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EDITORIAL

Access to the Registrar-General's records: at what price?

The Public Records (Amendment Bill) received its second reading in the House of Lords on January 28th. The event attracted little attention outside the small circle of peers who took part in the debate and even now the implications of this legislation which ultimately could affect most users of historical records are not widely known. The Bill is the brain-child of the genealogist and record agent Lord Teviot. It was born out of the controversy with the Registrar-General over public access to the copy registers of births, marriages and deaths which are in his custody. The Registrar-General has alleged that these records fall outside the current definition of public records and so cannot be deposited in the Public Records Office without some amendment to the 1958 Public Records Act; and this Lord Teviot's Bill seeks to provide.

Had this been the full extent of the proposed legislation we would have welcomed Lord Teviot's initiative; the copy registers and the indexes have been microfilmed and this legal snag is the one obstacle preventing their deposit in the Public Record Office and the public having unrestricted access to them once again. However, as it is drafted at present, the Bill introduces a major new constraint. It seeks to limit unrestricted access to those registers which contain entries more than one hundred years old.

The debate in the House of Lords unravelled the tangled logic which lies behind this Bill and revealed the new dawn which users of these records may look towards. At present a reader is allowed to search the indexes which are held at St. Catherine's House and an annexe and having identified an entry may then purchase a certificated copy. This will cost £4.60 for applications made in person and £9.60 if the application is made by post. There is no guarantee that the entry will turn out to be the one sought as the indexes do not offer sufficient information to identify individuals beyond doubt. Consequently more than one certificate may have to be bought before the user satisfies the object of his enquiry. This will be true particularly in cases in which a popular surname is involved and the costs of such research can be considerable. There was general agreement amongst those who spoke in the debate that this system was restrictive, unsatisfactory and expensive and should not be allowed to continue. But intoxicated by the prospect of a simple and effective solution their lordships were led to support a remedy which we believe would prove more damaging than the disease it is intended to cure. The introduction of a hundred years' rule was justified by Lord Teviot on the grounds that these records are of a sensitive nature. The case for privacy was supported by the Lord Chancellor, Lord Hailsham, who compared the present case with the census records to which such a rule has been applied. In reality the comparison is false. Unlike the census enumerators' books the current registers of births, deaths and marriages are available to the public. These are the registers which are still in use in registrars' offices throughout the land and the current legislation allows the public general access to them. The comparison is also misleading in the case of information less than one hundred years old but outside the current registers. If Lord Teviot's legislation is adopted the registers which con-
tain this information would remain in the Registrar-General's custody and would remain accessible to the public but with the same serious limitations as at present. The privacy which is to be upheld would be defended only by the security of inadequate indexes and a system of high fees for certificated copies. If there is a principle here we cannot identify it. The purgatory of half-access at a high price to which the registers of intermediate age are to be condemned until they are more than one hundred years old is a nonsense. These are not private records. No undertaking of confidentiality is, or ever has been, entered into with the individuals concerned in their creation; in our view complete accessibility is the only principle which can be justified.

The anomaly created by the proposed hundred year rule can be resolved by removing the appropriate clause from the Bill. The method the Government has in mind for the implementation of this new legislation may be more difficult to withstand. Lord Hailsham pointed to the way ahead when he drew attention to the explosion of interest in family history and of the effect this has had on the use made of St. Catherine's House and the Public Record Offices Census Room. He went on to say that the estimated cost of the facilities required to make the Registrar-General's registers accessible to the public had risen substantially. In 1979 the number of readers had been forecast at 150 per day. That figure is now estimated at 720. The annual operating cost in 1979 was £213,000 a year. The estimate is now £1,300,000. The initial capital cost of buildings and equipment was put in 1979 at £300,000. If a new building were to be constructed it might cost over £1,000,000. The capital cost of the necessary microfilm equipment alone is £300,000. ... Inevitably, these costs, small as they may seem in comparison with some other sums we discuss from day to day, will have to compete with other demands from no doubt other departments, ... It may be that part of the cost could be met by fees. The Registrar's current operation is self-financing through the income from the purchase of copies of certified entries ... We shall have to consider whether and in what way fees might be charged so as to insure that the service continues to finance itself. I hope that when we do that, the grisly spectre of museum charges, which so befogged my noble friend Lord Eccles in his period of office, will not raise its horrible head to oppose it. Responsibility for these records will more than double readership at the Public Record Office, so this is a major new task. I can only say that the service to readers will be better but it will not necessarily be free.’

The implications of charging the public for access to records housed in the Public Record Office are grave. There is no legal bar to such charges; indeed in its early days the Public Record Office did charge the public for its services. The effect must be considered in terms of both the implications that such a policy would have for Public Record Office users and the pattern which would be established for other record repositories to follow in other parts of the country. There will be some who will identify their interests with those of Lord Teviot in his concluding remarks to the House of Lords. ‘Suppose, as a hypothetical figure, £10 per day were the cost of searching. The present cost of certificates is £4.60, so there would be substantial savings quite quickly.’

These short-term gains must be set against the greater costs which lie ahead. Is it likely that the Public Record Office would be allowed for long
to continue to run rooms of microfilm-readers which are used partly by readers consulting census records for which they do not pay a fee and partly by those consulting the registers of births, marriages and deaths for which a fee will be charged? Once a pattern is established for certain records it will be adopted for others. The dangers of charging for access to records as a general policy have been set out in these pages more than once and we are not alone in our condemnation of this practice. In LPS 26 we noted the views of the Association of County Archivists in their publication ‘Record Office Charges: a Policy Paper’. This draws attention to the comparability between the freedom of access enjoyed by records users and the service provided by libraries. It also points to the risk of the imposition of charges bringing about a decrease both in the use made of Record Offices and with a consequent reduction in the service itself. There is also the risk that the depositors without whose goodwill Record Offices could not survive might be led to withdraw their holdings from deposit. It is to be hoped that the Association will make its views known to the Lord Chancellor without delay.

We have reason to believe that the Bill will be introduced in the House of Commons with Government support in the near future. This does not mean that the Lord Chancellor intends to act quickly in establishing new facilities at the Public Record Office; the legislation is enabling legislation and once it is passed the speed at which the microfilms become available will be determined by a variety of factors. We have no doubt that in the short term every effort must be made to see that the Bill is opposed and amended so that the objectionable one hundred year provision is removed. The argument that fees should be charged for access to these or any other records must at the same time be conducted vigorously and proper consideration given to the alternative courses of action which exist. In the recent past those in authority have been taking soundings amongst certain bodies of users to establish what level of fees might be acceptable. It is now generally known that Lord Teviot’s suggestion of £10 per day is likely to prove an underestimate; the Treasury figure is nearer £20 per day but whatever the cost the authorities have in mind no doubt there will be some who, to avoid the frustration of the present system, will agree to pay up.

In fact there is an alternate and it is to be found in a model from the recent past. When the census enumerators’ returns began to acquire their present popularity it became clear to the staff at the Public Record Office that they would be overwhelmed by the demand to see these records. They recognised that they could not command a substantial increase in resources and so they followed the logic of the new technology of the day. They recognised that once records have been microfilmed they can be made available in many different places at a comparatively cheap cost. By a variety of means including this journal the Public Record Office made known its willingness to allow copies to be made from microfilms and every effort was made to provide a reliable service in distributing microfilm copies of the census returns to libraries throughout the country. As a result the national appetite for this important source of information has been satisfied without any need to concentrate a large number of users in one central metropolitan building. The parallel is obvious. Microfilm
copies of the vital registers and the indexes should be made available to libraries. Furthermore the new legislation should make it possible to deposit in the county record offices and other appropriate record repositories the original registers which are at present in the hands of the local registrars. In some areas, one of these solutions may be preferable to the other. In others both remedies may be adopted. Ultimately the only loser will be British Rail.

We believe the proposal to charge fees for access to records of whatever kind at the Public Record Office is quite unacceptable and must be opposed. This is now a matter of Government policy. It will be imposed on the Public Record Office whatever views the keeper and his staff may hold. Only the most vigorous presentation of the arguments against these plans can have any hope of success. We urge all our readers to take up the matter with members of Parliament and as users or as members of local history societies or other groups of users, make their views known to the Lord Chancellor and to the Keeper of Public Records at the Public Record Office.

Local Population Studies in schools

Readers will note that the second report on Local Population Studies in schools is printed in this issue and we very much hope that as well as encouraging school teachers amongst our readers it will be of interest to all our readers. Here, perhaps, are the local demographers of the 1990s, and even future LPS readers. We feel sure that the lament over lost data cannot be limited to junior-school classrooms. We repeat our hope that this series will be seen as of interest to the community in general and that readers who came to local population studies as adults will be prepared to say what they would have found most useful in terms of preparation for such study.

An increase in the price of LPS

We regret that we must announce an increase in the cost of subscriptions to LPS. We have maintained the present rate for more than two years despite rising prices and have managed to include two enlarged issues (LPS 27 and LPS 28). But now, looking ahead, we find ourselves with no alternative if we are to retain our present financial good health. The cost of the annual subscription will be £4.00 for U.K. and £5.00 for overseas subscribers. These rates will take effect from LPS 30. We understand that the membership fees for the Local Population Studies Society will also be increased at the same time. The new fees will be £6.00 for U.K. members; £7.50 for overseas and £5.50 for student members.

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

February 1983
The queues of people that gathered in Portugal Street, outside the Census Room of the Public Record Office, during the months of January and February, 1982, were witness to the great interest shown by local historians in the unpublished census returns of 1881, recently made public under the hundred year confidentiality rule. Many of these dedicated people were, no doubt, genealogists with specific aims of tracing a particular family, or group of families. Others may have been embarking on wider based studies, perhaps transcribing the microfilm copies of the original returns for a whole parish or enumeration district, since the wealth of information contained in the return makes them prime reference material for any historical study of the nineteenth century. Ten years ago two major publications laid down methodologies for analysing census data,¹ and a recent Open University publication serves as a good guide to the major research based on the enumerators' returns that has so far been undertaken.² This study also brings out very clearly a growing problem, namely the general lack of comparability between studies, not only in the presentation of results, but also, perhaps more importantly, in the ways the data have been classified and the nature of the assumptions that have been made. This basic difficulty can obviously have far reaching consequences when attempting to draw conclusions and generalisations from a number of separate census based studies.

In collecting and transcribing information individual researchers devise systems which best suit their needs and which best fit the time restrictions and limitations placed on their work. A copy as close to the original document would be the most desirable form of transcription. This would not only enable later checks to be made simply, but would allow other researchers to make their own analyses without having to return to the original source. Such a transcription may also easily be copied and distributed to local Record Offices and other interested bodies.

However, it is during the initial stages of analysis that most problems occur. In order to compile even the most basic tables, standardisation of the data will invariably have to take place. Should the researcher be using a home microcomputer system, as is increasingly becoming the case, this will usually require converting the original entries into a series of numeric values. Here, in order to simplify the raw data, original entries will be allotted a series of predetermined standardised codes. In undertaking this step it is unlikely that a particular researcher's codes will be the same as another's, thus making the resulting computerised dataset incompatible with others.³

At Edinburgh University, Michael Anderson is working on an SSRC funded project to establish a 'public data-format', based on the two per cent national sample of the 1851 census that he has collected over the past ten years and converted to machine readable form. Hopefully, one outcome of this work will be the establishment of a set of guidelines for coding and formatting census data, flexible enough for use on a variety
of computer systems, but still maintaining compatibility and portability between datasets.

The Cambridge Group are paying attention to the secondary stages of data analysis. Carrying on from the foundations laid in *Household and family in past time*, several tables have been designed in order to standardise the general analysis of census type listings. The tables are intended to be applicable to census-style documents from all periods and places. They are grouped into nine major subject categories covering most researchers' interests. The main subject areas at present are as follows: general population characteristics; family size and structure; children and offspring; the elderly; residential kin; servants; inmates; occupation; and birthplace. Finance permitting, it is hoped that the tables will be printed in the near future and made available to researchers on request. They will be issued together with explanatory text, a comprehensive set of definitions and suggestions on what assumptions may be made about the documents in completing the tables. Space will also be provided in which researchers can add comments, observations and other remarks.

If many tables covering a large number of localities need to be completed, it may be more sensible to use a computer to help organise the data. Accordingly, the Group is using the 1851 census data collected by Michael Anderson to develop a series of computer routines that will process census data in machine readable form and automatically generate the tables mentioned above.

If researchers are interested in any aspect of this work they are invited to contact Kevin Schurer or Richard Wall at the SSRC Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure, 27 Trumpington Street, Cambridge CB2 1QA.

**NOTES**


3. A number of schemes for classification of occupational entries are set out and discussed in Open University Social Sciences Third Level Course Team (eds.) *A guide to nineteenth-century census enumerators' books*, D*01 GCEB, Milton Keynes, 1982.

LOCAL POPULATION STUDIES IN SCHOOLS (2)

A DEMOGRAPHIC APPROACH TO HISTORY IN THE PRIMARY SCHOOL

Leslie Stevens
The Junior and Infant School, Elm, Cambs.

The history syllabus theme for my fourth-year class is Georgians and Victorians and I decided to approach the topic through the available parish registers and national census enumerators' returns. I decided upon such a statistical approach to history with my class of ten to eleven year-olds because that is my own approach to history, and I believe that an enthusiastic teacher will arouse the interest and enthusiasm of the class. I also saw in the project the opportunity for the children to gain experience in arithmetic and mathematics, geography, and art and craft; and as an additional bonus to the work the children would be presented with the opportunity of responsible, first-hand contact with the artefacts of history, principally the parish registers that have recorded life and death in their parish, for some 450 years. This method of study reached beyond the confines of their classroom textbook and the class were excited by the proposition that, since no history of Elm of this type had previously been written, they would have to write their own.

With these thoughts in mind I set about the task of organising work for the class that would be interesting yet within the capabilities of a group with a range from a reading age of 7.6 to a mental age of 15 years. The work would need to be comprehensive yet capable of completion in the available time, allowing for all the other academic, sporting and social demands made upon the children's time. But to a degree the work is open-ended and next year's class will be able to continue the study. Underpinning everything is the essential objective of awakening an interest in history, and my belief in the value of first-hand experience for children of this age range.

Having decided to undertake the project I needed to develop a pattern of organisation. Whilst the children's time was inevitably at a premium and as a class they were inexperienced in methods of research, I had the advantage of being free to organise my own timetable and the support in matters of administration of the headmaster. I was also fortunate in the help offered by the vicar of Elm and his wife1 in allowing the class, as a class or in groups, to visit the vicarage, church and churchyard as often as necessary. In the event some children made three visits during the year, some as many as five or six. All the class were taken on introductory visits to see the registers, then subsequent visits were arranged for
specific groups as the need arose. The children who worked on a family tree found a constant need to refer to the registers as the answer to one question raised a further question.

The project was introduced to the children in the classroom and preparations for the visits to the vicarage were made. Visits to the vicarage to see the registers were organised on a group basis. The children were shown the registers and the need to work with care, and in pencil at all times, was emphasised. Throughout the whole project and especially when visiting the vicarage I have been impressed by the children's responsible behaviour and mature regard for the unique value of the registers. Yet one would be often amused by their rapid transition back to being children when the opportunity arose: when, during breaks from study, they were allowed on the climbing frame in the garden, or when the vicar's daughter was absent from school with a cold and allowed one group to play with her toy farm!

The purpose of these visits was to allow the children to read the actual entries in the registers, and then to begin to extract information from them. They were pleased to find that they were able to do so quite easily. After their introductory visits the children made their decisions as to what they wished to study. Baptism, burial and marriage statistics would be collected as a major part of the work. In response to the question “What does it mean when it says “her mark”?” it was decided to examine evidence of illiteracy. Some children decided to compare a survey of Christian names in the registers with the names on the current school register. Another group wanted to record occupations. Inevitably the class was fascinated by causes of death when they were recorded. One child whose family had been local for many generations decided to compile a family tree and great excitement was caused when a forbear was found to have been buried with a note in the burial register 'inquest — manslaughter'. Arrangements are currently being made to inspect copies of local newspapers of the time. Whether or not all initial plans actually come to fruition does not of course really matter. What is important is that the children discover the sorts of questions which they can ask and try to answer on the basis of the registers.

Before the second visit to the vicarage the children prepared worksheets. Appropriate worksheets allowed the speedy but accurate extraction of the required information. Since one of the functions of the junior school is to develop basic skills I demanded a high standard and although it is not necessary that work produced should be flawless I was more than pleased and satisfied with the results. The children, in fact, set high standards for themselves; work was often started again because of errors in recording or presentation. The skills demanded were accuracy in recording, neatness in presentation and an ability to keep control of quite complicated work procedures, often involving extensive amounts of paper. The benefits, however, extend beyond work skills to social organisation within groups. The children have developed an increasing awareness of the past and a concern for the buildings and the people of our village, past and present. One pair produced a baptism graph but being dissatisfied with
the fluctuations went on to present a graph based on a five-year running mean. They also analysed their results and offered logical theories to explain a decline in baptisms revealed by the graph: subsequent investigation supported their explanation that the parish had been divided when another church had been completed in an adjoining village.

Within the classroom the work functioned through classwork, group work and individual work. When working with the whole class I used the blackboard a lot and much of the analysis was done in this way. The children provided information from their researches, but I was concerned that each group should know what other groups had discovered. I feared that I could too easily become the only one with a comprehensive picture of the work and the findings. Accordingly, when I felt it was appropriate we worked as a class on the analysis of group findings, and much of this work centred on the blackboard. The children were encouraged to take notes from the blackboard whether or not the particular analysis concerned their own group's work. Nevertheless, group activities were the main working method. The children were more or less allowed free choice in forming groups and since there is a tendency for junior children to choose work-mates of roughly the same ability level my class of twenty-four children became six or eight groups, each working separately and with a considerable range of ability between groups. The groups tended to vary slightly as children completed a task and then chose to work as pairs. Generally speaking very little time had to be given to the organisation of groups and very few children had to be directed into a group. It was in groups that the main tasks of reading the material and extracting the information were undertaken. The tally-mark system was employed in all groups, children worked in pairs and findings were bonded before graphs were produced. Children did not willingly choose to work alone, but were occasionally placed in situations where it was necessary to do so. As each group completed the extraction of information, for example, each member of the group was required to produce a graph of the results. This prevented anyone losing interest after the tally-marks had been made and ensured that each child understood how the information could be used. It also had the effect of producing enough copies for further use. Each child would have a piece of work which could be included in a folder of individual work. A good selection of material was thus available for display. Like all junior teachers I place enormous emphasis on the use of children's work for wall display.

During the term we began to watch a television programme for schools: How we used to live. During the course of the series we found many useful comparisons and discussion points which related to our parish register work. We now began as a continuation of our project an analysis of the 1851 census enumerators' returns for the village of Elm. We obtained a photostat copy of the census and I prepared one index card for each household, completing 401 cards in all. The class then copied my cards and we completed five copies of the original, to allow groups to work on the information at the same time. The task of copying was laborious but the children persevered and many took cards home to complete. I calculated that each child did an average of sixty-six cards, although some
did less and some did many more. Once again we discussed the information which might be used and the class decided which topics should be pursued. The popularity of names had proved fascinating, particularly to one group of girls, so further work was planned on the basis of the census. Likewise, occupations were to be continued as a subject of study. But now we could think about households, the number of lodgers, the number of servants, and so on. One group decided on a study of the ages of males and females. Another on the ratio of a farmer’s acreage to labourers employed. The place of birth of the head of household was used as a guide to mobility. This was done by placing tally-marks on a chart calibrated in five mile distances from Elm. A group of girls proved very competent at handling this study and identified all sorts of problems. They were sometimes unable to locate birthplaces on maps and found this very frustrating. At the completion of their study they realised that some confusion had arisen in the use of the tally-marks and were gamely prepared to begin again. Time, however, defeated them and we intend to make this theme part of the project for next year’s class. The children were, of course, very interested in what the census revealed about scholars. The school itself was built in 1860 and we have the school log book dating from 1862. This allowed us to look at reasons for absences from school, yearly inspectors’ reports, and so on. This provided a valuable means of extending the range of the project beyond the census.

Before commencing work the children were given time to familiarise themselves with the form of the census so that they could work on the task of extraction as accurately and effectively as possible. But things frequently went wrong. ‘I gave him the paper, but he can’t find it; we’ll have to start again’. ‘We’ve finished our tally-chart but are not sure it’s right; so we’re going to start again’. ‘I’ll have to do this graph again because he lent me this felt-tipped pen and it’s just run out, and I haven’t finished the colouring’.

As with the parish registers the class worked in groups of their own choice, with minimum interference from me, on topics agreed upon by discussion. I had, of course, to assess the difficulty of the proposed topics and guide some groups towards appropriate choices. Broadly speaking my role became one of helping with the identification of tasks, providing resources and ensuring that each child was usefully employed within the group. As an analysis was completed by a group we discussed the implications of the findings together as a class. Some very good ideas came from individuals. ‘Ninety-three servants were unmarried and only one was married, so it must have been a job for girls to do until they married’. ‘Most men and boys in the parish were agricultural labourers, but farmers of less than five acres didn’t employ any labourers at all, did they?’ ‘Most people worked in the village then, but it’s different now, isn’t it?’ (We are, at present, completing a study of fathers’ occupations). ‘There’s lots of scholars in 1851, but this school wasn’t built until 1860, so perhaps they had another school building or they may have had school in people’s houses, mightn’t they?’ (We are still not sure what the arrangements were before 1860 so here again is something to be followed up).
Here then was the evidence that I had sought that this work had been worthwhile with the class; they were analysing their results and beginning to appreciate that the evidence before them was of a life-style different from their own; evidence of their village but not of their time; of a social order that had once been, but was no more. They were writing their own village history and asking their own questions of the evidence. 'Although Victoria was Queen, there were very few girls named after her — was that because she wasn’t popular?' 'Here is a man of seventy-six years working as an agricultural labourer — why wasn’t he a pensioner?'

A year's work in a junior school had included many other subjects and had included diversions within the history work (we spent half a term studying slavery and its abolition since Thomas Clarkson was born in Wisbech, our market town). During the year we have also studied the geography and historical geography of the Fens. But the work on local population studies has been of immense value. It has created avenues of study for other classes to follow in their turn. I have had the opportunity of building a relationship with my class in demanding situations, and when I have had to make demands of the class they have not failed me. They have shown that eleven-year-olds are capable of a more demanding standard than the pages of their history text-books would suggest. At the end of it they have produced work which has been meticulously presented. Of this work few pieces are perfect examples of academic scholarship, but all represent very considerable effort on the part of top-juniors in

![Figure 1: Number of boys named after their father: 1851 Census.](image)
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precise displays. The children enjoyed their work on names and as well as drawing graphs to illustrate the popularity of boys' and girls' names in 1851 and 1980 we tried some more sophisticated analysis which had an immediate appeal to the children: figure 1 shows what one boy produced to show the number of boys in the 1851 Elm census returns named after their fathers.

Some of the errors which appeared in the children's final charts indicated the difficulty which they sometimes found in reading the originals, and sometimes reading one another's handwriting during the various stages of preparation of the charts. At this stage I made no attempt to correct such errors; it was after all the children's own work and the errors often served to teach valuable lessons about the nature of the work. Figure 2 shows our graph of the number of children living in each house in Elm in 1851.

![Bar chart](image)

Figure 2: Number of children living in each house, Elm 1851.
This led us to discuss the idea of the large Victorian family, and to question the basis of our evidence. We accepted that we only had evidence of children living at home and had no way of knowing how many might have already left home. Our work on scholars from the 1851 census allowed the preparation of an age-sex pyramid of scholars which was quite a demanding task for ten to eleven year olds. Figure 3 shows the distribution of the 162 scholars we discovered in 1851.

![Age Pyramid of Scholars in 1851](image)

**Figure 3:** Scholars in Elm 1851.

The work on parish registers produced a wide variety of charts and it was clear that some of these top-juniors were well able to cope with presenting graphs of baptisms and burials such as appear in all works based on parish register demography. I hope the content is correct, of course, but it is much more important to note the way in which children were able to grasp the idea of such figures. As an example of one aspect of our work on parish registers, figure 4 shows one boy's presentation of information on occupations recorded in 1830.

Throughout all the statistical presentation, however, this remained a very human study. Nothing fascinated the class more than those instances
Figure 4: Occupations recorded in baptism registers, 1830.
where cause of death was recorded in the burial registers. Cholera and smallpox will lead to subsequent study of health and hygiene and link with study of the Third World as part of the Religious Education scheme. But the children found it strange that their forebears had been exposed to the same sorts of perils and accidents that they are warned about today. Between 1824 and 1852 six people were recorded as drowned and four as burned. Two had even been poisoned. Such detail had as much to do with creating in the children a feeling for the past as some of our more elaborate studies.

Finally, I myself learned much during this project. It played an important part in my relationship with the class as a whole, and with individuals. I was able to bring together demanding academic work, skills in presentation and the development of social relationships. Next year's class will not repeat this year's work but use it as a starting point for new work. But each class has a character of its own and much of the success of this sort of approach depends upon the degree of enthusiasm aroused. The final test will be whether demographic studies can be relied upon to win an enthusiastic response from all classes.

NOTES
1. Rev. and Mrs. J. P. Gilding have encouraged, advised and actively assisted me throughout this study, making their home and their time readily available to the class on many occasions. I owe them both my thanks.
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Long before the time of Malthus, who suggested that delayed marriage was one form of 'preventive' check on population growth, demographers had been interested in the relationship between the economic situation and age of marriage. 'Of the three short-term regulators of population, marriage is the most sensitive to economic change, birth the second, and death the least. Marriage as a calculated act which takes account of present assets and future prospects was known in Greek and Roman times.'

Closer to the present day Victorian moralists held strong views on what constituted 'present assets' in the marriage stakes. For working girls domestic service was considered the ideal preparation for the future prospects of wife-and mother-hood. Middle-class philanthropists enthused over the moral worth of domestic service, for other people of course, a view which was echoed from the pulpit by a preacher in 1883 roundly condemning the alternative of agricultural employment. "It is indeed contrary to every principle of delicacy to see young women leave their domestic duties, their household employments, to work in the fields ... How can it be that the bold girl — for working in the fields must make them bold — can turn out to be a modest servant, a careful wife, a respected mother." But, in spite of the volume of rhetoric on the subject there are no official statistics to tell us what relationship, if any existed between the experience of domestic service and marriage patterns of those so employed.

This investigation of the marriage patterns of working women will, therefore, address two questions of interest to historical sociologists: when and whom did working girls marry? Did a woman's pre-marital occupational experience influence the age at which she married? Whilst the influence of the groom's occupation on both his own and his bride's age at marriage has been studied, the occupation of the bride has been largely ignored. The second question — choice of husband — concerns marriage as a vehicle for social mobility. When a woman's employment prospects are limited, marriage is the primary means by which she may
alter her social status. Her marriage defines her position in society in much the same way as a man's occupation places him.

1. **When** did working girls marry?

As mentioned earlier age at first marriage is considered the most sensitive of the demographic variables, quickly responsive to socio-economic circumstances in a way that birth and death are not. When reliable contraceptive practices are not widely available marriage age is an important predictor of fertility. Furthermore, for the individuals concerned, marriage is an important *rite de passage*, marking adulthood and the setting up of an independent household. Of all such rites, it is the one over which they have the greatest control.

The variable affecting age at first marriage and choice of marriage partner are compounded of the past and present socio-economic circumstances of those concerned. Thus, occupation, religion, size of family, sex-ratios, housing and health may all play a part in any one decision to marry, data on some of these variables being more accessible than on others.

An often used definition of socio-economic circumstance is occupational class. Hence a couple's past circumstances may be seen in terms of their parents' occupations, while the more immediate situation may be described by the occupations of the bridegroom and the bride themselves. While attention has been paid to some of these factors, (as mentioned earlier) the occupation of the bride has been largely neglected. The tendency to consider a woman's status largely in terms of her father's or husband's position is reflected in historical records and may account for this neglect. But by the latter half of the nineteenth century records had improved enough to provide individual data suitable for investigation of the effect of a woman's own occupation on marriage age.

The most notable aspect of employment options for women in the second half of the nineteenth century is the prevalence of domestic service as a pre-marital occupational experience. The 1851 census tells us that 36 per cent of working women in England and Wales below the age of twenty were in service. The comparable figure for the registration district of Cambridge was 68 per cent. Thus any investigation of the influence of women's occupations on marriage patterns, particularly for Cambridge, must deal largely with the effect of domestic service.

It might be hypothesised that the nature of domestic service (residence with employer, long hours, and circumscribed free time) militated against early marriage. Michael Anderson, for example, found that the incidence of domestic service in a district was correlated with low rates and late age of marriage. However, as he also points out, the proportion of servants in an area is related to its 'middle-classness', a factor which may itself delay or even prevent marriage. Since he only used aggregate data one cannot be sure whether the correlations he found reflected the behaviour of the daughters of middle-class employers or of their servants.
The data on individuals which will be used here can provide at least partial answers to this question.

2. Whom did working girls marry?

The second question considered (domestic service as a vehicle for upward social mobility) also requires data on individual marriages. Theresa McBride, in her study of domestic servants in nineteenth century France suggests that 'from one quarter to one third of servants upon marrying bettered their social status'. However, as she also notes, a more accurate measure of the importance of service in this pattern requires comparison with other working girls from the same social background to see if they were equally mobile. This is particularly important in the case of the French servants where social mobility was apparently closely linked with geographical mobility, as country girls from farming families moved to the towns and found their husbands among men following higher status urban occupations.

To summarise: the historical facts of limited employment opportunities for women and incomplete record-keeping focus investigation of the influence of a woman's occupation on her marriage choices on a comparison of domestic servants with other working women (at least for the second half of the nineteenth century). Records before this period are inadequate and occupational choices narrow even when records improved. Whilst aggregate data can supply many answers it also provokes questions which can only be approached by the use of individual data. The records which provide data on individuals also enable us to address the issue of marriage as a means of upward social mobility.

This preliminary investigation of one particular time and place will attempt to answer some of the questions raised by the research of Michael Anderson and Theresa McBride. It is hoped that it may stimulate comparative studies of areas with different occupational patterns, areas both more and less industrialised than Victorian Cambridge.

Sources

The introduction of Civil Registration of marriages in 1837 provided the kind of sources hitherto lacking. But even though new registers provided spaces for the occupation of both bride and groom this was not enough to change the habits of Anglican parish priests long used to their own registers. However, 1837 also saw the introduction of a new breed of form-fillers, the Civil Registrars. These people apparently felt that spaces on forms should be filled, not ignored, and at last, the occupation of the bride began to be recorded with enough regularity to provide adequate data on individual marriages.

From 1837 onwards all marriages outside the Established Church had first to be recorded in the Marriage Notice Register (equivalent to the Anglican Banns Book), and then in the Marriage Register itself. (A minimum of 21
days’ notice was required unless a special licence was issued, and Marriage Notices were valid for three months.)

Roman Catholic churches, Baptist and Zionist Chapels for example, provided for those marrying outside the Anglican Church, and in addition, a minority of marriages took place in the Registry Office itself. The Marriage Notice Register does not, however, give the occupations of the fathers of the bride or groom, but access to the Marriage Registers themselves provided the opportunity to add this information to the majority of records collected from the Marriage Notices. A further source of data was the Anglican parish register of St Paul’s Church which was usable from 1851 onwards.

Of course the value of these records is to some extent dependent on their representativeness. If Nonconformist working women display different marrying patterns from Anglicans then the generality of any conclusions drawn from this data would be limited. Fortunately, the Anglican parish register for St Paul’s provided the means for a comparison of ages, although the small number of brides of known occupation precludes any comparison of occupational composition of the respective populations or of the mean age of occupied brides. As far as brides without known occupation are concerned, there were no significant differences in age between the two sources. See Table 1.

![Table 1. Age at first marriage, brides with no occupation recorded](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anglican (St. Paul’s)</th>
<th>Nonconformist (Civil Register)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-1860</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-1880</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1901</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There remains, of course, the question of how far St Paul’s is representative of Cambridge Anglican marriages as a whole. Here age comparisons are not possible for the greater part of the period 1847 to 1901. Where age registration is incomplete, comparison is particularly unreliable since under-registration may actually be age-related. For example, older people may have preferred to conceal their ages, or alternatively the very young may have done so in an attempt to escape parental control of their marriage partner. Similarly, the difficulty of distinguishing between incomplete registration of occupation and genuinely unoccupied brides makes comparison of ‘occupied’ and ‘unoccupied’ brides unreliable. Consider the several reasons why the space for occupation of the bride may be left blank;

One: She may, of course, be genuinely without paid occupation.

Two: She may only work part-time, possibly assisting in a family business, and therefore not be perceived (by herself or official form-fillers) as being occupied.
Three: She may have given up her job at marriage and not been asked for, or considered, her previous occupation. This may be so particularly in the case of domestic servants.

However, these suggested explanations for absence of recorded occupation of the bride are largely speculative, and the problem remains that there is no sure way of distinguishing between them. In view of Anderson's research it would have been particularly useful to have a reliable comparison between domestic servants and 'middle-class' women without paid occupation. However, the fact that the occupation of the bride's father is available for the majority of cases collected here does at least permit comparison between working girls from different backgrounds, which may provide a partial explanation of the correlations found by Anderson.

The focus, then, is on women whose pre-marriage occupations are known. Just how many brides does that cover? During the period 1847 to 1901 there was a total of 12,204 marriages in the registration district of Cambridge. Of these, 76 per cent were solemnized according to the rites of the Established Church, the remaining 24 per cent being Catholics, Baptists and other Nonconformists plus a small proportion of civil marriages. (The comparable figures for England and Wales were 74 per cent and 26 per cent.) Over 45 per cent of these non-Anglican weddings in Cambridge provided information on the occupation of the bride. Some of these were second marriages and were therefore excluded from the data, leaving 1,316 marriages for analysis. St Paul's register covered 13 per cent of Anglican marriages and of these, 351 or 39 per cent were usable.

Categorisation of the data

1. Occupation of the bride

As expected, domestic servants formed the largest single occupational group, nearly half the brides being described as servant, housekeeper, housemaid; the next largest category being milliners and dressmakers, including stay-makers, seamstresses and tailoresses (29 per cent). The variety of the remaining occupations represented among these records increased over time; for example — by the 1870s waitresses and barmaids were being recorded, whilst the first telephone operator appeared in 1898. Table 2 gives a detailed breakdown. The few governesses who were recorded throughout the period were ignored. Though in some ways comparable to domestic servants (through in-house service) their education placed them on a par with the growing numbers in clerical employments. (Since their numbers were too small to constitute a separate category they were excluded from either category.) Hence the dichotomy 'domestic servants' and 'others' was the basis for all analysis in terms of the occupation of the bride.

2. Occupation of the groom and father of the bride

The scheme adopted here (adapted from the Registrar General's 1951
Table 2. Occupations reported in Cambridge registers 1847 to 1901

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>no. of cases</th>
<th>% of sample</th>
<th>1847-1880</th>
<th>1861-1870</th>
<th>1871-1880</th>
<th>1881-1890</th>
<th>1891-1901</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Servant</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milliner/Dressmkr.</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundress/Washerwm.</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charwoman</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopkeeper/Dealer</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop Assistant</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawker</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse (Hospital)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Servant</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinist</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging House Kpr.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barmaid</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitress</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoebinder</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army Capt.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labouring woman</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upholsteress</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booksewer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambermaid (Hotel)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China Mender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook (Hotel)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory Operator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruitpicker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantlemaker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missionary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musician</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silkweaver</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Operator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>1667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Governess 7 x (not included in sample)

scheme) was that used by Armstrong in his study of York in 1851. Briefly, this uses five occupational categories: professionals (Class I), shopkeepers and semi-professionals (Class II), skilled occupations (Class III), semi-skilled occupations (Class IV) and unskilled occupations (Class V). Preliminary examination of the data showed that the vast majority of men fell into Classes III (56 per cent), IV (15 per cent) and V (25 per cent). In order to produce data sets of a reasonable size, Classes IV and V were combined into the category 'Lower' and Classes I, II and III into the category 'Higher'.

Results

Figure 1 shows mean age at first marriage using 5-year intervals for the three categories; a) domestic servants, b) other working women in Cambridge, and c) all spinsters in England and Wales, the national figure providing a wider context for the local data. Allowing for the random fluctuations inherent in the much smaller Cambridge sample a broadly similar picture emerges from local and national figures. Both the domestics and others mirror the rise in mean age at marriage from the interval
1847-1855 to 1856-1860. The gradual lowering of marriage age in England and Wales over the next two 5-year intervals (reaching the lowest point 1871-75), followed by a steady rise to the end of the century, is also reflected in the behaviour of Cambridge servants. Other working women in the Cambridge sample exhibit a similar steady rise in marriage age over time, starting from a low point a decade earlier.

Overall it looks as though the earlier part of the fifty four year period 1847-1901 differs from the latter part in two respects. Firstly there is the fall and rise of national and local mean age, the earlier period being characterised by a general lowering and the latter years by a steady rising of marriage age of first-time brides. Secondly, the two periods differ with regard to the behaviour of the two female occupational categories relative to each other. The earlier period shows domestics marrying later than other working women, whilst the situation is reversed during the later years. The change seems to occur sometime within the intervals 1866-70 and 1871-1875; therefore the data were divided at 1870 and the two periods 1847-1870 (I) and 1871-1901 (II) are considered separately in the analysis which follows. The median test\textsuperscript{9} was used to determine whether the differences in age at marriage between the two groups were significant. The $X^2$ test\textsuperscript{10} was used to test whether the differences in class of origin or class of marriage were significant. The McNemar test\textsuperscript{11} for the significance of changes was applied to the data on girls marrying into different classes from their class of origin.
Figure 2  Cumulative frequency, age at first marriage, Cambridge 1847-1870

Figure 3  Cumulative frequency, age at first marriage, Cambridge 1871-1901
Figure 4 Cumulative frequency, age at first marriage of Cambridge domestic servants.

1847-1870  n = 183, mean = 25.4
1871-1901  n = 614, mean = 24.5

Figure 5 Cumulative frequency, age at first marriage of other Cambridge working women.

1847-1870  n = 324, mean = 24.7
1871-1901  n = 546, mean = 25.1
Table 3. Age at first marriage, occupied brides

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Period I 1847-1870</th>
<th></th>
<th>Period II 1871-1901</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>median</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England and Wales</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the basis of Table 3 and Figures 2-5 it is clear that:

1. Domestic servants married significantly later than other working women during period I. (Figure 2. \(X^2=4.050, p<.05\) (1-tail)).

2. In contrast with this domestic servants married significantly earlier than other working women during period II. (Figure 3. \(X^2=3.23, p<.05\) (1-tail)).

3. Domestic servants marrying during period I did so significantly later than those marrying during period II. (Figure 4. \(X^2=4.45, p<.025\) (1-tail)).

4. Other working women did not vary significantly in their marriage age over the two periods. (Figure 5.)

It follows therefore that the changes in the relationship between the age at first marriage of domestic servants and others over the periods I and II are due to changes in the marrying age of domestics rather than of other working women.

In what way, then, did domestic servants alter between periods I and II? One possibility is that their origins changed. Alternatively their choice of marriage partner may have varied or even their working conditions or their status in the marriage market altered. What can account for the differences between them and other working women?

Consider first their origins: in this case the socio-economic class from which they came, defined in terms of the occupation of their fathers as given on the marriage record.

Table 4. Occupational class of bride’s father (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class:</th>
<th>Higher</th>
<th>Period I Lower</th>
<th>Period II Higher</th>
<th>Lower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(X^2=51.79\) \(p<.001\) (1-tail) \(X^2=57.46\) \(p<.001\) (1-tail)

Table 4 shows that domestics differ significantly from other working women in their class of origin. More servants came from the class ‘lower’, whereas the majority of other women had fathers in the higher occupational categories. This holds true for period I and II. Domestic ser-
vants showed no change over time in their class of origin — so it appears that this is not the explanation for the difference. For other working women, however, the proportions coming from different classes did change over time ($X^2=5.599$, $p < .001$ 2-tail), even though their mean age at marriage did not differ significantly between periods. It seems reasonable to conclude, therefore, that the age at which a working woman marries for the first time is not affected by her social origins in the same way that it is influenced by her own occupation.

The possibility remains, of course, that there is an interaction between a woman's own occupation experience and her social origins. Thus girls following the same occupation may show different marrying patterns where their socio-economic background differs. There might be a difference, say, between the daughters of skilled artisans and the daughters of unskilled manual labourers going into service. Table 5 presents a comparison between domestic servants from the class 'higher' with domestics from the class 'lower'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of father:</th>
<th>Period I</th>
<th>Period II</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>Period I</th>
<th>Period II</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestics</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>25.5*</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>24.6*</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2=2.71$ $p < .05$ (1-tail) Median test.

The results of this analysis are clear: within her own occupational group a woman's class of origin does not influence her age at first marriage significantly. Domestic servants marry at about the same time whether their fathers are unskilled manual labourers or skilled artisans and professional men. This holds true for other working women and for both periods I and II. The only statistically significant difference occurs among the daughters of men in the lower occupations. Here domestics did marry significantly later than other working women during period I. Overall, however, the difference between domestic servants and others is greater than that within either group of women when they are categorised according to the occupational class of their fathers. This confirms the suggestion that the past socio-economic circumstances of these working women did not influence the age at which they marry to the same extent as their own current occupation.

The other immediate circumstance which may be relevant is the occupational class into which they married, that is — the present socio-economic circumstances of the bridegroom.
Table 6. Occupational class of bridegroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of groom:</th>
<th>Higher</th>
<th>Period I</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Period II</th>
<th>Higher</th>
<th>Lower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestics</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$X^2=18.92$</td>
<td>$p&lt;.001$ (1-tail)</td>
<td>$X^2=13.52$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows that the two categories of working women differed significantly in their class of marriage (as defined by the occupation of the groom). This is true throughout the second half of the nineteenth century. As with their class of origin, domestics showed no change over time in their class of marriage, a little over half married husbands in the higher classes in both periods. Thus the occupation of the groom cannot have been the decisive factor influencing the change over time in mean age at marriage of domestic servants. Other working women, by contrast, changed their pattern; the ratio of higher to lower occupational class of marriage changed over time from a 75:25 per cent split to one of 67:33 per cent ($X^2=5.33$ $p<.025$, 1-tail), while their mean age at marriage remained unchanged.

As before, with the occupation of the bride and her father, there is the possibility of interaction between the occupational class of the groom and the occupation of the bride as variables influencing marriage age. Table 7 is similar to Table 5 except that working brides are divided in terms of the occupation of their grooms in addition to their own occupations.

Table 7. Bride’s age at first marriage, by occupation of groom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of groom:</th>
<th>Period I</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Period II</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestics</td>
<td>25.8*</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>24.6*</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2=4.034$ $p<.025$ (1-Tail)

Here again it can be seen that within each occupational group a bride’s choice of husband did not affect her marriage age. Domestics married at about the same time, regardless of the class of their husband, and other working women were similarly unaffected. The only significant difference occurs between the two occupational groups of women who married men in the higher social classes during period I, where domestic servants would appear to have delayed marriage. Once again the difference between domestics and others is larger than that within either group. Previous observations are thus confirmed: the choice of marriage partner affects a working woman’s age at first marriage less than her own occupational experience.
Finally we turn to the question of marriage as a vehicle for social mobility — in the cases where both fathers' and grooms' occupations are given, some estimation of this may be feasible. From Tables 4 and 6 it can be seen, for example, that only 39 per cent of domestics were the daughters of men from occupational class 'higher', yet 55 per cent married in this category. This increase implies that a minimum of 16 per cent of brides married into a higher social class from that of their fathers (a minimum since it assumes no 'downward' marriages at all). To gain a true measure of mobility, of course, the individual cases must be analysed. Table 8 shows the two classes of marriage broken down by occupation of the

Table 8. Class of marriage by class of origin of working brides

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of marriage</th>
<th>Period I</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Class of origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Hi</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Lo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of origin</td>
<td>Lo</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Lo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of origin</td>
<td>Hi</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Lo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of origin</td>
<td>Lo</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(McNemar) $X^2=12.85$</td>
<td>p &lt;.001</td>
<td>(1-Tail)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Hi</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Lo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of origin</td>
<td>Lo</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Lo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of origin</td>
<td>Hi</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Lo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of origin</td>
<td>Lo</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(McNemar) $X^2=27.71$</td>
<td>p &lt;.001</td>
<td>(1-Tail)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

bride. For both periods domestic servants showed a significant upward movement on marriage, (31 per cent and 29 per cent of marriages), whereas other working women did not. However, the fact that a larger proportion of domestics started off in the lower class may be a source of bias in so far as there is a greater potential for them to marry up. A more valid comparison would be between brides from the same social origins. From Table 9 we can see that domestic service is not actually the vehicle

Table 9. Comparison of working brides from lower classes of origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moved up to higher</th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to higher</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed in lower</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moved down to lower</th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stayed in higher</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of working brides from higher classes of origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moved down to lower</th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stayed in higher</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2=2.48$ (ns)  $X^2=14.48$ p <.001 (1-tail)
for upward social mobility it might at first appear to be. When class of origin is held constant, there is no significant difference between the numbers of servants 'marrying up' and other working women. On the contrary, significantly more domestics actually married men from lower social classes than their fathers when compared with other working women with origins in the same class. (The 33 per cent to 19 per cent of period II is significant at the .001 level, and the 29 per cent to 18 per cent of period I approaches significance at the .05 level.)

Discussion

Three main points emerge from this preliminary study of the marriage patterns of working women:

1. As a variable affecting the age of the bride at first marriage the occupation of the bride is more important than either her social origins or her choice of husband. Although these latter factors certainly exert some influence, it would be limiting to classify brides only in terms of their fathers' or husbands' occupations.

Bearing in mind that Anderson used the 1861 census for his data base, the behaviour of these Cambridge brides for the earlier period 1847-1870 certainly does not conflict with his finding that late marriage age correlated with the incidence of domestic service. Indeed, if the generally higher social origins of other working brides are taken as an indication of 'middle-classness' then these results would appear to identify domestic service as the causative factor in delayed marriage. However, since this may strike some as a rather cavalier description of 'middle-classness', perhaps this point should not be pursued.

In view of the later fall in marriage age of domestics in this Cambridge sample it would be of particular interest to see whether Anderson's correlation held for a similar analysis of later census data.

2. Domestic service, for these Cambridge brides at least, was not a significant means of achieving upward social mobility. When compared with other working girls from the same background, domestics were no more likely to 'marry up' than other working women. On the contrary, comparison of girls from the higher social classes (defined by the occupation of their fathers) suggests that there was actually a significant tendency for servants to 'marry down'.

A methodological point here concerns the measurement of social mobility. Although domestic servants had more husbands than fathers in the higher social classes it does not automatically follow that domestic service was a vehicle for upward social mobility. A true measure requires comparison of all working girls from the same social origins. This comparison revealed just how misleading the behaviour of domestic servants could be when taken in isolation.
3. The situation between 1847 and 1901 was obviously far from static. Whatever influences were being felt during the earlier part of this period had altered by the end of the nineteenth century. Some changes have already been mentioned, for example, the increasing variety of occupations open to women. However, it seems that the most profitable source of explanation may lie in the circumstances of domestic service.

Other working girls showed no significant difference in marriage age between the periods 1847-1870 and 1871-1901 suggesting that the reversal of the difference between groups is due to the significant fall in marriage age of domestic servants. The reasons for this fall are not clear from the data used here, but a possible explanation might be a change in the pattern of servant recruitment. Not, it should be emphasised, in their social class of origin (which has been discounted here) but rather a change in their geographical origins. One plausible hypothesis for future testing might be that domestic servants during the earlier period may have been predominantly emigrants from the rural area around Cambridge — bringing with them the mores of the countryside — including, maybe, the habit of later marriage. In contrast the brides of the later years may have been ‘second generation’ city girls adopting urban values. In order to test this one would need to know more about the geographical origins of these servant girls — or perhaps at least a means of classifying their fathers’ occupations as rural or urban.

Finally, while a preliminary descriptive study such as this can only offer tentative explanations, an intriguing area for further exploration is the question of the **status** of domestic service (particularly in relation to the marriage market). Quantitative data on this question is difficult to find, but a striking factor which emerged from an initial survey of the qualitative material in Cambridge was the moral fervour mentioned earlier with which domestic service was regarded by middle-class philanthropic organisations.

The primary aim of such bodies as The Cambridge Mission for the Prevention of Vice in Young Women, for example, was the training and placement of domestic servants. Although there were obvious economic advantages (for homeless girls in particular) of a job which also provided a place to live, the overriding emphasis by the ladies who ran these societies was on the moral and spiritual value of domestic service. Furthermore, this attitude was not confined to Cambridge, the Registrar General in 1841 expressed the opinion that: ‘it must be a matter for congratulation that so large a number of females should be comprehended in a class in which habits of steady industry, of economy, and of attention to the maintenance of good character are so necessary as that of domestic service’.

Of course, one can only speculate whether such attitudes were shared by the prospective bridegrooms of domestic servants or indeed on the effect this would have on the marriage of the brides. High status in the marriage market is equally likely to be related to later as to earlier marriage — a debatable point which again demonstrates the complexity of the whole issue of status.
NOTES
Thanks are due to Richard Wall of the SSRC Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure for reading an earlier version of this paper.

2. From a sermon preached by Reverend Arthur Savile in Fowlmere Church (Cambs.) in 1883 and later published in book form.
6. Unfortunately the Registrar General does not currently permit access to the civil marriage registers for research purposes.
9. The Median test is a form of the Chi-square test which uses the median to divide the groups being compared.
10. See p. 34 Bradley, op. cit.
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To the student of Irish population history the rich manuscript data sources available to his British counterpart must appear to be a documentary cornucopia. For example, parish registers for the majority, Catholic, population of Ireland date to only the first quarter of the eighteenth century and then for only very few places; in some rural districts Catholic registers do not begin until the 1830s. The Protestant Episcopal (Church of Ireland) registers were at one time more numerous but the pre-disestablishment (1869) registers (marriages pre-1845), having been constituted public records in 1875, where no local suitable place for storage could be found were placed in the custody of the Public Record Office in Dublin where most of them perished when that office was destroyed during the Civil War in 1922, (although a few had been copied and thus survive in transcript). Relatively more registers from the non-episcopalian Protestant churches have survived but these relate mainly to just the six counties which now constitute Northern Ireland.

Despite having little parish register material to occupy his time the demographic historian of Ireland cannot simply turn to that other mainstay of his British colleagues, the nineteenth century manuscript census returns, for these have survived in even fewer numbers than the parish registers. The enumerators’ books from the 1861, 1871, 1881 and 1891 censuses were never preserved; those from the 1821, 1831, 1841 and 1851 censuses, together with material from the abortive 1813-15 census were kept in the Record Office in Dublin and thus suffered a similar fate to the episcopalian registers when the building was destroyed in 1922. A few of the enumerators’ returns survive in original or transcript and some have been subjected to analysis just as some processing of parish register material has been carried out but population studies in Ireland sorely lack the bodies of nationwide detailed data available in Britain. The surviving national nominal records such as the Tithe Applotment Books of around 1830 and the Valuation Records of the 1830s and 1860s contain only relatively sparse details and are no substitute for the richness of the British data. In fact, some genealogists and historians of Ireland have turned to the British and other records not just because of a perfectly legitimate interest in the documentary evidence about Irish nineteenth century migrants but actually as a surrogate for their own missing
records, both parish registers\textsuperscript{11} and census enumerators’ books. In the introduction to transcripts of Irish families living in Canterbury and recorded in the British census of 1851, Harrington and Perry make this point:

'The 1851 census returns for the whole of the United Kingdom\textsuperscript{12} remain unprinted ... and the reader’s first reaction may be to wonder why it is worth printing abstracts from these valuable records. In the present case the main reason is, of course, the destruction of almost all the 1821, 1831 and 1841 census returns for Ireland in which many of the Irish born persons listed here would have appeared.'\textsuperscript{13}

Given the lack of widespread detailed information, Irish demographic studies based on local records take on greater significance than would be the case in Britain. Work has been carried out not only upon the surviving census and parish register manuscripts but also upon a very varied range of other evidence, for example estate maps and rentals\textsuperscript{14} tithe records,\textsuperscript{15} military records,\textsuperscript{16} even memory,\textsuperscript{17} but perhaps the most important group of documents are the ecclesiastical censuses. Religion has long played an overwhelmingly dominant role in Irish affairs and despite the loss of much irreplaceable material in 1922, its documentary legacy is great.\textsuperscript{18} Ecclesiastical censuses make up only a tiny fraction of the total mass of material but for the demographic historian they, together with the parish registers, are probably the most significant part of it.

In contrast to Britain where the manuscripts from both the Religious Census of 1851\textsuperscript{19} and the Clergymen’s Returns to the Parish Register Abstract of 1831\textsuperscript{20} are almost fully extant, no substantial body of manuscripts exist from any Irish ecclesiastical census, although there were national enquiries in 1766 and 1834. In 1766 the Irish Parliament ordered the Protestant Clergy to take a census of the numbers of Protestants and Catholics in the country. The returns were stored in the Public Record Office and so largely perished in 1922 but a few listings, if not full analyses of some of the returns have been published.\textsuperscript{21} The 1834 survey was carried out by a Commission of Public Instruction which was set up to ascertain, amongst other things, the state of the various religions in Ireland, including their numerical strengths, on a parish by parish basis\textsuperscript{22}. To find out the numbers, the enumerators from the 1831 census were pressed into service again (where possible) and were furnished with copies of their original 1831 manuscript returns with instructions to add the religion of the people therein recorded.\textsuperscript{23} After this had been accomplished the amended returns were open to inspection locally and then a commissioner visited each place to cause

‘the population return as classified by the enumerator to be verified by his oath and (to receive) any evidence that might be tendered on the spot with respect to its accuracy.'\textsuperscript{24}

Such local evidence often took the form of a census privately taken by clergy of various denominations. In fact the clergy were specifically invited to furnish their own evidence to the Commissioner: and
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'every such census was open to the inspection of all persons present at the inquiry and its accuracy was scrutinised by the visiting Commissioner who received all proper evidence in support or impeachment of its correctness and whenever the accuracy of such original census was established to the satisfaction of the Commissioner it was adopted in preference to the computation based upon the census of 1831.'

Where the 1831 based assessment was accepted its statistics were extrapolated to relate to 1834 based on the population trends of that parish computed from the 1821 and 1831 censuses.

Because of the politico-religious situation of the time, the Catholic hierarchy was particularly concerned that the proportion of Protestants to Catholics might be exaggerated. Accordingly, as de Brun makes clear, many Catholic priests were urged to make their own census for submission to the Commissioner. The Bishop of Limerick for example issued such instructions to his high priests and Daniel O'Connell urged similar action to be taken nationally. De Brun reported that a relatively small number of priests followed up these behests but a survey of the statistical tables forming the appendix to the 1835 report, which state which of the 1834 figures were computed from the 1831 based enquiry and which taken from original censuses, reveals that at least 235 Catholic surveys were taken plus another 37 where out of co-operation or, perhaps, competition Catholic Clergymen had joined with others to submit a joint survey of the parish. Additionally 542 censuses of members of the Established Church were accepted as were 32 of Presbyterians and 11 of other sects. On a further 68 occasions other original surveys, often by the 1831 enumerators were accepted. Altogether for the 1440 parochial benefices (some of which contained more than one actual parish) into which Ireland was divided it seems that at least 925 original censuses of one or more sects were taken. Many of the published accounts of Irish ecclesiastical censuses are based on the few survivors from this body of documents.

However, by no means all extant ecclesiastical censuses are from the 1834 or 1766 enquiries; for example: de Brun has used data for Ferriter parish Co. Kerry in 1826 from the New Catholic Association's attempt to survey Catholics in Ireland at that time; Clarkson has carried out a considerable amount of analysis on Rev. Dr. W. Lodge's census of Armagh city in 1770; Ellison has listed Protestants in the Diocese of Meath for 1802; Conlan has noted the population and other details for St. Mary Shandon parish in Cork for about 1830 (but despite the date this does not seem to be one of the 1834 survey's censuses) and Ward listed the landowners of four parishes in East Meath in 1830 — a census taken in connection with the imposition of an ecclesiastical tax — the church cess.

Other ecclesiastical censuses remain yet to be subject to (published) analysis. The two Irish Public Record Offices contain some manuscripts, others probably remain in various church record depositories lying perhaps subject to the 'indifference and inactivity' mentioned by Beale in her article on ecclesiastical records.
One census not hitherto analysed relates to the Established Church (Church of Ireland) population of Clogherny parish Co. Tyrone for late 1851/early 1852 and its investigation forms the second part of this paper. It would seem that attendances at the parish church in Clogherny were unsatisfactory and in 1851 the Lord Primate of Ireland ordered an enquiry. John Whitley Stokes, Archdeacon of Armagh and the Rev. William Quain, Rector of Drumglass and Rural Dean of Aghaloo were commissioned to make a report, in connection with which a number of censuses were taken.

From the report, dated 3 January 1852, (held in the Public Record Office of Northern Ireland [P.R.O.N.I.])\(^7\) it would seem that Stokes and Quain were furnished with a census of the church population, but in a discussion with the curate of the parish, Rev. A. Young, (the Rector, Rev. J. Lowry would not attend the meetings out of ‘delicacy’) and the church wardens held on the 16 December 1851, doubts were entertained as to its accuracy. Accordingly:

‘the Rev. W. Quain visited the parish on the Thursday and Friday following and met Mr. Sinclair Perry, one of the church wardens, and several of the parishioners for the purpose of obtaining additional information and he then arranged that Mr. Perry in company with Mr. Young should visit the several houses of the parishioners and obtain such information as would enable us to fill up the census according to the form furnished by your grace. Mr. Perry forwarded an amended census as the result of this enquiry which together with his letters we annex to this report … upon comparing the census as furnished by him with that revised at Clogherny we found that in some degree they did not correspond and that there was general uncertainty as to the numbers of confirmed and of age to be so.’\(^8\)

Another meeting was arranged for the 2 January 1852 at which they ‘managed to fill up the census in the form as furnished by your grace in a satisfactory manner except in the columns relating to confirmation to fill up which with accuracy would delay the sending in of this report to your grace longer than you would wish.’\(^9\)

So it would seem that three separate censuses existed: the original one furnished to Stokes and Quain; one prepared by Perry in December and the final one prepared for the meeting on January 2. Of these, two still exist: the Perry census dated 26 December 1851\(^10\) and one of which there are two copies, both undated.\(^11\) It is not entirely clear whether the undated census is the one preceding Perry’s enquiry or the one based upon it. However, since the undated census contains no information that could not have been taken from Perry’s census and the copy held by the P.R.O.N.I. in association with the report\(^12\) is in handwriting very similar to that of the Rev. Quain it would seem likely that it is the census prepared by Quain for submission with the report rather than the one furnished at the start of their enquiry. In addition, a note appended to the census stating that no families are prevented from attending church on account of its distance is initialised JWS, presumably John Whitley Stokes. This is
further evidence that the extant census resulted from their enquiry and did not precede it.

Statistics taken from the censuses are used in the report to confirm the low attendances although the actual usual level of attendance is not given — perhaps the Archbishop already had detailed figures, indeed the very existence of the enquiry suggests that he knew the seriousness of the situation. With regard to the reasons for the diminution of congregations, it would seem that the

'very large decrease in the numbers in the report of the year 1851 as compared with that of 1834' must in some measure be attributed to the opening of a church in Sixmilecross in the period 1834-51.'

But Stokes and Quain regret to have to state also that the

'small attendance at divine service in comparison with the number of church families in the parish is owing to most important parts of the pastoral duties not having been diligently performed by the Rector and Curate.'

The report goes on to single out various derelictions of duty including: neglectful visiting of the sick and the whole; not enough done to drive away erroneous doctrines; lack of 'endeavour to reclaim members who have left the church'; insufficient seeking out of families moving into the area; and the lack of an evening service for the convenience of those living some way from the church.

It would seem that the report was not accepted without criticism for another document held with the censuses is a letter from Stokes and Quain dated 9 March 1852 in which they state very firmly that:

'having investigated the various matters into which we were authorized to enquire ... we found them as stated in our report of the third day of January 1852: and which said report and the several matters and things therein set forth are true in every particular to the best of our knowledge and belief so help me God.'

The letter is witnessed by one Alexander Irvin, Surrogate.

Nor did Stoke's statement that families were not prevented from attending church because of their distance from it go unchallenged because a further document held in association with the censuses is a plea to the Lord Primate that:

'steps may be taken to secure to us and our children the stated ministrations of the church of Our Father on the Sabbath Day in the village of Seskannor, a portion of the vineyard of the great head of the church which has been for a series of years uncared and uncultivated and plunged into spiritual darkness having no public worship nearer than the parish church, a distance of between 3 and 4 miles and being equally destitute for the sick and the afflicted in their hour of need.'
The letter is signed by 77 heads of households and dated 'Seskannor 16 January 1852'.

However, in spite of some parts of the report obviously not meeting with universal acceptance and the doubts mentioned as to the accuracy of confirmation details, with regard to most aspects of the censuses latter day investigations can retain some confidence in the completeness of the returns, firstly because of Stokes' and Quain's signed affidavit to the accuracy of their report and secondly because Sinclair Perry whose census appears to have been used as the basis for that given in the final report was a local knowledgeable churchwarden and additionally was given a very good character reference by Stokes and Quain:

'from the character of him (Perry) given by Mr. Lowry and Mr. Young as well as from our own observation we believe him to be a trustworthy person having an accurate knowledge of his parish being collector of the county cess and we feel assured that he would not wilfully mislead us.'

Perry was also prepared to stand by the accuracy of his work for in the covering letter to Quain enclosing his census he claims that his schedule sets out:

'the names and age of every individual I can find in the parish of Clogherny who even call themselves (sic) by the name of Church Protestants many of whom I have no other authority for entering as such as I never in my life saw them at Church and some (sic) with large Families (sic) have not even got one of their children baptised (sic) at Clogherny.'

Thus there is circumstantial evidence at least to attest to the fullness and accuracy of the censuses. The only doubt arises from the fact that not all the seventy seven people who signed the plea for a church to be built at Seskinore could be traced to the censuses but as Seskinore town is situated at the edge of Clogherny parish, perhaps some of the signatories lived across the border and thus would not have been enumerated by Perry and Quain. There is no independent source against which the accuracy of the censuses can be checked. The nearest contemporary religious investigation of Clogherny was the 1834 report, already noted as being outdated.

The census included with the report details the names of household heads, size of family, their townland and gives a series of figures relating to the number of children between 7 and 15; the number of Protestant servants; the number who have been confirmed; the number of age to be confirmed; the number of age to receive sacrament and finally an observations column which is exclusively used for noting the families who 'scarcely ever attend church'. To the present day researcher, Perry's census has a lot more to offer since it gives the details from which the bald figures in the other census might well have been taken, ages (and names) of all family members, and its observation column is not just used
to mark those rarely in church but also to specify which adults were single, widowed or were servants. One hundred and four families containing 490 individuals are recorded. Six thousand and seventy nine persons were enumerated in Clogherny parish in the 1851 census of Ireland. Incidentally Perry’s census shows that the Reverend Lowry was seventy nine years old in 1851; in Carlisle’s 1810 Topographical Dictionary of Ireland he is recorded as having been rector of Clogherny since at least 1806. It seems a little surprising that Lowry was no longer an assiduous visitor to the houses of his parishioners but no mention of his age was made in the report.

Perry’s census has obvious value for genealogists and despite limitations such as its containing no occupational evidence, it is also of wider interest especially if one bears in mind Lee’s well known maxim that in Irish demographic history “one line of evidence is worth a page of hypotheses”. In fact, Lee urges that work should be carried out on every “scrap of demographic data available” and he specifically singles out a number of religious censuses as suitable “scrap”.

A number of different demographic variables can be constructed from the Clogherny “scrap”. From the ages recorded a simple age/sex pyramid can be constructed and this can be compared with one compiled for Omagh East Barony (of which Clogherny is part) using information given in the Irish 1851 census (Figure 1). The work of Tucker has raised some doubts as to the accuracy of the ages recorded in the mid-century censuses and in 1841 and to only a slightly lesser extent 1851 he makes a strong case for about 10 per cent under recording of children under two. He based his argument on statistical enquiries inspired by the odd way in which the census volumes record the ages of young children (1 month, 2 months ... 11 months, 12 months, 2 years — with no category for less than one month or for between one and two years) and also the likelihood of the (non-civilian) enumerators not noticing these ‘least obtrusive children’ in their recording or checking of the families of peasants often suspicious or unco-operative. However the evidence presented in Figure 1 does not strengthen Tucker’s admittedly plausible claims for not only do the two pyramids display a form quite logical for an area having just undergone a famine, with comparatively few children in the 0-4 age groups (presumably through a combination of high infant mortality and low birth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Class</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Parish</td>
<td>5425</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1851 Census of Ireland.
Clogherny Established Church census (P.R.O.N.I. DIO 4/32 C/9/4/5).
rates) but also there is a correlation coefficient of 0.98 between the two total age distributions illustrated in the pyramids and however doubtful the barony data we can be sure that Perry, a known, local fellow-religionist did not under-record the Clogherny episcopalian children — he even lists a bachelor with an illegitimate child. The pyramids also show a slight 'waist' in the 25-40 age groups. This, too, is not unexpected given the rate of Irish emigration in the 1840s for, as Cousens notes although the Irish generally hoped to migrate as a family many people had to leave on their own. Tyrone and most of the rest of Ulster were not areas most heavily affected by migration (or the famine) but Cousens suggests that between 12.5 and 14.9 per cent of Tyrone's population emigrated between 1846 and 1851 and this is reflected in the age pyramids presented here.

From the age information some attempt can also be made to measure fertility. Various ratios have already been constructed for the pre-famine period and these can be used for comparison. For example Cousens discovered 659 children under six per 1000 women 16-45 for Ireland in 1841 (707 for Tyrone); Connell and Drake have suggested that 532 children under five had been born per 1000 women 15-44 for 1841 Ireland — a revision of Connell's earlier figure of 644; Tucker using the same formula for his ratio 'corrected' the Irish 1841 figure to 612 by adding 10 per cent to the recorded number of children under four (see above). A decade later, when the Clogherny census was taken, one would expect fertility to have fallen given the intervening demographic disaster. The Clogherny 1851 episcopalian fertility ratio is 635.32 children under six per 1000 women 16-45 (Cousen's ratio) or 510.42 children under five per 1000 women 15-44 (Connell's, Drake's and Tucker's ratio) — however the comparison is made the figures are much below the national average for 1841 and Cousen's Tyrone statistic. The Omagh East Barony ratio is lower still (442.2 children under five per 1000 women 15-44, the only ratio possible from the 1851 census figures, or 486.42 if the children under four are increased by Tucker's 10 per cent) and the Church of Ireland fertility seems to have held up better than the rest of the local population.

This differentiation between the Clogherny Established Church population and the rest of the area is found in another 'scrap' that can be constructed from the schedules — household/family size. This topic, like Irish fertility ratios and marriage ages/rates has aroused a good deal of discussion in the literature. Carney has constructed mean houseful (total number of inhabitants), household (all members of the family related directly or indirectly plus servants) and family (all members related by blood or marriage) sizes from a sample of the surviving Irish 1821 census enumerators' books. At 5.68, 5.45 and 5.05 respectively they were significantly larger than Laslett's English standard sizes of 4.77, 4.45 and 3.82 (as reworked by Carney). Connell (re-iterated by Clarkson) records a variety of pre-famine estimates ranging from 4.36 to 8.00 but put forward household means of 5.47 for 1767 and 5.65 for 1791. Newenham's survey of Cork in 1804 discovered a mean of 6.04. Only Clarkson's mean household size of 3.904 for Armagh city in 1770 is much below the English Standard and, as he stressed, that is for a town, not a common residential form in eighteenth century Ireland. Armagh in 1770, however, was similar to Car-
ney's 'Ireland' in 1821 insofar as mean household size varied with social class. Carney found that not only houseful and household size increased with class but also that family size alone increased. In Armagh where the Episcopalians were the religious group of highest social standing their mean household size was larger than those of the Presbyterians or Catholics although with regard to conjugal family units alone this was not the case.

These data refer to the pre-famine period. After the famine one would expect household size to fall: immediately, as death and migration decimated families and in the longer term because of the later marriages. Only if there was significant combining of households during the famine and post-famine eras would one expect mean household size to rise. This had not happened in the Clogherny Church of Ireland population: 54 households (51.92 per cent) were couples with children excluding 6 (5.77 per cent) who also had servants; 8 (7.69 per cent) were couples without children (excluding one (0.96 per cent) with a servant); 11 (10.58 per cent) were headed by a widow/widower and contained children (excluding one (0.96 per cent) with a servant); 12 (11.54 per cent) were single person households and 2 (1.92 per cent) were children without parents. Only 4 households (3.85 per cent) contained three generations and only 2 (1.92 per cent) were shared households; one contained a fifty two year old woman of different name from the family, possibly a relative or an unrecorded servant but perhaps a lodger and the other contained a miller who might have been a servant/apprentice. For two households insufficient information was given for them to be assigned to any category.

Using the same standard definitions as Carney (above) the Clogherny data reveal a mean family size of 4.57, a mean household size of 4.69 and a mean houseful size of 4.71, figures considerably lower than those for Ireland in 1821 as postulated. However, to complicate matters, the mean size of family of the 77 signatories to the Seskinore letter of 1852 mentioned above was 5.25 and from the population and number of families given for each parish in the 1851 census of Ireland, the mean houseful size for Clogherny parish as a whole works out at 5.56 (6079 people, 1093 families) or 5.65 (5589 people, 989 families), excluding the contemporary Clogherny Church of Ireland information, and these figures are little changed from the Irish 1821 position.

The only clear fact which emerges from the household size data is that in Clogherny in 1851 the Church of Ireland population on average inhabited smaller households than the rest of the parish in both the rural areas and the villages (Table 1). It has already been established that household size tended to vary with status in eighteenth and nineteenth century Ireland and the Clogherny data would thus imply a low relative status for the parish's episcopalian population. Morgan noted the low standing of episcopalianists in Coleraine for the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries as did Jones for Belfast for a later period and so, superficially, the Clogherny mean household size implication seems logical and acceptable. However, as already noted, in eighteenth century Armagh the Church of Ireland population were of the highest class and, further, what other
evidence can be gleaned about the social position of episcopalianists in Clogherny in 1851 tends to imply that they enjoyed a relatively high social standing. From the 1851 Irish census, for example, it can be inferred that the Church of Ireland members had better housing than other groups. This census, like most of the nineteenth century censuses of Ireland, collected data on housing standards, constructing a four class index of quality which varied with the number of rooms, the number of windows and the solidity or durability of a house, (based on the materials used to construct its walls and roof). As Table 1 indicates, the two villages within the parish had, in general, the best housing and Perry’s census indicated that a high proportion of the Church of Ireland households were to be found in the villages — in fact he recorded twenty three episcopalian families in Seskinore, three more than the 1851 census. Thus a large proportion of Established Church members must have lived in high quality houses and enjoyed commensurately a higher standard of living than members of other groups. Further indirect evidence as to the status of at least some members of the Established Church can be inferred with the aid of Lewis’s ‘Topographical Dictionary’ of 1837. In the entry for Clogherny he noted that the parish contained four ‘principal seats’: those of the Reverend J. Lowry at Somerset; Mrs. Perry at Seskinore; Mr. K. Burgess at Mullaghmore and Mr. J. Galbraith at Gortmore. Apart from the Reverend Lowry, no positive trace can be made of the holders of these seats in Perry’s census fourteen years later but there was a Perry family at Seskinore, as well as Sinclair Perry’s own family (and a servant) at Laragh. Additionally, although no Burgess family was enumerated, three Galbraith families were recorded. Therefore, as well as being generally better housed than other people, the Church of Ireland membership probably encompassed three out of the four principal families in 1834.

Thus, there is contrary evidence as to the relationship between household size and status in Clogherny in 1851. Indeed, little of the demographic ‘analyses’ from this ecclesiastical census has led to clearcut results. But, Lee in his plea for scraps of evidence did not predict that they should or would form any coherent pattern — he just asked that they should be presented. Clarkson also looks to ‘the discovery and examination of lists of households’ and Morgan, too, looks forward to more work being done in the field of parish register analysis. The present paper must end with a similar plea for further work to be done but although there are more sources to be analysed — religious censuses and others — the difficulties over Irish historical demographic data with its uneasy mixture of what are being seen increasingly as a series of less than fully reliable published censuses and a scatter of other data widely variant in time, place and form suggest that there will always be problems of fact, never mind interpretation, and that no accepted picture can ever emerge.
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NOTES AND QUERIES

THE DAYS BEFORE SOMERSET HOUSE

Roger Lee Brown

The records of baptisms, marriages and burials have been kept parochially ever since Thomas Cromwell's injunctions of 1538, although few of these records have survived the ravages of time. In 1597 a constitution of the province of Canterbury, modified by the 1603 ecclesiastical canons, required that annual transcripts of the entries for each year in these parish registers be sent to the diocesan registry, so that duplicate copies were available. Various acts of Parliament in 1694-5, the marriage act of 1753, and Rose's act of 1812 further enforced and standardised the keeping of parochial registers. But it was not until the general registration act of 1836, which introduced the civil registration of births and deaths and ordered that copies of all marriage entries should be sent eventually to the registrar general, that a national system of registration of births, marriages and deaths was established. This requirement has been of immense benefit to genealogists, and no doubt many have often wished that this act of 1836 had been passed at a much earlier date. It may be of some interest to record, therefore, that at least one proposal was made in the 1690s to establish such a 'general registry'.

This proposal was made by Nathaniel Whetham. Although the printed pamphlet relating to it is contained in the state papers domestic for 1698, the catalogue of these papers suggests an earlier date of 1692-4. Whetham made it clear that his proposals had been in general circulation and discussion for at least two years previous to this, and he had only printed them because others were making use of his ideas as their own.

His basic proposal was that a general register office should be established, and that this, and the resulting fees and duties to be charged by it, should form a means of increasing the crown revenue. One of the suggestions was that the fees should be graduated according to the social rank of the family concerned. The government of that day, anxious for additional forms of revenue 'for carrying on the war against France with vigour', appears to have accepted the broad principles of these proposals, namely that a tax should be placed on births, marriages and burials, and that this tax should be imposed upon a sliding-scale. An act of 1694 implemented these measures, although the idea of a registry office was not taken up. The Act provided a minimum tax for all those not in receipt of poor relief of two shillings for a birth, an additional sixpence for a marriage, and four shillings for a burial. Those in higher social positions paid correspondingly higher charges, an esquire paid five pounds upon his marriage and a duke fifty! A further act imposed stamp duties on licences and certificates of marriage.

There was widespread evasion of these requirements, so that the anticipated revenue never materialised. A further act of 1695 endeavoured to eliminate those centres of clandestine marriage in London, St James'
Duke's place, Holy Trinity Minories, and the Fleet prison, whose clergy had totally ignored the provisions of the previous Act. This had only limited success, and it did not prevent the widespread evasion of these duties by the clergy and the general public, in spite of the various fiscal and ecclesiastical penalties provided for non compliance.

The initial paragraph of Nathaniel Whetham's proposals suggests that he considered himself partly responsible for the thinking that lay behind the legislation of 1694. As he went on to mention 'the late Act', which had failed to prevent 'frauds and perjuries', presumably the 1695 Act, it might be suggested *that he submitted his now printed proposals for the consideration of the government around that date. It appears that they were still being considered as late as 1698. The main suggestion of these proposals was that, in order to prevent the widespread evasion of these duties, a general register office should be established in London. He argued that this would make it easier to check whether the duties had been paid or not. In addition Whetham proposed that subordinate offices should be set up in every county in England and Wales. Churchwardens and parish clerks were to be required to make half-yearly returns to these county registrars of all the births, christenings, marriages and burials in their parishes, and these were to be transferred by the county registrar 'in a book' to the general registrar's office, where 'all persons may have recourse'.

Whetham argued that there were several reasons for having such a registry office. Such reasons as the loss of registers by fire or the death of their custodian, the expense and difficulty involved in searching for specific entries, and their 'imbezeling' by churchwardens or parish clerks, whose livelihood, it was claimed, depending in many cases on the income of a 'small tipling house or ale house', exposed them to 'such mischiefs as several families have cause to lament', (a reference possibly to the insertion of false entries and the removal of good ones) were all mentioned. The real reason probably lies, however, in the last of the arguments put forward by Whetham, and which had financial undertones. This was 'the great detriment and loss that doth frequently accrue (from the uncertainties of such registers so unduly kept) in matters of law, and otherwise, whereby the end of so useful an injunction is wholly perverted.'

A list of 'conveniences' which would 'arise ... from this office' were also given. These included the discovery of 'those that have two wives or more, and those who live together and are not lawfully married,' the age of infants 'who sell their lands and enter into bonds and assurances or debt during their minority', while the place of settlement of paupers 'and what parish ought to relieve them' would be known. Proof would also be given of those who were 'natural born subjects of this realm', and 'aliens and strangers'. The true significance of the proposals emerges in this 'convenience', that all frauds and perjuries 'which are too frequent (and many whereof are at this day in question, notwithstanding the late Act made to prevent them) will be hereby avoided.'

In order to gain governmental support Whetham and his fellow proposers
made it clear that the office should not only be a general registry office, but it should also provide further financial resources for the crown. It was suggested that an income of between eighty and one hundred thousand pounds could be realised if a fee of sixpence were charged for the registration of birth, rising to two and sixpence for a man worth one hundred pounds, a tax of one or two pennies be imposed in the pound upon all who received a dowry or portion from their wives, and a death duty of the same amount in the pound based on the yearly value of the real estate of the deceased. This income was in addition to that obtained by the 1694 legislation.

A list of objections and their answers ended these proposals. The first answered the objection that the value of each man’s estate would be exposed by stating that this was already possible under the land tax acts. The second objection was that ‘this office of registry will prejudice the present registers of christenings, marriages etc. and all others depending on the registry, and who derive their profits from it, and seems to entrench on the jurisdiction of the prerogative courts, and those of the bishops’. This was answered in this way, ‘that it will in no wise intrench on the just jurisdictions of the said courts, nor injure the bishops common register, nor any person therein concerned; because the time of the birth, marriage and death, and who is heir, is only triable by common law, and not by the certificate of the ordinary; besides the ordinaries, parish clerks etc., shall be allowed their usual fees, notwithstanding this register.’

Although it appears that the government considered these proposals for some time, they were never implemented, possibly because the financial returns of the 1694 Act had been so desultory. Nevertheless Mr Whetham ought to be congratulated for sowing the seed of a successful idea.

NOTES

1. Nathaniel Whetham’s proposals are contained in a pamphlet at the PRO, SP/32/11 fol. 65.
2. 6 & 7 William III, c. 6.
3. 5 & 6 William and Mary, c. 21.
4. 7 & 8 William III, c. 35.
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 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.

Life in the 1930s

Dear Sir,

Currently we are making a study of life in the 1930s. As part of our enquiry we discovered an 'overcrowding survey' which has been carried out by Biggleswade Rural District Council. Unfortunately I have no information as to its formation, function and purpose and whether the same constraints about confidentiality apply as with census information.

The items from this survey have proved to be an interesting source of evidence and our eleven-year olds have enjoyed working with them. I would be most grateful for any light you could shed on this matter.

Yours faithfully,

P. G. Teague,

Robert Bloomfield Middle School, Bloomfield Drive, Shefford, Bedfordshire SG17 5BU.

Photocopying charges at the Public Record Office

We print below a letter from Lieutenant Colonel Sir David Cooke, Bt., to the Deputy Keeper of Public Records and the current list of charges for copying services at the Public Record Office. We hope to print a comment on this situation, from the keeper, in LPS 30.

Dear Sir,

When I visited the Portugal Street building last week to obtain copies of the 1861, 1871 and 1881 Census Enumerator's Books for this parish — in connection with my Open University studies, I was shocked to find that a price of £1 per page or frame was quoted for photocopying.

In views of the implications of such a price for serious students, some 150+ sheets — I would be grateful for confirmation of the scale of charges so that I can raise this with the University authorities. It is surely
well in excess of that required to cover costs of the photocopying service and most produce diminishing returns.

Yours faithfully,
David Cooke,

‘Wheatley,’ 21 Roman Way, Bourton-on-the-Water, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire GL54 2EW.

A. Microfilm
(i) **Silver halide duplicate from existing negative:** for each run of consecutive frames, £0.44 per foot or £36.00 per reel or 100 ft, subject to a minimum charge of £8.80.
(ii) **“Diazo” duplicate from existing negative:** for each run of consecutive frames, £0.38 per foot or £31.50 per reel of 100 ft, subject to a minimum charge of £7.60.
(iii) **Copies of records of which no negative microfilm copy exists:** £0.16 per exposure with a minimum charge of £16.00 for each run of consecutive records. The Public Recorrd Office reserves the right to retain the camera negative.

B. Microfiche
Prices for microfiche will be supplied on request.

C. Electrostatic Copies
(i) **Copies made direct from original documents:** £0.25 per page print.
(ii) 11”×16” “Regma” prints from existing master microfilm: £1.00 per page print. Where no master microfilm exists: £1.75 per page print.
(iii) 13” wide “Copyflo” prints from existing master microfilm: £0.25 per print, subject to a minimum charge of £10.00 for each run of consecutive frames.
(iv) 13” wide “Copyflo” prints from specially commissioned microfilm: £0.50 per print, subject to a minimum charge of £20.00 for each run of consecutive records.

D. Bromide Prints from specially made microfilm negatives
The Maximum size of document which can be copied by this process is 36”×48”. The prints are made by a photographic process and the quality is superior to that of copies produced electrostatically. They are available in three sizes: 12”×16” (£5.85), 16”×20” (£6.45), 20”×24” (£7.35), respectively overall, and the image provided is normally the largest which can be fitted into the sheet size chosen after allowing for a caption. Reproduction of originals up to 20”×24” at actual size or to customers’ requirements can be supplied at an additional charge of £2.50 per print.
Travellers' and artisans' allowances

Dear Sir,

There is a "non-racial" parallel at Herne, Kent, to the anti-Irish resolution at Steeple Ashton, Wilts., referred to in Note 24 to Dr. Kent's article on Population Mobility in the Midlands in LPS 27.

The Herne Churchwardens' accounts have an entry dated May 4 1715,

"It was y° agreed to at a Generall parish Meeting that for y° futter No Church-Warden shall at any newe Relive any travilest whatsoever uppon y° parishes account.

It was likewise furer agreed upon at y° same time y° No Carpenter Marson or other tradesman what ever shall for y° futter be a Lowed any Lowance uppon y° parishes account".

This seems to suggest that the parish funds were feeling the pinch, both as regards migrants and travelling paupers, who were the Overseers' responsibility anyway rather than the wardens and as regards the refreshments offered to artisans working on Church property, which the wardens usually paid for. However, this strict economy did not last long; for example in 1721 we find

"Mem. spent when ye workmen wear about Lad's house from ye beginning to the Ending 6s 3d which I forgott to Charge in my last years accounts".

Yours faithfully,
Harold Gough,
Beverley House, 141 Grand Drive, Herne Bay, Kent CT6 8HU.

---

Constables' and Churchwardens' accounts of Waltham-on-the-Wolds

Dear Sir,

How 'meaningful' are the calculations that Dr Joan Kent has made in her article 'Population Mobility and Alms' LPS 27 of the 'numbers on the road'?

In looking at extant material for poor/refugee relief for Waltham-on-the-Wolds why were the Churchwardens' accounts not used? In Waltham churchwardens like constables were responsible for providing relief to all categories (Dr Kent's) of people passing through the 'town'. For instance in 1632 when Robert Flower and Richard Sneath were churchwardens they gave aid to forty seven destitute travellers who were with or without briefs, letters of request, passes, certificates and the like.

If the forty seven destitute travellers dealt with in 1632 by Flower and Sneath are added to the ninety five Dr Kent calculated as being relieved by the constable then the total of the mobile population passing through Waltham is increased considerably by about one third to 142.
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In 1632 on a number of occasions those relieved by the churchwardens were given money in spite of the officials in the first instance being not sure whether they should help. Entries like 'given to two women in the church by neighbours' consent and 'given to a brief 8 July by neighbours' consent 2s' suggest that a few of the travelling destitute appealed to a group of villagers for aid. This seems to imply that a proportion of the travelling destitute were refused assistance by the officials and possibly the villagers and therefore would not appear in either the constables, or the churchwardens, accounts. How stringent were officials in years of bad harvests?

How much of the iceberg has Dr Kent exposed.

Yours faithfully,
William Couth,
351 Harlaxton Road, Grantham, Lincolnshire NG31 7JT.

Birth-baptism ratios in Letterston

Dear Sirs,

I read with interest Leslie Bradley's review of The Population History of England 1541-1871 (LPS no. 27). My attention was particularly caught by the inflation ratios applied to Anglican baptisms to convert them to figures for births: the figure for baptisms in 1835 is, as I understood it, 1.0682.

This figure, of course, applies only to England, where non-conformity was generally not such an important factor as in South West Wales, but your readers may be interested in the following figures recorded in the parish register by the Rector of Letterston, a rural parish between Haverfordwest and Fishguard in Dyfed, with a population of 428 in 1821. The table is headed "from 1811 to 1820 or rather December 1820", but appears in fact to run from the beginning of 1812.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children baptised in Letterston Church</td>
<td>16*(19)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35(38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children baptised before their parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>came to live in the parish</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Named by Baptist preachers</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptised by Independent preachers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptised by Wesleyan preachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Named only by their parents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

74 73 152 (155)

*From the registers, it appears that this figure should be 19 and the total 38.

Naturally one cannot assume that the figures are absolutely accurate, and there are some problems in interpreting them. But if one assumes that all the children, except those in the second row of figures, were born in Letterston, it seems that only 35 out of 140, or perhaps 38 out of 143, were
baptised in the Anglican Church. This represents a proportion of roughly one in four. It is also interesting to note that seven out of the 152, or nearly five per cent belonged, apparently, to no religious denomination, and are therefore unrecorded.

These figures would suggest that the task of the aspiring historical demographer in South West Wales would be fraught with considerably greater difficulties than his English counterpart, particularly if one bears in mind two further considerations: firstly many series of parish registers in Pembrokeshire do not start until after the rise of non-conformity in the second half of the eighteenth century; and secondly, the survival of registers of non-conformist churches, is, to say the least, sporadic.

Yours faithfully,
J. Pepler,

---

Guides for Genealogists, Family and Local Historians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Tax Assessments, 1690-1950:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ed. Jeremy Gibson and Dennis Mills</td>
<td>£1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Quarter Sessions Records for Family Historians: A select list, 1982 | £1.20 |


| Marriage Indexes: How to Find Them; How to Use Them; How to Compile One. Third edition, 1982 | £1.20 |


Prices include postage in the U.K.

From: J. S. W. Gibson, Harts Cottage, Church Hanborough, Oxford OX7 2AB.
or The Federation of Family History Societies, 96 Beaumont Street, Milehouse, Plymouth, Devon PL2 3AQ.
Journal of
Family History
Studies in Family
Kinship and Demography

Published by the National Council on Family Relations
Editor: Tamara K. Hareven
Associate Editor: Robert Wheaton

The JOURNAL OF FAMILY HISTORY is an interdisciplinary scholarly undertaking, which publishes relevant research in history, demography, anthropology, and sociology—in the liberal arts as well as in the social sciences. Articles are published which
—advance the theory and methodologies used in the field
—present the results of recent research work in hitherto neglected areas
—provide up-to-date resumés of existing scholarship
—review major scholarly works in Family History

In the first six years of publication, special issues have appeared on Sexuality and the Family in France; Papers from the Cullom Shelby Davis Center at Princeton University (two issues); The Family in Latin America; Women's Participation in the Work Force; and The Family in Eastern Europe.

Future issues will continue to reflect the interdisciplinary, international character of the Journal. Articles on the following subjects are among those recently published: Widowhood and Rational Domesticity: Modes of Independence for Women in Early Modern Europe (Papers from the 1981 Berkshire Conference by Roelker, Diefendorf, Wytjes, and Brown); Some Aspects of Social Security in Medieval England (Clark); Gentile da Fabriano, St. Nicholas, and the Iconography of Shame (Taylor); Marriage, Family Size, and Inheritance Among Hessian Nobles (Pedlow); Dispersion of Kinship Ties in Modern Society (Fischer); and special issues on the Family in Japan and Papers from the Harvard Divinity School Conference on Religion and Family History.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: For One Year: Institutions $25.00, Individuals $22.00, Students $17.00, National Council on Family Relations Members $14.00. Checks should be made payable to the National Council on Family Relations, 1219 University Avenue Southeast, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55414.
1851 Census of Leatherhead — a report from A. J. Gillies

Almost thirty years ago I started some work on the occupational structure of part of Surrey, based upon the Post Office Directory of the Six Home Counties, 1851. It was quite fortuitous that I should have chosen directory for a census year. Although I was also using census data at the time, the significance of the data of the directory did not register; nor was I then aware that few directories for census years are now extant.

Subsequently, in connection with work in connection with the preparation of the history of Ashtead, I discovered the wealth of the census abstracts. One could devote a lifetime to the study of a single set of abstracts, without exploiting its full potential.

Having seen papers on the use of the census and on the use of directories as source material, I felt that it would be useful to bring the two together and to compare the one against the other. I have not seen this done so far. I decided to work on Leatherhead rather than on Ashtead, as the data seems fuller and it is far more varied.

To date I have attempted a 'trial run', restricting myself to a sample consisting of all the 'heads of households' extracted from the census. This has proved extremely useful, providing pointers to areas where research in greater depth is desirable.

It is easy to get involved in research of this nature and to fail to produce any written work. I hope, however, to publish something of an interim nature during the next two or three years.

Originally I thought that I might complete and write-up the 'trial run' for publication before tackling the main investigation. From the provisional results to hand so far, however, it looks as if there will be little or no correlation between the directory data and that from the census. I think, therefore, that I should try to complete and publish this aspect of investigation. It should, I feel, serve as a warning against placing too much reliance upon directory data. I will need to go rather more deeply into various aspects of the comparison than I had originally intended to do at the present stage and there will be a considerable amount of checking and cross-checking necessary. I will need to test, for instance, how representative a sample of the total populace is afforded by the 'heads of households'.

I have been surprised by the comparatively large number of young/middle aged married women who are shown as 'heads of households' in the census. Although I doubt whether it would be possible (or that I would wish to devote sufficient time) to answer the question 'Where were their husbands ...?' I think that it would be interesting and useful to write something, drawing attention to the problem, in case someone else
wishes to pursue it. I do not know how widespread this problem is, but someone else has noted the same phenomenon in an area of small crowded lodging houses in Leatherhead in 1871.

As another by-product of the main investigation, it might be of interest to see whether there is any evidence of a general age for retirement, a century before the welfare state. Amongst the directory entries there is one for Elizabeth & John Lloyd — saddlers. From the census, Elizabeth turns out to be a widow aged 84 years!

Originally it was my intention that, having investigated the correlation between the directory data and the census data, I should apply my results to directory data for the whole Mole Valley District (which reaches from here to the Sussex border). As it now looks as if such correlation is non-existent (as I rather suspected) that would be rather pointless.

I realise that conditions in Leatherhead may not have been typical of Surrey in 1851 and that 1851 need not have been typical of Leatherhead throughout the century. I can only attempt to analyse one area at a particular time.

It seems, however, that having completed the work outlined above, I should decide which direction to follow for my main line of research. There are three spheres which attract me particularly:-

(a) There seems to be considerable scope for an in-depth study of agriculture in Leatherhead at the mid-19th century. Some fascinating problems have emerged during the ‘trial run’, but they have had to be ignored to date.

(b) On the statistical side, there is much that could be investigated, in a Leatherhead context, concerning the influence of different methods of sampling upon subsequent analysis of 19th century occupational data.

(c) There is a need for research into the classification of 19th century occupational data, in the context of its subsequent analysis. Again, this could be attempted in respect of the Leatherhead data.

As a by-product of this work, it would be interesting and useful to prepare a transcript of the census abstracts, arranged alphabetically by ‘heads of households’, with cross-references to the other surnames which appear.

Indexing of Leatherhead Census Data, 1851

Hitherto I have been working from various lists of ‘heads of households’. Now, however, I am transferring the data to index cards with the following layout:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Father's Occupation</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPLEBY, George</td>
<td>84(b)</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Elder Cottage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricklayer's labourer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born: Leatherhead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class: G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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For the 1851 census Leatherhead was divided into two enumeration districts, each with a separate sequence of numbers for the householders' schedules. In indexing the census abstracts, these districts are differentiated by use of the suffixes (a) and (b).

The classification of occupations, which is based broadly upon the Classification of Occupations (HMSO. 1950), is as follows:-
A Agricultural, Forestry, etc.; B Metal Workers, including Engineering; C Workers in Wood; D Treatment of Non-Metallic Minerals; E Leather Works; F Makers of Food and Drink; G Building and Contracting; H Manufacture of Clothing; J Transport and Communications; K Retailers of Food and Drink; M Other Retail Traders; N Professional; P Personal Service; Q Public Service; R Private Residents, &c; S Domestic Service; T Unspecified Service; V Retired, Pensioners, &c; W Paupers and Unemployed; Z Other and Undefined.

As is the normal practice, classification is according to the first named occupation or descriptor where more than one is given; except in the case of Classes V and W. In the context of the present analysis it is felt more realistic that the latter should take precedence.

My immediate aims include the completion of an alphabetical index of the Heads of Households by name and also a topographical index. My main aim, however, is to prepare alphabetical and classified indexes of occupations descriptors for working purposes. These indexes should be as accurate and as comprehensive as possible, forming the basis for whatever subsequent and more detailed work I may wish to undertake. For the time being, however, I am regarding these indexes as PROVISIONAL: further problems may be resolved as the work progresses. To date the indexing has provided valuable pointers to problems which may arise at later stages of work.

Historical demography in north east England

A one-day conference held in the Department of Adult and Continuing Education University of Durham on Saturday 4th December 1982.

This conference was jointly organised by the Department of Anthropology and the Department of Adult and Continuing Education of the University of Durham.

After coffee the morning session was devoted to three talks:-
Dr Malcolm Smith from the Department of Anthropology, University of Durham, 'Genes and History'.
P. Norris from the Department of Geography University of Durham, 'The potential and problems of a demographic approach to the history of the Durham coalfield'.
John Smith from the Department of Adult and Continuing Education University of Durham, 'Some sources for a demographic history of Durham: sixteenth to eighteenth centuries'.

After lunch, a business session was held at which it was agreed to continue the regional initiative. It was felt that this could best be achieved
without any formal organisation or membership. A bibliography of northeast demography seemed a constructive and worthwhile way of proceeding and all interested parties agreed to contact Dr Smith with offers of help.

LPS Society Day Conference — a report

On Saturday 27th November 1982 the LPS Society again held a day conference at Birmingham. This was the sixth occasion that the Society had co-operated with the University of Birmingham Extra-mural Department and the facilities were as usual of a high order. This year’s theme was Population Migration and some thirty or so people attended for the whole or part of the day. They first heard Malcolm Kitch of the University of Sussex speak on ‘Sources for Migration History’. The morning session was completed by Tom James of King Alfred College, Winchester, who spoke on ‘Southampton and Migration 1400-1600’. Under the chairmanship of the LPS Vice-Chairman, Barry Stapleton, both speakers responded to a variety of questions from the audience. The morning proved a very valuable session in which Migration was introduced in general and then demonstrated in a particular local community.

After lunch, workshops were led by LPS Society committee members, Edward Higgs, Barry Stapleton and Geoffrey Stevenson. The workshops had been devised to cover the whole range of interest from beginners to those interested in advanced techniques but in each case the emphasis was on participation and the opportunity to practise some of the techniques.

Geoffrey Stevenson again displayed the books available to members of the Society and as usual sales were high.

Members are reminded that the residential conference will be held at Reading, 8-10th July.

Guide to the Listings Collection of the SSRC Cambridge Group

The list below is a further instalment of the guide to the copies of listings held at the SSRC Cambridge Group library, where they may be consulted. The guide attempts to show roughly the kind of information which the lists contain. If an item is nearly always given — explicitly or implicitly — an ‘X’ is marked. If sometimes ‘%’ is marked, and if information rarely or never appears ‘—’ is marked. ‘Inmates’ and ‘visitors’ are not included in the lodgers column but are footnoted; and ‘kin’ column includes all kin except sons, daughters or spouses.

Further details of the kind of information usually given in listings and why they were drawn up may be found in Local Population Studies Nos. 24-6. Information on any listings not mentioned in the guide would be gratefully received by the SSRC Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure, 27, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, CB2 1QA, telephone: Cambridge 354298.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County and Settlement</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Household size</th>
<th>Ages</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Kin</th>
<th>Servants</th>
<th>Lodgers</th>
<th>Head's occupation</th>
<th>Individuals named</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LONDON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Hallows, Staining</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1694 Marriage Act Return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Andrew Wardrobe</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1694 Marriage Act Return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bennetts</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1694 Marriage Act Return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Ethelburg</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1694 Marriage Act Return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridewell Precinct</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1694 Marriage Act Return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bartholomew the Great</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1694 Marriage Act Return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lawrence Pountney</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1694 Marriage Act Return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary Aldermary</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1694 Marriage Act Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary le Bow</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1694 Marriage Act Return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary Woolchurch</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1694 Marriage Act Return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Thomas Apostle's</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1694 Marriage Act Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mildred Poultry</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1694 Marriage Act Return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Martin Ludgate</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1689 Poll tax Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1691</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1691 Poll Tax Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1694</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1691 Poll tax Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1698</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1698 Poll tax Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLESEX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealing</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Vagrancy/Sett Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatfield</td>
<td>1699</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Copy, G. King, 1694 Marriage Act Return</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LONDON
1. Journeymen listed.
2. Possibly incomplete. Some individuals not listed by household.
3. Inmates, apprentices, journeymen listed; 1 lodger only.
4. Lodgers named: children's and some servants' sex not given; apprentices listed.
5. Journeymen, apprentices listed.
6. Apprentices listed.

MIDDLESEX
7. One servant 'employed to husbandry'; wet nurse children, apprentices, school children listed.
8. Lists child not at home, wet nurse children.

University of Nottingham

DEPARTMENT OF ADULT EDUCATION

Recent and forthcoming
LOCAL HISTORY PUBLICATIONS

Edited by A. Rogers.
Edited by J. Heath.

Forthcoming:
R. C. Swift of the Wesley Historical Society.
IN THE SHADOW OF THE WORKHOUSE: the implementation of the New Poor Law in the County of Nottingham, 1836-1846. late Spring 1983. M. Caplan.

Publications and further information available from:
Mary Emery, Publications Unit, Department of Adult Education, University of Nottingham, 'C' Block, Cherry Tree Buildings, University Park. Nottingham NG7 2RD Tel.: (0602) 56101 Ex. 2717.
Social History
An International Journal
Edited by Janet Blackman and Keith Nield
Department of Economic and Social History, University of Hull

'Social History has without a doubt immediately established itself as enormously superior to all English-language journals in the field, with the possible exception of Past and Present.'
The Times Educational Supplement

Social History publishes the best work available in social historical writing of a theoretical and polemical kind as well as empirical analysis. The journal seeks to be international in content, to cover all periods, and to explore links with other disciplines that increasingly seek historical perspectives, especially sociology, social anthropology, politics, demography and studies of the process of economic development and growth.

Subscription Rates for 1983: Individuals (UK) £16.75 per annum; Institutions (UK) £24.50 per annum; Individuals (Overseas) £20.00 per annum; Institutions (Overseas) £27.00 per annum; Airmail £31.00 per annum;
Single copies £10.00

Frequency: Three issues per year (January, May and October)

Methuen & Co Ltd, 11 New Fetter Lane, London EC4P 4EE

Family Forms in Historic Europe
Edited by RICHARD WALL
in collaboration with JEAN ROBIN and PETER LASLETT

This book represents the first attempt to recover and compare the different familial systems of Europe: an important development and extension of Household and Family in Past Time (C.U.P., 1972). The studies range from Russia, Poland, Hungary and Austria to Scandinavia, Flanders and Britain. All the factors affecting the character and composition of households are taken into account — economic, social, cultural and political, central and local. Claims that inheritance practice and occupation of household head exerted a powerful influence are rigorously investigated. In his analytical introduction, Richard Wall measures and traces the origin of major differences between the family patterns of eastern and western Europe, suggests a new way of categorising households, and considers to what extent peasant and proletarian households were self-sufficient.

£37.50 net
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