. This distribution clearly reflects the distribution of the Reformed Presbyterian church, though, of course, not all the subscribers need have been of that persuasion. The name of a noted minister of the dissenting Associate Presbytery — John Brown of Haddington — appears in the 1780 list.

Clearly there is great scope for further research on these lists, much of which might be best done at a local level. Most probably other books published for Reformed Presbyterians carry subscription lists, though such books are not always easily tracked down — certainly not in English libraries. The lists considered here might alone yield much to further detailed analysis. Together they provide information on the names, occupations and places of residence of several thousand highly literate, sectarian working class Scots of the later eighteenth century; men (and occasionally women) who were prepared to spend a substantial amount of money on the purchase of books demanding considerable intellectual ability of their readers.
THE HISTORY OF FAMILY STRUCTURE IN AUSTRIA: SOURCES AND RESEARCH PROBLEMS

Peter Schmidt Bauer

The Council of Trent and the Counter-Reformation are of importance for research into the family in Catholic Europe. After the Counter-Reformation churches started to keep not only registers of births, marriages and deaths, but also the so-called libri status animarum. It was intended in the first place that the parish priests should write down a list of all the people in their parishes at regular intervals, supplemented by comments on their behaviour, spiritual worthiness and financial standing, but the libri status animarum were not kept as diligently as the parish registers so that the libri vary greatly in different dioceses.

In Austria these church records seem to have been intended for secular as well as ecclesiastical purposes, but in the second half of the eighteenth century the first state censuses were introduced and by the 1850s the libri status animarum had lost practically all importance and were mostly discontinued. However, the state censuses are but rarely preserved so that the ecclesiastical records that do exist for the second half of the nineteenth, and even for the twentieth century, are of great interest.

- Although large numbers of the libri status animarum were destroyed, some do still exist in Austrian parish and episcopalian archives, but most remain unpublished and unknown to the outside world. There are important regional differences. In the province of Salzburg (formerly an ecclesiastical principality) they start early: two from 1569 and 1593 respectively, with a few from the 1620s. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries they are well kept, but there are none after 1800. On the other hand, in Upper Austria they are rare in the seventeenth century: a single one from 1638 and a small number for the end of the century; yet they become quite numerous in the eighteenth and are very common in the early part of the nineteenth century. In addition a number survive for the second half of the nineteenth and even for the first half of the twentieth century — in three instances after World War two.

Lower Austria is divided into two dioceses. In St Pölten libri animarum are quite common from the last quarter of the eighteenth until the middle of the nineteenth century and they are all conveniently centralised in the episcopalian archives. In the eastern diocese they are rare, especially for Vienna, where they were probably destroyed during the 1939-45 war. In Styria they are not rare, but they are not, on the whole, well kept, whereas Carinthia can boast a very interesting series of libri for the year 1757, for several adjacent parishes, covering in area nearly a quarter of the diocese of Gurk. The eastern part of the Tyrol which belongs to the diocese of Salzburg has a number of libri but the western part together with the Vorarlberg has none.

The Austrian government censuses began in the reign of Maria Theresa (1740-80) and until 1857 were taken mainly for military purposes. This has the advantage that, at least in the early censuses, horses, cows and
oxen were enumerated alongside people so that, without using additional sources, households may be classified roughly according to wealth. Another advantage is that the Austrian censuses were carried out on the same lines throughout the Empire thus facilitating comparison between the states. But against this there are important disadvantages. Up to 1935 the original state enumerations were stored at the local offices; the central office received only summaries and where it did have the complete originals these were merely on loan and were returned to the local offices who regarded them as of little importance and too bulky to be kept. Therefore only big towns like Vienna, which had the available storage space or those communities which, for reasons of their own, wanted to keep their censuses, now still hold this valuable material. It should be added that between the years 1935 and 1961 the census lists were collected at a central office, but they were kept for only ten years, so for this period no census material whatsoever remains. However, a number of official enumerations did remain with the local councils and some of these have been preserved.

When we come to consider the libri status animarum we find that for the study of family structure they need to be used in conjunction with parish registers and where possible a family reconstitution of the parish should be carried out. Libri status animarum are particularly valuable where they exist for a number of consecutive or nearly consecutive years, for it should then be possible to study the life-cycle of persons and families, the impact of short-time economic fluctuations and change over time in the composition of the co-resident kin and non-kin groups in the household. Such series would also give additional interesting information: for example, people who had been classed as servants might turn out to be distant relatives, while illegitimate grandchildren might well be foster-children and the exchange of personnel between farms might indicate kin connections between farming families. Finally, where we do have a series of lists, there is the possibility of correcting errors, filling in omissions and of calculating correct ages, while there is always the chance that one or other book of the series may contain additional information that is relevant to all the others.

Whilst work on a series of libri status animarum can be very rewarding, it is also extremely difficult, both when it is carried out manually or when
it is prepared for the computer. This is one of the reasons why relatively little work has been done so far on these books. The other reason is that the *libri status animarum* were practically unknown until quite recently, but it is hoped that this will change during the next few years and that these magnificent sources for the history of family structure in Austria will be opened to a wider public.

NOTES

1. *Libri status animarum* have been referred to in *Local Population Studies* as listings of inhabitants.

APPENDIX

A preliminary list of the principal series of *libri status animarum*

1. Grieskirchen: several in the seventeenth century from 1638; a series from 1709 to 1870, but incomplete in the 1850s and 1860s. A big rural community.
2. Rottenbach: 1730-1824, 1836, 1849-1899. In addition several lists of taxes, ownerships, tithes, etc.
4. Ebensee: 1779-1809; 1821-1892; incomplete in the 1820s and 1880s. A large industrialised parish.
5. Maria Langegg: 1788-1856, 1875.

Figure 2
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A LOST SEVENTEENTH CENTURY DEMOGRAPHIC CRISIS:
RURAL SURREY

Jeremy Greenwood

Derek Turner's article on the seventeenth century population decline in Sussex has prompted me to apply his methods to the parishes of the Reigate hundred in Surrey, which are contiguous to the East High Weald parishes of his study, for purposes of comparison.

The Reigate hundred parishes are completely rural, with the exception of Reigate itself, and are almost entirely situated in the Weald or the vale of Holmesdale. Only Chipstead is completely outside (north) of this area.

Since the Compton survey returns are vague about exact numbers, the hearth tax assessments have also been included as a check. A multiplier of 4.75 has been used for the hearth tax, otherwise the same multipliers as Mr. Turner propounds have been utilised.

The Compton survey gives no figure for Leigh which has therefore been excluded, and that for Gatton almost undoubtedly refers to the total population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Reigate hundred</th>
<th>1642</th>
<th>1664</th>
<th>1676</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reigate</td>
<td>1,244</td>
<td>1,558</td>
<td>1,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other parishes</td>
<td>2,796</td>
<td>2,808</td>
<td>2,723</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ecclesiastical parish of Reigate comprised the two civil parishes of the Borough and Foreign, representing the urban and rural parts respectively. More information is available for the population of the Borough of Reigate and this shows an increase from 751 in 1664 to 1,097 in 1698 and 1,344 by 1710. Evidence from a family reconstitution (in progress) shows that much of the later increase was self generated by the lack of migration of the inhabitants. There was not a massive discernible migration into the town from rural parishes.

These figures show that the rural parishes of this part of Surrey had an almost static population level whilst the town of Reigate almost doubled its population in fifty years. Whilst the former finding contrasts with the situation in Sussex, the latter reflects the findings for Horsham. The towns of Reigate and Horsham had much in common, both being non-corporate market towns and parliamentary boroughs and only some seventeen miles apart.

I should be interested to know if Mr. Turner's figures show any discernible difference between the market towns and the rural areas of Sussex.

NOTES
1 The parishes are Betchworth, Buckland, Charlwood, Burstow, Chipstead, Gatton, Horley, Leigh, Merstham, Nutfield and Reigate.
4 1664 figure from the hearth tax assessment above; later figures from a survey of 1698 (Surrey Record Office. Sc 445/1) and of 1710 (Hertfordshire record office D/EcD E156).

Derek Turner comments:

Mr. Greenwood’s comments and findings raise some points of great interest, and he is quite right to draw attention to the variable reliability of the Compton Census figures.

The contrast between the static rural population of the Reigate area and the decline in rural Sussex admits of no easy explanation but the fact that in only one of the three most northerly mid Sussex parishes bordering Surrey was there any fall in population between 1642 and 1676 would seem to indicate that the Sussex/Surrey weald was not so affected by the population decline as other areas.

Mr. Greenwood’s speculation that the population of market towns grew is also partly borne out by the Sussex figures, which are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>1642</th>
<th>1676</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pulborough (east)</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>+45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henfield (east)</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>+11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steyning (east)</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>−32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petworth (central)</td>
<td>1291</td>
<td>1716</td>
<td>+33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arundel (central)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>(997 in 1724)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midhurst (west)</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>−37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester (west)</td>
<td>2338</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>−27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whilst it is dangerous to generalise from these figures or to place too much reliance on their accuracy, it does appear that it was only in the western part of the county, and for some reason in Steyning, that the market towns were not growing quite rapidly.

I am also intrigued by Mr. Greenwood’s assertion that the growth of population in Reigate was due to the retention of its natural increase rather than to immigration. I have not undertaken a full reconstitution of Horsham but an analysis of those named in the 1642 Protestation Return shows that 49 per cent had been baptised in the parish in comparison with 32 per cent and 33 per cent in two rural Sussex parishes. I had been inclined to explain this difference in terms of the variations in the size of the parishes but it would also be consistent with the hypothesis of low emigration rates from parishes containing market towns.

It would also square with the fact that baptisms outnumbered burials in the Horsham register, which is not the case when population increase was the result of immigration, as in the major cities.

I am pleased that Mr. Greenwood has so quickly taken up the suggestion which I made at the end of my article for other LPS readers to undertake investigations of mid seventeenth century population in their own area and I hope that his findings will stimulate others to follow his example.
MOBILITY AND REGISTRATION IN THE NORTH IN THE LATE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

W. J. Sheils

The exceptional detail contained in some registers of the north of England in the later eighteenth century has often been noted by archivists, genealogists and historians. The problems involved in giving legal proof of identity did not escape the notice of contemporaries either, and one of the purposes of Hardwicke’s Marriage Act of 1754 was ‘to preserve the evidence of marriages, and to make the proof thereof more certain and easy’ whilst a bill for registration of births and deaths at the same time failed to pass the House of Lords. The limitations of the registers, however, were not only apparent to legal minds, but also to the antiquaries who often had recourse to search the registers in compiling their local histories. Ralph Thoresby, in Ducatus Leodiensis published as early as 1715, had provided an improved form of registration which included dates of both birth and baptism, father’s name and occupation, mother’s name, and place of residence for each entry. This was the direct inspiration for the registers of the parish of Hushwaite near Thirsk where an improved version adding the mother’s maiden name, was adopted from 1769 in order ‘to afford much clearer intelligence to the researches of posterity.’ Of course, in line with the interests of the antiquaries, the research in mind was largely genealogical. It was presumably a refinement of this sort of register which Dr. Wrigley was able to exploit recently for his study of the life-time mobility of married women at Colyton in this period. Thoresby was not alone in his concern and another northern antiquary, William Dade of Barmston, who had direct experience of the problems of registration during his time as a curate in the city of York from 1763, devised a form of registration with even fuller information than Thoresby.

A new parish register was purchased for St. Helen’s church in Stonegate, York, when Dade became curate in 1770 and on the first page was inscribed a note; ‘the following method of ascertaining the births and baptisms, deaths and burials in this parish of St. Helen’s, York was introduced in 1770 by William Dade . . . curate of this church. This scheme, if properly put into execution, will afford much clearer intelligence to the researches of posterity than the imperfect method hitherto generally adopted’. The register was divided into columns for the information given; that for baptisms included child’s name and surname, father’s name, profession, descent and place of residence, mother’s name and descent and dates of birth and baptism; the burial information included the deceased’s occupation, residence, dates of death and burial, age at death and cause of death. The extent of detail is perhaps best illustrated by the first two full entries in each category:

Daniel Corsican, late of London, a coach trimmer to Mr. Cochran and a married man, of Swinegate died 14 January, buried 16 January 1770 in the new burying ground. Aged 30 years, Consumption

and their value is obvious for studies of both migration and mortality. It is with the former that I am particularly concerned. The detail provided in these baptismal registers, giving information on occupational status and residence for both grandparents and parents, opens up the exciting possibility of linking migration to social mobility through reference to occupational status. Dade, who compiled materials for a history of his native Holderness and was later elected an F.S.A., shared his post at St. Helen's with another curacy at St. Olave's, Marygate where the same policy was also adopted in 1770. His example was followed by one or two of his clerical friends in the city, but what really makes Dade's initiative important is the influence which his principles had on the new archbishop of York in 1777, William Markham. Markham was impressed with the legal difficulties arising from insufficient registration and so, at his primary visitation of 1777, ordered that Dade's scheme be put into practice throughout the diocese 'as great complaints have arisen of the registers of marriages, births, and burials belonging to several parishes, being inaccurately kept and drawn out, so as not to identify and ascertain the persons etc., whereby they have not their due weight in point of evidence'. This confirms D. J. Steel's suggestion that the uniformity of entries could be attributed to episcopal recommendation, but his view that the order was 'largely ineffective', happily needs to be reconsidered. Markham's order gave the new form of register official support which was endorsed in the following year by the Dean and Chapter at the visitation of the parishes within their jurisdiction. The result was that Dade's initiative was copied elsewhere, making the information available of more than local value to both contemporaries and historians. It is as well to examine the effect it had within the area of the present archdeaconry of York which covers an area within a radius of approximately fifteen miles from the city. The parish records of this area are deposited at the Borthwick Institute and, of 161 registers deposited from the archdeaconry, 82 give all details under Dade's scheme whilst others, such as those for Crayke, provide some information, mostly concerning maternal descent or maiden name. Indeed local printers began to print registers arranged in columns with headings necessary for the scheme. The very layout of the registers encouraged better registration and they were purchased by over half the parishes examined. Of course not all parochial officials continued to use the system for the same period of time; as the table below shows there were considerable variations but the figures are still impressive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>No. of parishes</th>
<th>Percentage of archdeaconry population (1801 census)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-20 years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 years plus</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1778-1812 complete</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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They are even more so if, as in column three of our table, they are plotted against the 1801 census figures. The total population of the parishes covered by the survey was 86,233 in 1801 and the figures in the above table refer to the percentage of that population living in the parishes in each category. Thus, within the archdeaconry, 58.7 per cent of the population were affected by the new order to some extent and we have information for a period of more than ten years from parishes containing 42.7 per cent of the total population of the region. There were of course geographical variations within the archdeaconry, the order being less effective in parishes to the east and north of the city than in those in the city itself and to the west, but the coverage for the whole area remains impressive. Only five parishes with populations greater than 1000 in 1801 failed completely to comply with the order. Individual studies of particular parishes have already been undertaken by students in extra-mural classes or pursuing the applied historical studies course for the Open University, but the material offers scope for that study of inter-generational migration and social mobility in ‘an entire, close-knit geographical region during the generation from 1778 to 1812’ suggested by Dr. Holderness. This is considerably earlier than similar work based upon Census material, and a start has been made on the project. For York and its hinterland we can thank William Dade and William Markham for providing this opportunity, but did they know of precedents elsewhere, and do similar opportunities exist? I would be grateful for any information.

NOTES

1. See for example, D. J. Steel, National Index of Parish Registers, i, 1968, p.44, he says that very full details are given ‘from about 1765’ in some Lancashire, North Yorkshire and Durham registers, though the examples he gives are taken from the period after 1778. A valuable article by B. A. Holderness, ‘Personal mobility in some rural parishes of Yorkshire,’ Yorkshire Archaeological Journal, vol. 42, 1970 pp. 444-54, exploits this detail using printed registers.


3. R. Thoresby, Ducatus Leodiensis, 1715, p.163, he gave examples and attributed the method to Thomas Kirke, esquire.


6. D.N.B.


8. Ibid. PR.Y/OL.5.

9. In 1773 at St Mary, Castlegate and St Cuthbert, see The Parish Register of St Mary Castlegate, York, ed M. F. M. Mulgrew (Yorkshire Arch. Soc. Parish Register Section, vol. cxxxvi, 1972) and B.I. PR.Y/CUT.3.

10. See Ibid. PR.ALN.4; and the note in PR.K/W.4, which mentions the visitation.

11. Steel, p.44.

12. York Minster Library, C/3a, Printed visitation articles of Dean Fountaine, 1778.
13. Some were in fact purchased by parishes which did not comply with the full details of the order. Several parishes did give additional information on descent than had previously been the case, even if they did not always include occupation and place of origin.

14. This table includes only those parishes giving details of both occupation and residence for both sets of grandparents for the period given, some continued to give partial details for considerably longer but this is not shown. A few places such as Sherburn in Elmet even operated an index system for descents to avoid writing out repetitive details at length. Six rural parishes within the archdeaconry are excluded from the survey as their records have not yet been deposited.

15. Census, 1801

16. New Malton, St Leonard; New Malton, St Michael; Coxwold; Sheriff Hutton and Burwash.

17. Mr. B. Pace has worked on St Mary Bishophill Senior, York; Miss E. Barton on St Mary Castlegate, York; and Mr. R. Moore on Easingwold. See also the work on marriage registers at Easingwold by Mrs. B. Maltby, 'Easingwold marriage horizons,' LPS 2, pp. 36-9 and her 'Marriage registers and the problems of mobility,' LPS 6, pp.32-42.

18. Holderness, p.454; see the note in Wrigley p.29 n.4, which suggests that Durham followed York's example.

Anyone with any information please contact me at the Borthwick Institute, St Anthony's Hall, York.

---
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Two Census Songs
Contributed by Mary Turner

THE CENSUS OF 1861

COME all you ladies list to me,
I'll tell you about this fiddle de de;
The government has a jolly spree,
In reckoning up the Census.
There's Jane and Mary, and old Bet—
And lots of women that I forget—
There's Sal, that lives on heavy wet.
All crying about the Census.
Some women — oh, I blush to say,
And one that lives just over the way
Had a baby born the other day,
And she popped him on the Census.

So all you ladies must engage,
To tell the gents your proper age,
So do not be in such a rage,
You all must sign the Census.

An old lady, aged sixty-nine,
Sware she was just in her prime,
Combed out her hair and looked sublime,
Saying, I will chisel the Census.
Where was you married, my pretty chick?
And what's the age of Tom and Dick?
Why we jumped over a great broom stick,
Put that down in the Census.
Like honest people of one accord.
To pay the parson think it absurd,
So we took each other's word.
That's what tricks the Census.

There's Victoria, Jane, Maria, and all,
William and Jane, and little Ball,
There's hump-backed Bob, who had a fall,
All to fill the Census.
If you please, kind sir, what shall we do,
For we are in a terrible stew,
We're just a-going to trouble you,
To fill up this here Census.
My eldest girl is deaf and dumb,
And the old man's blind—a drinking rum—
And Jacky's gone to kingdom come,
You can put him in the Census.

Oh, as my old man he cannot see,
I get another man to sleep with me,
You must have a head of a family
To put it in the Census.

London is a funny place,
They try all ages here to trace,
So old ladies put on a old face,
To chisel the old Census.
Ten years ago they their names did sign,
Then young and tender and sublime,
They were thirty three, now twenty-nine.
It is the mistake of the Census.

Some children were not born at all,
But hatched like chickens under a wall
And they put down those not born at all,
For it all does for the Census.
These little secrets they must know,
You must tell the truth from top to toe,
To the gentlemen the gaff must blow,
To expose it in the Census.
Oh, if you have a little-come-by-chance,
That on your knee you're about to dance,
You must tell who's the father, if he's in France,
So much for the Census.

How many children? mam, says he,
Says she, only twenty-three,
And I'm only thirty-two, you see,
So put it in the Census.
Who is that young man, so tall and mild?
Says she, that is my dear grandchild.
I'm twenty-two, and then he smiled,
It will all fill up the Census.
Some are younger, I would let you know,
Then they were ten years ago;
They dress like lambs from top to toe,
To swindle the man with the Census.

An Irishman, named Jerry Noon,
Was just a-going to shoot the moon,
When a man walked up to Jerry's room,
Saying, my man, now sign the Census.
Jerry scratched his head and rubbed his eyes.
Sure I can't write at all, he cries,
So just put down all with bugs and fleas,
They will all do for the Census.
There's Jerry Noon, and Judy, too,
And Barrety's gone up the flue,
There's Mike and Con, and the old pig, too
So to the devil take the Census.

Taylor, Printer, 92 & 93, Bric Lane,
Spitalfields.
A NEW SONG ON

THE CENSUS

O pay attention old and young,
And I will not detain you long,
I am going to sing a comic song,
And all about the Census.
According to the Government plan
Every woman, child, and man,
That slept in your house on Sunday night,
No matter whether black or white,
Old or young, blind or lame,
Wise or crazy, all the same,
On the 3rd of April what a game,
They had to be put in the Census.

Every one on Sunday night,
Wise and witty, wrong or right,
Brown and yellow, black and white,
They had to be put in the Census.

You'd to give your christian and surname,
Where you was born from where you came
And if blind, deaf, dumb or lame,
It had to be put in the Census.
Your rank, profession, and what you do,
Whether you're married or single too,
If you didn't put these particulars down,
You were under a penalty of £5.
If a widow or widower, you had to say,
And give your age from last birthday,
And if girls are in a particular way,
It had to be put in the Census.

There's one old cove name Billy Brown,
When the Census paper was brought round,
Says he by George I must put down,
All my family in the Census.
He put down himself, his wife, then he
Began to describe his family,

There was Michael, Murphy, Dan and Pat
Three hens, a cock, a dog, and a cat,
Will sleep in the house on Sunday night,
If every thing goes well and right,
But the bugs and fleas so nip and bite,
They ought to be put in the Census.

In —— street there's some old dame,
From the Hickney, Hockney, island came,
And she has got the funniest name,
That will be in the Census.
It takes 90 letters her name to spell,
And how to pronounce it old Nick can't tell
She was left a widow in sixty-one
With 12 young daughters and a son,
Two is in France, and two's in Spain,
Three's troubled with water on the brain,
Four's in Walton gaol, and three insane,
What a jolly fine lot for the Census.

There's one old woman name Betty Bright,
See didn't understand it right,
She filled up her form on Thursday night,
And put this into the Census.
At Bullock's smithy I was born,
At five o'clock one bright May morn,
Last birthday I was just three score,
And children I've had twenty four,
Fifteen are living nine is dead,
Twelve are single, three is wed,
And two on Thursday got there bed,
Just in time for the Census.

John White, Printer, Rose Place,
Scotland Road, Liverpool.
Mary Turner writes:

The ‘New Census Song’ interests me. It is published in Liverpool — at least printed in Liverpool, and is the usual style, full of errors and contrivings in order to find a rhyme, but when it mentions Bullock’s smithy I began to wonder if it is local to here because Bullock Smithy is the old name for the district of Hazel Grove, near Stockport. There could be other smithies for bullocks or smiths called Bullock, for aught I know, but perhaps some reader knows.

The census comment about Billy Brown putting everybody down including the dog and the cat is not as daft as it seems. Years ago I was going round Levenshulme checking on voters’ register returns around October, in readiness for the new register, and I had a completed form which showed about seventeen people in one house. The family, of course, was Irish. Mother answered the door and she was nursing a baby. It transpired that there was herself and her husband, three lodgers and one of her own children eligible to vote when he reached 18. The rest were all her own children down to the babe in arms, with the exception of the last one, called Tricia. Having crossed off the babe in arms I said to her “And who is Tricia?”, and she said “Tricia, Tricia! Ah, here she is” — and down the lobby came a blasted white poodle. This happened to me and is not transmitted via somebody else. As a matter of fact, doing that job at that time was good basic education for anybody in the history business. It fosters a necessary doubt.

* 
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CORRESPONDENCE

Letters intended for publication in LPS should be sent to Richard Wall, 27 Trumpington Street, Cambridge CB2 1QA.

Editor's note

LPS readers are reminded that the editorial board is always prepared to offer advice on subjects within the scope of LPS. Sometimes queries which have been raised are discussed in print in this section of the journal but there are many others which are not published, so if you think we can help do not hesitate to contact us.

Female blacksmiths

Dear Sir,

I see from a directory that there was a female blacksmith at Leigh, near Reigate, in 1851. It would be interesting to check back in the census and discover whether she took over from her father; was she the blacksmith before her? Equally, it would be interesting to know whether or not she was unique. Do you know of any source which would tell me how many female blacksmiths there were in the country in 1851? My father thinks that they may not have been so rare as I reckon. He recalls one who used to go round the flower shows in the Torrington area of North Devon during the early years of the present century.

Yours sincerely,

Alan Gillies.

Sunnymead, Epsom Road, Ashtead, Surrey, KT21 1LD.

Game, set and match. (LPS 22, editor's note)

My dear Editor,

I think that the last laugh is mine. We spell Goadby and not Goady!!

Yours sincerely,

F. R. L. Goadby.

Gaunt Mill, Standlake, Witney, Oxon. OX8 7QA.

Editor's note. Brigadier Goadby joins the select circle of contributors to LPS whose names have been tampered with by mis-spelling or the transposition of initials. This includes such well known personalities as A. E. Wrigley and Leslie Bindley.

An East End immigrant baptism bulge in 1837?

Dear Sir,

I should be grateful if the editorial board of LPS could throw light on two matters which arose during the course of some recent genealogical enquiries I have been making.
The settlement of large numbers of 'German' immigrants in the East End of London in the nineteenth century is well attested, but I have not been able to find a study which shows the main dates of the immigration, the origins of the immigrants (perhaps in well-defined parts of German-speaking Europe) or the conditions which drove them to move. The registers of St. George-in-the-East round 1817 show many German names, but I have seen references which imply that these immigrants were still arriving in the 1870s, which seems unlikely. Could you indicate some generally available sources of information?

I have not examined the baptismal registers for St. George-in-the-East very extensively, but I noticed what seems to have been a remarkable upsurge in the number of baptisms at the end of June 1837:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number of Entries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23 June 105 entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perhaps this rush for (belated) baptism had some connection with the statutory birth registration which became effective on 1 July 1837, possibly through some popular misunderstanding. It may, however, have been purely a local phenomenon. Do you have any evidence of its occurrence elsewhere?

Yours sincerely,
E. G. Andrews.

34 Coulsdon Rise, Coulsdon, Surrey CR3 2SB.

**Editor's note.** One example is provided by the baptism register of Hinckley, Leicestershire: in 1836 75 baptisms were recorded while in June 1837 360 people were baptised, 78 on June 28 and 161 on June 30. (See comment by Roger Schofield in **LPS** 19, p.52.)

**The Penarth census project**

Dear Editor,

I am a member of the Penarth District Local History Society which is engaged in producing a detailed picture of the town's population during the mid-nineteenth century. We have already completed this year transcriptions of the 1841, 1851, 1861 and 1871 population censuses and an analysis of each of the four, drawing attention to their salient features. Work is in progress on tracing and obtaining copies of probate material. We have been given permission by the Public Record Office to publish the census and the Registrar General's statistics of births and causes of death during the period under review, and membership of the **LPS** Society might help us to shape our publication so as to give it wide appeal. We will next month begin work on producing an index of all the
people listed in the four censuses. The population of the five parishes which make up Penarth was 352 in 1841 and is now 24,000, so you may see the size of the task.

Yours sincerely,
E. A. Benjamin.

74 Beechwood Drive, Penarth, South Glamorgan CF6 2QZ.

An early marriage certificate.

Dear Sir,
Following the comment by Richard Wall in LPS 18, p.57, that marriage lines were comparatively uncommon, I would like to draw readers' attention to the following certificate recording the performance of a marriage. It would appear that the certificate was an attempt by the lady to reduce her tax obligation.

Yours sincerely,
Sybil Jack.

Flat D, 4 Leinster Square, London W2.

Md that I Robert Stokes vicar of Hackney in the county of Myddlesex doo certyfe all men to whom these presentes shall come that I fynde upon searche made in the register booke remayning in the church ther that Sir Robert Lytton Knight now decessed by the name of Robert Lytton gentylman was maryed unto Elizabeth Burgon widow late wyfe of Robert Burgon esquier decesyd which was married in the church of Hackney the xvj day of February in the xxxvij yere of the reigne of the late kying of famous memoyre Henry the viijth. In wytnes whereof I the sayd Robert Stokes clerk vicar ther have wryten these presentes with my own hand & subscribed them with my name Robert Stokes vicar witness that they did see the register examyned with the certifcayte by the said vicar.

Thomas Twynyho
& Ellis Thomas

E199/76/1 Sheriffs petitions for allowances (4-5Ph&M)
Essex and Hertfordshire f42

A bigamous marriage?

Dear Sir,
In reply to Mrs. Freda M. Wilkins-Jones' letter (LPS 22, page 61) suggesting a bigamous marriage, may I suggest that Mary Hunt's husband John may have died during his transportation voyage as so often happened, or at some time afterwards?
In a parish census at Bawdeswell, Norfolk, the vicar noted that Harriet Adcock's husband Edmund was transported for stealing wheat. Among the parish documents is a form from the Secretary of State's Office, Home Department, Whitehall, which the vicar filled in with the details of Edmund Adcock's transportation in 1837 to obtain information about him. The form was dated 20th October 1845 and the Home Office reported that Edmund Adcock 'Died 15th April 1843.'

Is it not possible that the Rev. John Mickle received similar information before marrying Mary Hunt and George Bell?

Yours faithfully,
Joy Lodey.

Fieldfare, Etling Green, East Dereham, Norfolk.

Unbaptised children in the registers of St. Saviour's, Southwark.

Dear Sir,

While working on the parish register of St. Saviour's, Southwark, recently I came across an unusual naming practice which may interest the readers of LPS. In St. Saviour's, Southwark, children that died unbaptised in the closing years of the reign of Elizabeth were entered in the parish register in the following way: 'Feb. 27 1602 John Taplin a child not baptised.' Between May 1597 and December 1602 61 children died unbaptised; of these 27 were female, 29 male and 5 anonymous. All but 7 of these cases fell in the years 1600-1602. After December 1602 unbaptised children are not distinguished in the burial register.

Starting in May 1597 all the 27 female children that died unbaptised were given the christian name Jone (or Joan, Joane, etc.). The equivalent practice is not followed with male children. The 29 unbaptised males were given one of 12 christian names (though there is a predominance of 10 Johns). Presumably male children were more highly thought of than female children and parents were quicker to name their sickly male offspring, leaving female children to be given a 'dummy' name by the parish clerk. Jone was probably chosen for the females as it was then in widespread use, though it was not to remain so (LPS 19, p.31).

This practice is to be seen as an idiosyncrasy of the keeper of the parish register. This is underlined by the fact that the custom coincides neatly with a change in the style of handwriting that occurred in May 1597 and finished towards the end of 1602 when, as we know from the vestry minutes, a new parish clerk was appointed.

I wonder if any other readers of LPS have come across similar naming practices?

Yours faithfully,
Jeremy Boulton.

Darwin College, Cambridge.
Official murder?

Dear Sir,
This story was told me recently by a friend who was in fact relating his grandfather's memories.

A servant girl working at a farm not far from Beer in Devon was friendly with a travelling tinker who went everywhere with his dog. One day he turned up without the dog and said that he had lost it. He asked the servant girl to look after it, if it turned up. She saw the dog the next day or so, attempted to catch it and it bit her. It was rabid and she in due course contracted hydrophobia. When she was in the final stages of this affliction two policemen came out from Beer and proceeded to smother her.

This story is echoed by what happened to Shirley in Charlotte Bronte's novel of that name. Shirley was also bitten by a dog and says at one point, 'do not let them smother me.' In fact, she escapes the disease as the dog was not rabid.

Can it be assumed that this way of getting rid of sufferers from rabies (in fact a form of official murder) was normal in the last century? Was it officially recognised as the way to deal with those afflicted or was it just done and no one said anything? Were there any other afflictions dealt with in the same way? How is it that rabies, evidently known and recognised in this country, later disappeared? Why did it not at that time get into the fox population? It cannot have done or we should presumably still have it. Are there any other instances of this method of dealing with hydrophobics?

Yours sincerely,
Robin Stanes.

Culver House, Payhembury, Honiton, Devon.
SOME RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Books
Durham University Extra-Mural Department
Billingham, Port Clarence and Haverton Hill in 1851, undated, 90p.
A study based on the enumerators' returns of 1851 of the age, sex and
occupational structure of the population.

G. Patterson, ed.
Monkwearmouth colliery in 1851, Durham University Extra-Mural Depart-
ment, (1977), 80p.
An investigation of sex, age and occupational structure and migration
based on the enumerators' returns of 1851, with a general account of the
development of the colliery.

Pamphlets
Donald M. McCallum
A demographic study of the parishes of Bruton and Pitcombe in the
county of Somerset, reprinted from Proceedings of the Somersetshire
An aggregative and partial reconstitution of two Somerset parishes. The
mean age at marriage being based on small numbers should be treated
with caution. The infant mortality rate in the late eighteenth century at
200 per 1000 is still below that of some market towns that have been
reconstituted by the Cambridge Group. It is interesting to see that the
rates remained as high as 180/190 towards the mid-nineteenth century.
The lack of growth as evidenced by the failure of baptisms to outpace
burials in the late eighteenth century is also quite distinctive.

Articles

Duncan Adamson
The Hearth Tax, 3 parts, Transactions of the Dumfries and Galloway
Tentative attempt to derive information on social structure, wealth and
population distribution, mainly in the town of Dumfries, from the 1690s
Hearth Tax lists. Discusses coverage of the tax in Dumfriesshire and
Galloway, using the lists in conjunction with parish registers and some
town records to make suggestions about child mortality, accuracy of the
registers and the distribution of surnames. The techniques employed are
occasionally dubious, and some assumptions are questionable: e.g., about
the correct multiplier for household size calculations. There are useful
transcriptions of the lists for the above counties.

A. R. Bridbury
Before the Black Death, Economic History Review, 2nd series, Vol. XXX,
No. 3 (August 1977), 393-410.
A survey of ideas as to what happened to the economy after the Black
Death which includes discussion of the question of whether the popula-
tion was depleted before the Black Death, or had it recovered from its supposed losses. The author rejects the notion of a seriously depleted population before 1348.

John K. Chance and William B. Taylor

An examination of a colonial Latin American society using a series of house-by-house census records which provides an opportunity to measure the relationship between the spectrum of racial classifications and economic groups.

P. Corfield

From both general calculations and informed guesswork on the populations of towns in the period c. 1520-1700, Penelope Corfield assesses the picture of provincial urban growth vis à vis that of the metropolis. Apart from London’s inexorable growth, a complex pattern of diversity emerges rather than a general pattern of urban growth, crisis or decay. Overall, the period until 1650 appears to have been one of some urban growth, seen initially and most spectacularly in the case of London, and thereafter, as the economy became stronger and more diversified, in a number of provincial urban centres.

Alun C. Davies
The old Poor Law in an industrialising parish: Aberdare 1818-36, Welsh History Review, viii, 3 (June 1977), 285-311.

A regional study of the administration of the old Poor Law which takes account of its effects on the population, including the implementation of the laws governing bastardy, apprenticeship and settlement.

Richard J. Dennis
Distance and social interaction in a Victorian city, Journal of Historical Geography, III, 3 (July 1977), 237-50.

From the examination of patterns of marriage in Huddersfield 1850-80, considerable stress is placed upon the need to interpret distance-decay patterns of marriage in their social context. The extensive marriage area for the rich and the close-knit area for the poor is interpreted as being in part an expression of the relative population densities of the two groups, most striking in the case of the segregated Irish community. For inter-social class marriages, physical distance operated independently of social distance.

R. Floud

A helpful survey of quantitative techniques in general which includes a brief section on family reconstitution and the work of the Cambridge Group.
David W. Galenson
'Middling people' or 'common sort'? The social origins of some early Americans re-examined, with a rebuttal by Mildred Campbell, William and Mary Quarterly, Third Series, xxxv, 3 (July 1978), 497-540.

An examination of Ms Campbell's quantitative study of the social origins of seventeenth century English immigrants to America which scrutinises the evidence used and assesses her conclusions. The principal sources were two lists of servant registrations and it is the treatment of these which is likely to be of general interest to LPS readers. General problems of statistical evidence and semantic interpretation are considered and the tentative conclusion on the topic itself is that those who bound themselves to labour for a term of years in return for passage to the New World in the seventeenth century were not drawn predominantly from any one or two occupational categories or groups from within English society, but came from all levels, i.e. of 'common sort' making up a cross section of English society from gentry to paupers.

Ms Campbell defends her case in terms of statistical presentation, the use of hypotheses and models and the supplementing of deficient data by indirect methods, e.g. statistical inference. In so doing she provides a useful critique of the new economic history of the 1960s. Her final conclusion is that a division of society which includes 'the gentry to the paupers' in the 'common sort' would be as surprising to a seventeenth century Englishman as it is to a twentieth century historian.

P. Gibbon and C. Curtin
The stem family in Ireland, Comparative Studies in Society and History, xx, 3 (July 1978), 429-453.

A study of the stem family in the sociological literature and in anthropological studies of Ireland which examines the notion and derivation of the stem family from Le Play in the nineteenth century to contemporary studies, including Peter Laslett's claim that the stem family was more or less a fictional construction. On the basis of a study of historiographical and field work evidence the authors conclude that the stem family did exist as a norm in Ireland among a very substantial part of the rural population, with a specific material basis, i.e. a kind of petty-commodity economy. It is claimed that it was neither a fiction as Laslett suggested; nor was it a stage of some general evolution. It was the product of a particular economic conjuncture; and its conditions are shared by other European peasant communities of the twentieth century. This argument is supported by some six pages of tables.

J. S. W. Gibson
Regional societies for the study of family history, The Local Historian, xiii, 2 (May 1978), 100-102.

A useful source of reference for LPS readers and an oblique approach to the amateur-professional debate which gets an airing from time to time. It argues a case for the respectability of family history as distinct from pedigree-chasing genealogy.
R. S. Gottfried

An examination of testamentary demographic analysis in the fifteenth century which seeks to establish the overwhelming demographic importance of plague from 1348 until 1480 and of sweating sickness after 1480. Quantitative testamentary evidence is supported by qualitative contemporary narrative records. There is a lengthy section on the methodology of using testamentary records for demographic purposes. The testamentary population is sampled for mortality; biases by age and wealth class are considered and the replacement rate (the ability of the population to replace itself) is calculated. The conclusion is that the 1470s and the 1480s mark a turning point in English demographic history, after which epidemic disease and mortality ceased to be the dominant factors and fertility became the key element.

Christopher Hill

A review of Peter Laslett's *Family life and illicit love in earlier generations* (1977) and Lawrence Stone's *Family, sex and marriage in England 1500-1800* (1977). Less idiosyncrasies are found in Laslett's current book than in his 'unfortunately premature' *The world we have lost*; the reviewer finds it a great improvement but points out his main doubt about Laslett's 'uncritical attitude towards his principal source, parish registers'. There is a survey of earlier criticism of this source which will be of interest to LPS readers. Stone's book is rather better received; especially his suspicion of statistical conclusions and his willingness to use 'literary sources'. In the closing paragraph there is food for thought for readers of LPS: "historical demography is far too serious a subject to be left to the demographers".

Eric Hopkins

This study charts the decline in the family as a work unit in the area around Stourbridge during the nineteenth century. The 1851 census shows a great degree of propinquity of (supposed) kin, with few lodgers and servants, for this household-based industry. The demise of the system was not only achieved by the decline of family work through technological change in nail-manufacture, but also through industrial and educational legislation.

Herbert S. Klein and Stanley L. Engerman

Postulates lactation practices as a factor in child spacing, whether owing to the natural or the social impact of nursing.

56
Peter McClure
Surnames from English place-names as evidence for mobility in the middle ages, The Local Historian, xiii, 2 (May 1978), 80-85.
A welcome attempt to study medieval demography in a way which is possible for the enthusiastic amateur, e.g. by measuring the distance on a map between the place referred to by a surname and the place where the bearer of the surname owned property. The author is well aware of the limitations of such a study and discusses the methodology in general.

R. W. McDonald
An impressionistic account of parochial registration in Wales, this article includes often considerable detail on the form, survival, deficiencies and availability of (under-utilised) Welsh parish registers.

Edward E. McKenna
An examination of connections between conditions in the rural economy of Ireland and marriage during the post-famine period from 1851 to 1911. Theoretical explanations are briefly summarised; then a systematic analysis takes account of four main variables: marriage, agricultural land pressure, living standards, non-agricultural occupational engagement. The conclusion is that the ‘diffusion of the match’ (a marriage-inheritance system) explanation of marriage variations in Ireland was most applicable early in the post-famine period around 1871 but that the timing of the changes varies on an east-west regional basis.

Angus McLaren
Abortion in France: women and the regulation of family size, 1800-1914, French Historical Studies, x 3 (Spring 1978), 461-485.
Beginning with the contrast in the drop in the French fertility rate in the late eighteenth century and the general European decline in the fertility rate in the post-1870 period, the author seeks to answer the question of how fertility was controlled. Abortion is examined within a general discussion of contraception which questions the assumption that the restriction of family size was primarily a male decision and action. By its nature much of the evidence (e.g. medical accounts written by doctors violently opposed to non-medical practitioners, commentators on the situation in general) provides attitudes rather than quantifiable data but doubt is cast upon the view that the working class learned about family limitation from social superiors; rather, their attitude reflected the prevailing economic conditions.

Dennis R. Mills
The technique of house repopulation: experience from a Cambridgeshire village, 1841, The Local Historian, xiii 3 (May 1978), 86-98.
A description of the procedures of house repopulation in Melbourn, Cambridgeshire, for 1841, with a discussion of some of the problems of interpretation. This technique has been described earlier for LPS readers in LPS 10 (Spring, 1973), 37-52, by Adrian Henstock.
Wanda Minge-Kalman

A challenge to Peter Laslett's claim that industrialisation brought the demise of 'home-based' family labour which argues that industrialisation, whilst rendering the family non-competitive with larger, mechanised production groups, also created a new market for a new kind of family production. The treatment of child labour before the industrial revolution is examined along with the demand for educated labour. The extension of childhood which seems to have resulted had consequences for the family as a producer of labour, especially the steady rise in the cost of reproducing children. As a result children developed into a labour-intensive capital-intensive product of the family in industrial society.

Richard B. Morrow

A survey of the dispute between the demographic transition theorists and E. A. Wrigley's notion of preventative checks, which goes on to use a 'model' fertility schedule to determine whether Colyton's data are consistent with preventive control. The conclusion is that it is not necessary to look for any method of birth control, or any reason why Colyton's population would practise such control; rather, the existence of plague from 1645 to 1646 can explain Colyton's ensuing demographic experience.

R. P. Neuman

A micro-study of birth control among the working classes of Wilhelmine Germany; including an examination of methods of birth control and motives. The emphasis is on the workers' self perceptions rather than on a quantitative approach; much use is made of the workers' own words as found in autobiographies and studies of birth control among working class men and women, supplemented with contemporary studies of working class housing, sexual behaviour and medical histories. The findings of this micro-study are examined in relation to John Knodel's macro-study, e.g. his conclusion that a reduction in marital fertility was the cause of a decline in overall fertility. The conclusion is that working class people believed that by limiting their own family size they could preserve or improve their personal position in society, i.e. they tended to imitate the middle class, although economic necessity often made it essential in order to prevent a deterioration in their condition.

J. Patten and J. W. R. Whitehand (eds.)

An issue of the *Transactions* devoted to urban historical geography; this number contains a number of articles of interest to the readers of LPS. John Patten contributes a useful, if pedestrian, discussion of sources and preliminary research results of his work on 'Urban occupations in pre-industrial England'. Three studies utilize the nineteenth century census
enumerators' books: Mark Shaw describes 'The ecology of social change: Wolverhampton 1851-71', in which he analyses the shift in residential differentiation. Linking between the census of 1851 and 1861, R. J. Dennis analyses 'Intercensal migration in a Victorian city', showing that in Huddersfield in-migrants were more likely to leave the city than natives, but to move shorter distances within the city, that the young adults moved more and further, and that renters of property moved more often but shorter distances than did owner-occupiers. 'The residential segregation of migrant communities in mid-Victorian Liverpool' is a fascinating account by C. G. Pooley of the reasons for the segregation of Irish, Welsh and Scots — the Irish bound together into 'ghettoes' by socio-economic factors, their uniformly low social and occupational status, whilst the other ethnic areas were culturally cohesive but more socio-economically diverse. Other contributions include articles on late medieval Gloucester and St. Andrews, landscape parks in small British towns, London's milk supply, and a general essay by Whitehand on a 'theory of urban form'.

K. A. Pickens

A study of Canterbury, New Zealand, to assess occupational mobility in the nineteenth century. New Zealand lacks nineteenth century household census returns and tax records so other data for the study of social structure have had to be found, city directories, electoral rolls, shipping lists. Deficiencies in these records are discussed and the records of the Registrar-General of Births Deaths and Marriages established as the most useful source. The method is to compare the statement of occupation made by men on their marriage certificates with that listed on their death certificates; the various limitations of this method are also discussed. The conclusions are that occupational mobility did exist although rates of upward mobility diminished as the colony developed a more sophisticated economic structure. But at the same time the number of avenues of possible upward mobility increased. Only about half the men of labourer origins managed to improve their occupational status. But economic (as distinct from occupational) mobility also occurred but cannot be adequately measured in a study based on these sources. This general feature is similar to that found in America — men who arrived early had a better chance of rising; the upwardly mobile tended to be the less geographically mobile; rates of mobility tended to decline as territory became more closely settled. Hence a pattern of occupational mobility common to newly settled agricultural communities is established.

John D. Post

An attempt to determine whether famine was primarily responsible for epidemics; conducted in terms of the post-war famine of 1816-17 and major typhus and bubonic plague epidemics in Europe. The author correlates fluctuations in grain prices with fluctuations of post-war mortality levels; then examines differential death rates in the light of the effectiveness of administrative policies and specific government measures. Account is taken of current hypotheses in public health and human
ecology studies. The general conclusion is that subsistence crises after about 1750 no longer produced major mortality crises in western and central Europe. Environmental and behavioural changes concomitant with economic growth and modernization reduced diseases such as typhus and tuberculosis. No biological interaction between the plague bacillus and nutritional levels is accepted. That Europe escaped another plague after 1750 was due primarily to effective quarantine measures instituted by better organized governments.

Elizabeth Roberts

A general investigation which is mainly concerned with oral evidence but also includes local census figures.

E. D. Steele

A statistical analysis of the Irish in the north of England using the evidence of census returns and hence of some methodological interest to LPS readers.

Fran Stewart

An analysis of information inscribed on memorials in the churchyard of All Saints, Middleton Stoney, Oxfordshire, taking account of names, dates of death, ages at death and relationships. An examination of the 1851 census returns was made to see which classes were commemorated later by gravestones (occupations being given for very few persons on the gravestones themselves). The methodology of recording and analysis is discussed.

N. L. Tranter

An attempt, based primarily upon aggregative and family reconstitution from the evidence of parish registers of the period 1820-91, to determine how far, and in what ways, the pattern of economic growth and decay of Portpatrick, on the Galloway coast, was reflected in population changes. Rates of birth, marriage and death are examined. The parish register data is supplemented by manuscript census returns, including the Urquhart Census of 1832-34; consequently this is likely to be something of a model study for many LPS readers, dealing as it does with many problematical issues such as under-registration, accuracy of civil registrars and church registers, and special groups such as Irish Catholics. The general conclusion is that there are pronounced differences in the demographic history of Portpatrick during the periods of economic growth and decline. Between 1821-41 birth rates were relatively high, reflecting an economic stimulus. Subsequent economic contraction was marked by continuous decline in the total population. Lower crude birth
rates, higher ages at first marriage, longer intervals between marriage and the birth of first children, proportionately fewer pre-marital conceptions, a decline in the length of the average period of child-bearing, fewer births in each completed family and higher levels of infant and particularly child mortality. Economic stagnation and population decline were accompanied by a rise in the average age of the community and by a growing preponderance of females over males, i.e. the impact of economic decline on rates of nuptiality, fertility and mortality worked through to effect the age and sex structure of the population.

A. G. Veysey
A discussion of the custody of ecclesiastical parish records in Wales which reports on how the question has been resolved: county record offices have been designated as repositories, apart from Powys where no provision has yet been made for the care of local records.

Andrew S. Walsh and Robert V. Wells
An examination of census materials for the communities of the Mississippi river valley in the eighteenth century which allows a study of the characteristics of the people living there. Three censuses (1766, 1769 and 1770) are used, only part of the available material covering recently arrived settlers from Nova Scotia. The methodology will no doubt be of general interest to LPS readers; the general relationships of broad demographic patterns to social consequences are investigated in terms of family and household size and composition.

Michael P. Weber and Anthony E. Boardman
Economic growth and occupational mobility in nineteenth century urban America: a reappraisal, Journal of Social History, ii, 1 (Fall 1977), 52-74
This article raises a number of general problems of studies in occupational mobility: the treatment of one variable at a time does not provide sufficient inter-relationship and may allow the omission of significant variables which could bias results; for example mobility studies have been confined by census restrictions to the 1850-80 time period and the definition of social mobility is complicated, e.g. wealth and property may be more important determinants of status and class than skill levels and occupational achievement. These difficulties are considered in a study of a small, but in the authors' eyes, representative American community, Warren, Pennsylvania 1870-1910. The study notes geographic mobility; persisters, in and out migrants; reasons for leaving; occupational mobility in relation to initial skill levels; mobility rates; wealth as a determinant of mobility. The conclusion is that individual success was determined more by the structure of the city than by individual ethnic and cultural background.

E. G. West
Literacy and the industrial revolution, Economic History Review, 2nd series, xxxi, 3 (August 1978), 369-383.
An examination of the extent and timing of literacy changes in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in Britain, and their relationship to economic growth. The author surveys recent research and takes particular issue with Roger Schofield’s work. He rejects attempts to deny the “threshold theory” of the American economists, M. J. Bowman and C. A. Anderson, and claims that available national estimates do not demonstrate that the Industrial Revolution depressed literacy; a distinct improvement in literacy coincided with the beginnings of large-scale factory production.

J. M. Winter

An examination of the immediate demographic consequences of the war for Britain incorporating a re-assessment of the assumption that Britain’s wartime demographic experience did not differ from that of continental Europe. Working class mortality and infant mortality receive detailed treatment.

James B. Wood
Endogamy and the mésalliance, the marriage patterns of the nobility of the Election of Bayeux, 1430-1669, French Historical Studies, x, 3 (Spring 1978), 375-392.

An excursion into late medieval-early modern demographic studies which analyses the marriage patterns of a provincial nobility over a period of more than two centuries, which takes account of two theories of noble marriage behaviour: estate-directed endogamy and internal noble division along semi-class lines which reflected social tensions within the nobility. The author’s conclusions support the theory that the nobility as a social group helped to define itself by practising strict endogamy; but reject the theory that there was hostility between irreconcilable sub-groups within the nobility. The results in general show a society with smooth mechanisms of social mobility and assimilation.

E. A. Wrigley
Births and baptisms: the use of Anglican baptism registers as a source of information about the number of births in England before the beginning of civil registration, Population Studies, xxxi, 2, (July 1977), 281-312.

A detailed examination of the shortfall between births and baptisms, taking account of indirect methods of under-registration and establishing the need for further research.

E. A. Wrigley

A reply to Richard B. Morrow’s claim that there is no evidence for family limitation in later seventeenth century Colyton. The author takes Morrow’s two main points (the evidence against family limitation, the plague of 1645-46 and its effects) and finds both arguments unconvincing. The use of the Coale-Tressell model fertility schedules is judged inappropriate in the specific circumstances and the plague hypothesis found untenable.
LOCAL RESEARCH IN PROGRESS

Comparative cities: a new teaching package

Comparative cities is a teaching package designed to introduce students to analysis of manuscript schedules of the nineteenth century census for social, urban, family and demographic history. The files are designed for use with SPSS. It was initially developed at Brown University with the assistance of a project grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities. The file is organised to illustrate contrasts among cities at different stages of industrialisation and the demographic transition in Europe and America: Pisa, Italy (1841), Amiens, France (1851), Stockport, England (1841 and 1851) and Providence, R.I. (1850, 1864 and 1880). The rural districts around Pisa and part of Providence County are also included. There are approximately 1,400 cases with information for individuals in each of eleven subfiles. These are random samples from the original 1:10 house samples for the four places made to permit flexible and economical student use. Summaries imbedded in the file permit analysis at the individual, household or nuclear unit level. There are 142 variables for each individual. The package also contains a coursebook with explanation of each variable, a dictionary with occupational titles that appear in the censuses, course syllabus and other instructions for use. The files are being used in the separate ongoing research of the two principal investigators and should be used for instructional purposes only. This teaching package can be supplied only in the format provided to ICPSR, as two card-image data files, two files of "SPSS instruction cards and associated printed documentation class IV. 

The package has been prepared by R. Burr Litchfield and Howard P. Chudacoff and is available from the SSRC Surrey Archive, University of Essex, Colchester, Essex.

Canadian studies in population

Contains articles on various aspects of Canadian demography, book reviews, news and notes on research projects. Subscription rates: institutions $10, individuals $5, students $3. Obtainable from Canadian Studies in Population, Population Research Laboratory, Department of Sociology, the University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2H4.

Work in Westmorland

The following aggregative analyses have been undertaken by members of the Kendal Regional Group of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society. These investigations are described more fully in the University of Lancaster Regional Bulletin, Summer 1979.

Beetham  
Mrs. A. M. Flatley  
12 High Garth, 
Kendal, Cumbria

Burton  
Mr. L. J. Hobbs  
East Brow, Woodhouse Lane, 
Heversham, Cumbria

Crosthwaite-cum-Lyth*  
Mr. and Mrs. L. F. Walling  
9 Helme Drive, 
Kendal, Cumbria, LA9 7JB
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grayrigg*</td>
<td>Miss J. Hackett</td>
<td>27 Larch Grove, Kendal, Cumbria, LA9 6AU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsington</td>
<td>Miss P. H. J. Quemby</td>
<td>18 Ashleigh Road, Kendal, Cumbria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morland*</td>
<td>Mrs. J. Young</td>
<td>Hale Bank Cottage, Hale, Milnthorpe, Cumbria, LA7 7BL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natland</td>
<td>Mrs. W. M. Inglesfield</td>
<td>Moresby, Hawes Lane, Natland, Kendal, Cumbria, LA9 7QF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underbarrow*</td>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. L. F. Walling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windermere*</td>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. L. F. Walling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winster*</td>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. L. F. Walling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witherslack</td>
<td>Miss E. J. Leresche</td>
<td>26 Greenside, Kendal, Cumbria, LA9 4LD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* denotes analysis completed.
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