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EDITORIAL

Important developments at the Public Record Office

Visitors to the PRO at Kew this autumn will have more than the canteen menu and the jolly banter of the uniformed staff to entertain them as they stand in the foyer. A model of the proposed PRO extension will be on display and, as part of a consultative process to be completed before the final plans are drawn up, they may have a chance to express an opinion on the proposals.

At a time when public expenditure cuts are so often in the news it is a pleasure to draw attention to one development that will manifestly improve a public service and, furthermore, one which is in an area that seldom attracts government largesse. Who knows what bargaining took place with the Treasury behind the scenes? But however it was achieved, outline approval has been granted and, if all goes according to plan, the new building will open before the end of 1995. What the new building will cost is, we are told, confidential; but there can be no doubt it will be a substantial sum. The extension will be comparable in size to the present Kew building and will occupy much of the adjacent ground filled until recently by a colony of decrepit Inland Revenue huts. It will provide storage and office space rather than reading rooms but readers will benefit from the new development as the first floor search room of the present building will be extended, so increasing the overall seating capacity of the Kew site. A covered link will connect the two buildings and the existing automated delivery service will be extended to the new storage floors.

The design of the new building and associated landscaping is in the hands of the Property Services Agency and it is to be hoped that it seizes this opportunity to produce a plan which will materially improve the appearance of this large and visually sensitive site. We will remember the local opposition aroused by the design and location of the first PRO building at Kew and we understand that, although as Crown Agents the PRO does not require planning approval from the local Planning Authority, consultation with the planners and local residents is already underway.

It is especially gratifying to learn that the new plans for Kew have not been won at the expense of neglecting or even vacating Chancery Lane. We are assured that this time there was no threat from a covetous Lord Chancellor seeking an excuse to seize the building for use as law courts. Nevertheless the Treasury once again insisted on the PRO considering the merits of locating all its functions on a single site. In the event the preferred option included the retention of Chancery Lane. Here too developments are in hand which will improve the services offered to readers. The census room in Portugal Street is to close; yes, this time the rumour has become a reality! The PRO sought
approval for a new building on the north terrace at Chancery Lane; instead a new census room will be opened in the basement beneath part of the existing Chancery Lane building. The target date is mid 1990. The other principal user of the office in Portugal Street, the conservation department, will move to the new Kew extension when it comes into use towards the end of 1995.

We congratulate the Keeper and his staff on their achievements. Having secured the bricks and mortar is it too much to hope that they will now turn their attention to improvements in opening hours and in photographic and other services?

Registration: a modern service

The Green Paper, *Registration: a modern service*, completed its consultative phase at the end of March and, the OPCS press officer informs us, is now being reconsidered by the under-secretary, Roger Freeman, and his civil servants. There is no sign of the autumn White Paper which was predicted in some quarters; OPCS will not say whether a firm timetable for its publication exists. We suspect that it does not; but of course we can only wait and see.

We know that ministers have received numerous letters from records users seeking clarification and attempting to alter the official line on access to the registers and we are grateful to those readers who have sent us copies of such correspondence. We were particularly interested in a letter from the Secretary of State for Health, Kenneth Clarke to Phillip Oppenheim MP. In response to ‘the proposal that non-certified photocopies should be made available without restriction while at the same time limiting the issue of certificates to those who could prove a legitimate need’, the Minister wrote as follows: [the] ‘suggestion that there should be a specific type of certificate for legal purposes and another for other applicants would not solve the problems of the misuse of certificates because possession of the information in any form might be significant for it to be used for fraudulent purposes’. It is evident that the Minister is unaware of all the other sources of information from which a criminal might accumulate information about a person living or dead whom he wishes to impersonate. Church registers, cemetery records, tombstones and newspapers are all available to such a person: and the existence of these records makes a nonsense of any proposal to limit access to the vital registers on the grounds that an effective check is thereby placed on the criminal misuse to which they might be put.

With regards to the so called historic records the Minister confirms the Government’s commitment to maintain a central reading room and points out that local authorities will be free to ‘open up the historic records for their area’. At the same time he emphasises that ‘the cost of setting up these libraries will have to be covered by fees for access to them’. The Government, it would appear, remains committed to making the service pay its way and still does not see the folly of leaving the provision of this service to the whims of individual local authorities so achieving, or so we believe, a national patchwork of provision and non-provision.
The evaluation of reactions to the Green paper may turn out to be a more complex task than OPCS expected. We have a particular interest in those sections of the Green Paper which refer to the historic records but it may not be the public reactions to these sections alone which are taxing the civil servants and their masters. Take for example the comments submitted by the Society of Registration Officers. These are the men and women with practical experience of the present registration service. They are craftsmen who are proud of their skills and tradition. They have found much to welcome in the Green Paper but they have quantified many aspects which they are convinced will damage rather than develop the provision of registration services. For them the fundamental flaw is embodied in the proposal to place the service almost entirely in local government hands. In contrast, the Society favours the creation of ‘a national registration board or independent agency controlled by legislation’. In this way the registration service would avoid both the loss of independence implicit in the new proposals and the risk of damage to its public image through entanglement in local politics and confusion in the public mind between its own rôle and that of the new poll tax registration service or other town hall agencies. It is felt that such a loss of confidence could lead to a reluctance to register, or at least encourage the withholding of information.

Nor will the proposed new structure lead to the creation of a national service of consistent quality. Within the overall brief the local authorities would have too much freedom and too few obligations. In the case of the computerisation of registration where the need for ‘a single decision made by the controlling body’ is of paramount importance, the Society doubts whether a unified national approach would emerge. These objections are also relevant in the proposed new freedom of choices for marriage locations. The Society fears some local authorities will approve almost any location and so remove any incentive to improve their existing register offices. ‘Such a system would create two tiers of marriage ceremonies with those who are obliged to use the registers office having to put up with second class facilities’.

The Church of England is also among the Society’s targets. Why, it asks, should the Church of England not be required to conform in its marriage procedures ‘to the same conditions as apply to the remainder of the population’? The present reform of the registration service should seize the opportunity to establish a uniform procedure. But it is the Green papers’ insistence that if clergymen marry to perform and register marriages single-handed so also should registrars which provokes the most waspish putdown. The comparison, or so the Society would have us believe, is ‘spurious and unwelcome’. We must ask how often a clergyman works alone at a marriage without an assistant, churchwarden, sidesman or at least an organist in the offing. In practice, most clergy have the registers written up a day or even a week prior to the marriage, quite often not by themselves and usually appallingly badly.

We cannot comment here on the numerous helpful points of detail raised in the Society’s submission but we would draw attention to its views on access to the registration records. The Society, anxious to respect what it calls the right to privacy, favours the hundred year option for the division between historic and modern records. It is apparently aware of, but unmoved by, the long tradition
of public access enshrined in all the earlier legislation, and for means of access, favours the creation of County Register Offices adding, helpfully, that if County Register Offices are not established the facility could be provided in 'the largest register office in the local authority area'. It would appear that in either case the Society assumes the records will remain under it's members' control and not pass into the hands of the local archivist. We doubt whether the archivists will see it that way.

The registrars will win few friends among records users with their views on access to recent records. They favour 'any move' to limit the availability of certificates to 'genuine' applicants noting that 'officers in the service have for many years been concerned about the ease with which members of the public can obtain certificates for dubious purposes'. They do not appear to have considered the provision of uncertified photocopies as a means of satisfying research needs. Certainly this is a point we shall be taking up with them.

We have discussed the Green Paper with the Secretary of the Society of Registrars, Peter Butt, Superintendent Registrar in Southampton and we are impressed by his concern for the sense of tradition and professional commitment exhibited by his members which the Green Paper may challenge. Registrars have achieved an enviable reputation for the accuracy of their work which even the Efficiency Scrutiny Report found to stand near perfection. The new measures through staff reductions and penny pinching methods must lower standards and so threaten the quality of the present service.

We hope the Government will come to share the Registrars' commitment to the bespoke tradition and will consider seriously the views they have put forward; after all there can be no one who knows the job better than they do.

Tom Arkell
Christopher Charlton
Terry Gwynne
May Pickles
Roger Schofield
Kevin Schurer
Malcolm Smith
Geoffrey Stevenson

October 1989
NEWS FROM THE CAMBRIDGE GROUP FOR THE HISTORY OF POPULATION AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE

The demographic and social structure of late nineteenth and early twentieth century England and Wales

The period covering the latter half of Queen Victoria’s reign and those of Edward and George, is central to understanding the demography of both the present and the recent past. The half century between 1880 and 1930 witnessed dramatic shifts in vital population rates, in short the period was one of demographic transition from which the basic structure of today’s population has arisen. Levels of marital fertility declined steadily from the 1870s through to the 1930s. At the same time age at first marriage increased on average by around one year for both sexes, the combination of the two factors bringing about a substantial reduction in the size of families. Advances in public health, medical knowledge and general improvements in the standard of living also combined to create substantial reductions in the levels of mortality. From the 1870s improvements of varying levels were witnessed in the mortality experience of those aged from five to thirty-five, and after 1900 infant mortality, as measured by the chances of surviving the first year of life, also started to improve sharply, causing the expectation of life at birth to rise from around forty-six years in 1891, through fifty years in 1901, to sixty years in 1931. These two factors, falling fertility and mortality, in turn led to changes in the overall age structure of the nation’s population. This has been marked by a gradual ageing of the population and what has been termed the ‘secular shift in ageing’ during which the proportions of elderly in the population shifted from a ‘low plateau’ pre-1880 maximum figure of around 10 per cent, with a projected ‘high plateau’ figure of some 25 to 28 per cent suggested for the end of the century.

In addition to these long-term demographic changes, the First World War created a dramatic upheaval, not only in social and economic terms but also demographically. In total the war cost the lives of some 634,000 men fighting in the British forces, relating to some 7 per cent of the country’s male population aged between fifteen and forty-nine in 1911. Yet, as one might expect, the fatalities were extremely age-specific with the result that over one in every six males aged between twenty and twenty-five at the time of the 1911 census lost their lives during the course of the war. Clearly, one would expect a major short-term upheaval such as this to have had a dramatic impact on the social structure of the surviving population, who would adjust their patterns of employment, living arrangements and demographic behaviour in an attempt to solve some of the problems caused by the loss of a significant sector of the nation’s workforce on the one hand and the loss of husbands, fathers and similar loved ones on the other.
Table 1. Population totals for the thirteen communities, 1891-1921

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>1891</th>
<th>1901</th>
<th>1911</th>
<th>1921</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abergavenny</td>
<td>9,018</td>
<td>7,782</td>
<td>8,239</td>
<td>8,188</td>
<td>33,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axminster</td>
<td>4,867</td>
<td>4,815</td>
<td>5,179</td>
<td>5,864</td>
<td>20,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banbury</td>
<td>8,322</td>
<td>8,192</td>
<td>8,229</td>
<td>8,037</td>
<td>32,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethnal Green</td>
<td>8,104</td>
<td>12,819</td>
<td>10,878</td>
<td>9,428</td>
<td>41,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>7,195</td>
<td>7,328</td>
<td>6,697</td>
<td>5,979</td>
<td>27,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earson</td>
<td>3,848</td>
<td>5,232</td>
<td>5,586</td>
<td>5,872</td>
<td>20,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morland</td>
<td>4,962</td>
<td>4,339</td>
<td>4,161</td>
<td>4,202</td>
<td>17,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinner</td>
<td>2,362</td>
<td>2,962</td>
<td>6,719</td>
<td>9,032</td>
<td>21,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saffron Walden</td>
<td>5,732</td>
<td>5,018</td>
<td>5,161</td>
<td>4,777</td>
<td>20,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoke</td>
<td>6,646</td>
<td>7,255</td>
<td>12,378</td>
<td>12,921</td>
<td>39,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swansea</td>
<td>9,491</td>
<td>9,030</td>
<td>11,478</td>
<td>9,232</td>
<td>39,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walthamstow</td>
<td>7,132</td>
<td>12,261</td>
<td>12,393</td>
<td>11,885</td>
<td>43,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>8,294</td>
<td>8,433</td>
<td>12,623</td>
<td>14,521</td>
<td>43,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>85,973</strong></td>
<td><strong>95,466</strong></td>
<td><strong>109,721</strong></td>
<td><strong>109,956</strong></td>
<td><strong>401,116</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite the overwhelming importance of this period, the availability of relevant sources has frustrated the historian's ability to study the impact of these changes, and the process of change itself, at either an individual or household level. This is due primarily to the fact that the manuscript returns of the decennial censuses are closed to public inspection for a period of one hundred years. Thus, at present, research on the census enumerators' books can only be undertaken up to and including 1881, leaving the period of transition unavailable for inspection. Fortunately, the Office of Population Censuses and Surveys (OPCS) have provided the Cambridge Group with machine-readable abstracts of census data for thirteen communities scattered throughout England and Wales for the four census years between 1891 and 1921. Each place selected is made up of a group of contiguous enumeration districts, thus in the case of some of the places within the sample, particularly the rural areas, the 'community' in question comprises a number of separate parishes.

Obviously, the selection of just thirteen communities out of all the cities, towns and villages of England and Wales is a thankless task. Regardless of the selection made, the result could never truly be termed a national sample. Yet in making the selection an attempt was made to choose places that appear to represent certain important aspects of the varied social and economic fabric of late nineteenth century and early twentieth century England and Wales. A list of the thirteen communities selected, together with the population size of the sample, is displayed in table 1. Since some of these contain several different parishes, the names given to the communities are rather arbitrary, being taken from the name of the registration sub-district from which the enumeration districts were selected. Thus both Abergavenny and Banbury contain enumeration districts selected from the respective town plus additional enumeration districts from the surrounding parishes. From table 1 it can be seen that a wide variety of community types are represented: lowland arable
(Saffron Walden); highland farming (Morland); market town (Banbury); traditional working class urban area (Bethanal Green); industrial port (Swansea); middle class suburb (Pinner); mining area (Earlsdon); textile town (Bolton) and so on. In total the complete sample covers some 400,000 individuals, although the numbers vary from place to place and year to year, the smallest size being some 2,500 in the nascent suburb of Pinner, the largest the 14,500 of the City of York in 1921. Despite these variations in community size over time, every attempt was made to ensure that the same enumeration districts were selected for each community year by year, although changes in the boundaries of enumeration districts clearly frustrate the situation.

To date, much time has been spent preparing the data for analysis, this has been a very time consuming and laborious process yet much of the hard slog is over and attention can now be turned to the job of analysis. It seems clear that the announcement of results from this important new dataset will fill these pages for a good few issues to come!

NOTES


2. These figures are for both sexes combined, obviously expectations of life for females were a little higher than these figures and those for males a little lower. See in general R. Woods and J. Woodward (eds), Urban disease and mortality in nineteenth century England, London, 1984. See also R.I. Woods, P.A. Watterson and J.H. Woodward, ‘The causes of rapid infant mortality decline in England and Wales, Population Studies, part I, 42, 3, 1988, pp. 343-66 and part II, 43, 1, pp. 113-32.

3. Elderly being defined as those aged sixty and over. Throughout much of the nineteenth century the proportion of elderly persons in the population fluctuated around 7 to 8 per cent, see P. Laslett, A Fresh Map of Life: The emergence of the Third Age, London, 1989.


5. The preparation of the data has been assisted by an award from the Economic and Social Research Council, grant number G00232261.
NEWS FROM THE LOCAL POPULATION STUDIES SOCIETY

Report of the conference held at St Mary’s College, Durham, 14-16 April 1989.

This conference, entitled Historical Population in Northern England, was our first residential venture for a number of years. The proceedings began on the Friday evening with two papers on aspects of Yorkshire history. Dr Christine Hallas presented a detailed case-study of immigration and emigration in Wensleydale and Swaledale during the nineteenth century. The substance of her paper was derived from an essay on migration which won second prize in the 1989 Edward Boyle Yorkshire History Prize competition. Rosalin Barker’s paper contrasted the demographic characteristics of two east coast towns, Harwich and Whitby. In spite of superficial similarities, the environmental differences between them - especially in regard to water supply and drainage - had a profound effect on public health and demographic development.

On Saturday the participants spent the morning in two workshops. In the first Dr Malcolm Smith gave a workshop on inbreeding, presenting data from the LPSS Surname Survey and demonstrating the calculation of inbreeding levels from genealogies. In the second workshop John Northwood, who writes a continuing series of articles on historical analysis in the magazine Personal Computing, brought his experience of the Stockport Education Authority’s IBM PC In Schools Project to give participants the opportunity to investigate and explore the use of PCs and databases as tools for historical research. This workshop used one of Durham University’s PC classrooms. On Saturday afternoon we explored the City of Durham and the Cathedral, and enjoyed a tour of the University’s Department of Palaeography, including a display of original documents, led by the Assistant Keeper, Margaret McCollum. Saturday afternoon was also the occasion for the Society’s general meeting, a report of which has been presented in the summer Bulletin.

On Saturday evening Malcolm Smith presented a paper written jointly with Lucinda Fowler on the nineteenth century genetic demography of some County Durham mining communities. Entitled ‘A peculiar race’, the paper showed how historical accounts, biographies and sociological research all combined to present the miners as a physically and socially isolated group, described by themselves and by outsiders as a race apart. This characterisation was then tested against data on migration and inter-marriage taken from parish registers and censuses, to see whether the miners really were so distinct from other contemporary groups.

The following day the regional focus shifted to the English Lake District, and the first paper was given by one of England’s most renowned local historians, Dr John Marshall, who discussed the pattern of illegitimacy during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It was shown that female servants were particularly vulnerable, because of lack of protection by kin. In terms of season, there was a relationship between both hiring fairs and religious festivals with
conceptions. The custom of night courting was reviewed, and evidence from petty sessions, where young women were pursuing affiliation, revealed in lively detail the courtship situations of the late nineteenth century. The final paper was given by Professor David Armstrong, whose research into the historical population of Greystoke parish began through an amateur interest in family history (the professorship is in physiology) - and which provides a fine example for any enthusiast tempted to follow a similar route. Among many interesting observations relating to births, marriages and deaths in Elizabethan and early Stuart times, came evidence that the youngest brides had the longest interval between marriage and the birth of their first child. This implied teenage subfecundity, and was the first demonstration of the phenomenon among English historical populations.

What this brief account has not done justice to is the informed and entertaining discussion which accompanied every presentation and activity. It is one of the best traditions of LPSS that discussion is full, and that amateurs and professionals can talk together without formality, sharing each others experiences and enthusiasm. There is no better forum for this than a residential conference, and the congenial atmosphere of St Mary's College enabled participants to benefit to the full from the opportunity.

**Future Conferences**

**18th November 1989**, Open University in Wales, Cardiff. Speakers include: Dr Rees Pryce, on 'Census taking in past times'; Philip Riden, on 'Problems and possibilities offered by the documentary records of Wales since 1536'; also workshop sessions led by Ernest Sandberg, Dr C. Roy Lewis and Brian Li James.

**6-8 April 1990**, a residential conference entitled *Nineteenth century population and community history* to be held at Bishop Grossteste College, Lincoln. This conference, centring on the use of the census enumerators' books, will consider both urban and rural communities, with some emphasis on occupations, households and house repopulation. There will be ample time for discussion in workshops, including on based on a recently published bibliography, while another will comprise a visit to a nearby Victorian residential area. Speakers will include: Richard Wall, Cambridge Group for the History of Population, on households; Dr John Beckett, Reader in English Regional History, University of Nottingham, on occupations in Laxton, Notts.; Mrs Carol Pearce, Queen Mary College, London, on using the census bibliography; Dr Dennis Mills, Chairman, History of Lincolnshire Committee, 1979-89, on Victorian Lincoln. Further particulars and booking forms can be obtained from Mrs G M Wyatt, 302 Prescot Road, Aughton, Ormskirk, Lancs. L39 6RR.

**June 1990**, Edinburgh, date to be arranged. Speakers include Professor Michael Anderson.

**3rd November 1990**, London. Speakers include Dr Irvine Loudon, Dr Audrey Eccles and John Skinner.

**March 1991**, Lancaster, details to be arranged.
EASTER BOOKS AND RELATED PARISH LISTINGS:
PART II
S.J. Wright

Sue Wright was until recently working as a research fellow in the Department of English Local History, Leicester. She now works for Christian Aid and is an Honorary Research Fellow at the Centre for Urban History, Leicester.

Introduction

In the first part of this article, published in the previous issue of LPS (pp. 18-31), an outline of the nature, coverage and usefulness of Easter Books was given. The purpose of this second part is essentially that of an appendix. It lists, initially in tabular form, and details the Easter Books and related parish listings that were noticed in the course of the research for the first part of this essay. In no way is this second section put forward as a complete or an exhaustive record of Easter Book listings. Equally, not all of the documents listed in this appendix are true Easter Books, for example, the first four documents listed below for Chester are quite different in character to Easter Books proper, however, they do provide a useful source for comparison to the other parish listings and further illustrate the variability and diverse nature of such lists, which is after all the key purpose of this appendix.

Throughout the accompanying text the following abbreviations have been used:

BCRL           Bristol City Reference Library
CCRO           Chester City Record Office
CDRO           Chester Diocesan Record Office
CRO            Coventry Record Office
CMRO           Cumbria Record Office
DRO            Durham Record Office
GDRO           Gloucester Diocesan Record Office
GL             Guildhall Library
GLRO           Greater London Record Office
HWRO           Hereford and Worcester Record Office
LRO            Leicester Record Office
LCRO           Lancashire Record Office
NRO            Northamptonshire Record Office
NLW            National Library of Wales
SCL            Sheffield City Library
SLSD           Shrewsbury Local Studies Department
SRO            Shropshire Record Office
WRO            Wiltshire Record Office
In the following table the given abbreviations and codes relate to the appropriate column headings as follows:

Column 1: The groups covered by the listing are designated as follows:

H  Householders only.
HS Mainly lists of householders, but servants and some other inmates, normally over sixteen, may be numbered or entered separately.
C1-4 All communicants: 1 if most are named and labelled according to their position in the household; 2 if named only; 3 if labelled only; 4 if we are simply given a total for the household.
A1-4 All inhabitants (1-4 as above).
Y1-4 Householders and children under eighteen (or sixteen).

Column 2: The arrangement of the listing is indicated as follows:

C1 Circuit (with streets named).
C2 Circuit (no streets named).
A Alphabetical.
O By occupation.
B No obvious order.

Column 3: The delineation of households is indicated by the number 1-3 as appropriate: 1 if clearly distinguished; 2 clear in some cases; 3 if many problems.

Column 4: The marital status of the householder: 1 if clear for all men and women; 2 if clear for women; 3 if there are problems.

Columns 5-12: These columns indicate the extent to which household members other than the head have been recorded. For the relationships listed below the following numbers have been assigned to indicate the recording practice: 1 if named and described according to their position in the household; 2 if named only; 3 if described only. The columns 5-12 relate as follows:

Column 5: Wives
Column 6: Children of communicable age
Column 7: Young children
Column 8: Servants
Column 9: Apprentices
Column 10: Journeymen
Column 11: Kin
Column 12: Inmates (such as sojourners, boarders and lodgers)

Column 13: Whether the occupation of the householder is given: 1 in most cases; 2 in some cases.

Column 14: Whether the occupation of other members of the household is given: 1 in most cases; 2 in some cases.
# Easter books and related parish listings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester, Eastgate Ward</td>
<td>1641</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester, St John's Ward</td>
<td>1641</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester, St Giles' Ward</td>
<td>1641</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester, Holy Trinity</td>
<td>1549-59</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester, Holy Trinity</td>
<td>1619-32</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester, St John's</td>
<td>1587-1644</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester, St John's</td>
<td>1670-6</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester, St John's</td>
<td>1677-9</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester, St John's</td>
<td>1684-1730</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester, St Michael</td>
<td>1560-1644</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester, St Michael</td>
<td>1653-94</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester, St Oswald</td>
<td>1607-20</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester, St Peter</td>
<td>1626-86</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Just in Penwith</td>
<td>1588-96</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Cumberland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Workington</td>
<td>1757-1801</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Durham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Ryon</td>
<td>1593-1615</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucestershire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Bristol, Christchurch</td>
<td>1570-1629</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol, St Ewens</td>
<td>1568-84</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol, St James</td>
<td>1637-8</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchcombe</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herefordshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Ledbury</td>
<td>1596-1607</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Bishop's Stortford</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</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><strong>Lancashire</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Blackburn</td>
<td>1565-69, 1586</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalton</td>
<td>1673-1765</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leicestershire</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Leicester, St Mary</td>
<td>1586-90</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester, St Margaret</td>
<td>1739-40</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Montgomeryshire</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Welshpool</td>
<td>1680s</td>
<td>Y2</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northamptonshire</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Daventry</td>
<td>1732</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oundle</td>
<td>1657-1869</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shropshire</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Ludlow</td>
<td>1601-2</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludlow</td>
<td>1717-24</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludlow</td>
<td>1741-1835</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeley</td>
<td>1649-1760</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morville</td>
<td>1610-1714</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oswestry</td>
<td>1680s</td>
<td>A4</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Warwickshire</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Coventry, St Michael</td>
<td>1594</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Westmorland</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Burton</td>
<td>1784-1804</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wiltshire</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Salisbury, St Thomas</td>
<td>1574-1607</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury, St Martin</td>
<td>1634-40</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yorkshire</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Sheffield</td>
<td>1571</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A civic document which lists householders by ward, of which there were twelve in Chester. It is not strictly topographical, for in some wards widows were bunched together. Moreover, it is not clear whether it simply lists householders or whether landlords were sometimes charged, as certain names recur several times. The poor were exempted from the rate. Using a survey of the poor for 1631 Alldridge estimated that around twenty per cent of the population were excluded, giving a total of circa 6280. The source can also be compared with a list of inhabitants by ward drawn up in 1628.


2: The names and surnames of all the Inhabitants within the Eastgate ward Masters and members of famillices, Widdowes, sonnes, daughters, prentices, journiemen and woemen servants that are above the age of sixteene years. (1641). CCRO Cas 1. fol.2. 234-9.

This is a form of poll tax, although the exact reasons for its compilation and precise date are unclear. The latter can be ascertained by comparison with other records. The coverage of residents is thought to be reliable and can be checked using contemporary listings for the parishes of St Michael’s and St Peter’s which lay within the ward. Poorer householders were listed, although their names were crossed out and they did not pay the tax. It is a particularly useful source for it gives the occupations of both householders and other members of the household and also notes ‘inmates’. The tax was probably collected in circuit fashion, although as with other Chester rate books it begins with the gentry.

3: A note of all the inhabitants of St John’s parish (1641). CCRO Cas 1, fol.9.

On the back is written ‘Pole money’ and it is thought that it was compiled in response to the poll tax of 1641, although again the precise date is unknown. Despite the heading it does not appear to cover the entire parish. There are certainly fewer households than in other lists. Although St John’s was a suburban ward, the lists include a number of householders with status titles. The coverage of the source probably extends to the poor, several names having an N beside them in the margin which may indicate inability to pay.

4: The inhabitants of St Giles ward (1641). CCRO Cas 1, fol.6.

Again undated, but thought to be a Poll Tax which Alldridge believes would have encompassed at least eighty-five per cent of householding population. This list together with number 3 covers the whole of St John’s parish and can be compared with the Easter Roll for that year. In both lists the marital status of
women is not always clear. The other members of the household are named but rarely described. Most units are separated by lines.

5: Chester Holy Trinity: Paschall Rolls, (1547-1599).

These lists form part of the churchwardens' accounts and give householders only with no extra details. The coverage is probably better than in the later assessments for the parish. A description of the rolls can be found in J.R. Beresford, 'The Churchwardens' Accounts of Holy Trinity', Journal of Chester and North Wales Architectural and Historical Society, 38, 1951, pp.111-22; 129-70.

6: Chester, Holy Trinity: Parish Assessments, (1547-1633). British Library, Harleian MS 2177 fo. 21b-52 (1547-1632) and CCR O P1/11 and 1/12 (1633-1703).

The rates for church repairs and similar items were determined according to property ownership. They may be more socially exclusive than pure Easter Rolls or wage lists, a problem resulting in large fluctuations in numbers from one year to the next and the fact that even if two assessments were made in one year the names are not necessarily identical. The fullest lists yield totals of 114 in 1619, 104 in 1629, 129 in 1632 and 151 in 1633. Particularly low totals were obtained using the assessments for 1597, 1606 and 1624.

7, 8, 9, 10: Chester, St John's: Easter Rolls. CCR O, CR BN 39 (1587, 1598, 1612, 1620, 1642, 1644); BN 40 (1670-76); BN 41 (1677-79); BN 42 (1684-1730).

The rolls were arranged in circuit order, although the parish élite normally headed the list. In many cases gaps between names or the bracketing of individuals makes it clear where one household ends and another begins, however there is a slight problem with solitary names. For example did these people really live alone or, given the prevalence of multiple-dwellings in Chester, were they independent members of larger housefuls? This is also a problem of other Chester listings. The identification of individual units is particularly difficult in 1612. The lists from 1598 to 1620 give all members of the household with some indication of their relationship to the head. The later books from 1670 onwards list householders only. Non-payment had become more widespread by the eighteenth century, although the fact that defaulters were still listed suggests good coverage. Moreover, almspeople were included and occasional marginal notes indicate that an individual was poor.

11: Chester: St Michael's, Quarterage Lists in the Churchwardens' Accounts, (1560-1599). CDRO P65/8/1.

These lists record the amounts paid quarterly by every householder towards the curate and the clerk's wages and for other 'necessaries'. Servants contributed independently at Easter. The collection encompassed the poorer members of the parish, for the lists include cellar dwellers and other people who paid at a minimal rate. Moreover, comparison with lists of the poor produced in 1600 and during the 1610s reveals that many of these people featured in the Quarterage lists. Occasionally extra details are provided such as notes for
newcomers and people who had recently left the parish.

12: Chester, St Michael’s, Parish Assessments in Churchwardens’ Accounts, (1653-1694). CDRO P65/8/1 and P65/8/2.

These lists are less comprehensive than the earlier Quarterage lists, but similar in format.

13: Chester, St Oswalds, Quarterage/Morning Prayer Lists in the Vestry Book, (1607-20). CDRO P29/7/2.

These also list householders and the amounts contributed towards the church and the minister’s wages. People are assessed on their ability to pay rates ranging from 2d to 2 shillings, although not everyone eventually paid. As is true of other Chester listings, the names are arranged in circuit order but began with the parish élite.

14: Chester, St Peter, Ministers’ Wage Lists in the Parish Account Books, (1626-86). CDRO P63/7/1.

The assessments range from 12d to 24 shillings and were based on property. Arrears were common. The lists continue after 1645, but as they relate to repairs only and not wages they are more socially exclusive.


These ledgers name all communicants and indicate servants, who paid a rate on wages in addition to the standard offering of 1d. A few occupations are given. Lodgers or ‘boardmen’ are occasionally indicated. The lists are subdivided into various settlements which are arranged topographically; farm names being given.


Each list in this series was used for several years, with crosses to show that payments for Easter dues and small tithes had been made. By this date people simply paid a lump sum for their tithes, as the heading of the lists, ‘A composition agreed upon by the inhabitants for their lambs, wool, geese etc’ indicates. Again householders only are listed and the lists are probably arranged in circuit order.


The Easter Book is included in a book with details about other tithes. Easter tithes were paid on hens, lambs, wool, eggs, bees etc and individual offerings of 2d for a single person, 3d for a married couple, and 1d for children and servants were also collected. No street names are given, but the names are grouped according to the four quarters into which the parish was divided.
Wives are named and widows noted. Children are specified, but servants do not appear to be labelled. 'Boardmen' feature in a few households. Three hundred and eight households were noted in 1593, a year when 878 people took communion at Easter.


Every Easter the parishioners in Christchurch were rated at between 12d and 10 shillings per household. Apprentices and children made an offering of 2d whilst the rate for servants varied according to their wages. The delineation of households is particularly good in the books for 1593-6 and 1599 and as the total number of households enumerated each year is very close it is thought that the coverage is reasonably accurate. The labelling of individuals within each unit varies. In 1570 wives were specifically named, an unusual feature in Easter listings. In some years, such as 1578 and 1588, journeymen and apprentices are specified.


A number of Easter lists of varying quality are included in this memoranda book. Apparently there are later lists in a subsequent book which continues to 1632. In 1574/5 the clerks noted all communicants. In other years only householders are included, although separate lists were made for servants and young people in 1568, 1569, 1571, 1575 and 1582. Sometimes they are simply named and sometimes their masters are noted.

20: Bristol, Receipts of St James Parishioners, 1637-38 for 16 yeres old and upwards. BCRL 4531 S165-9, XLIX.

On the first folio of the document is a key indicating codes for the various members of the household such a v for widow and p for sojourner. It then states that any figures between 2 and 7 by a 'distinct family shews ye number of the children the father or mother hath'; that the figure 8 indicates that the individual was between eight and eighteen and the figure 18 young, unmarried people of eighteen upwards. Unfortunately this information was never filled in and, given the title of the document and the small number of children recorded, it is dubious whether those under sixteen were in fact included. Although there is no evidence why the census was made, it is probably a church listing, the need to know when people were ready to be catechised or reached communicable age inspiring the interest in ages. At the end of the document the clerk noted a sum total of 1033.
In general, lines separating each unit make it possible to distinguish individual households. Where there is doubt one can assume that a new household begins with each new married couple and that a single person belonged to the preceding household if his name was indented or that he had a specific relationship with the head. One interesting feature of this listing is that it distinguishes sojourners and strangers, a detail which the church authorities would also have found useful.


In addition to individual dues, people were assessed on property, gardens, cattle and garden produce. In general it is possible to distinguish one household from another. In cases of doubt the following assumptions can be made: When a name is indented the individual can be presumed to be linked with the previous household. If an individual was charged on a garden he or she is likely to be an independent householder. Widows are either clearly specified or can be identified because of the presence of offspring in the household compared to other seventeenth century sources. Coverage seems reasonably complete.


The Easter Books for Ledbury, a large parish covering both the town and an extensive rural hinterland, survive in a ledger giving details about the Easter collection and a variety of other tithes and rates collected by the vicar. The collectors noted the householder followed by the ‘youth’ in each street and township. The latter, ‘servants, apprentices, journeymen and maydens’, were divided between ‘those that doe take wages’; ‘those that doe not take wages’ and those who were receiving communion for the first time. Whilst householders were assessed on Easter offerings, gardens, milk, ‘gains or trade’ and ‘hands or trade’, non-householders paid the basic offering and, if waged, a rate based upon their income. New communicants paid half the normal duty. The coverage of householders is thought to be fairly comprehensive for the lists include poor people living in the hospital, who paid offerings only, and the occasional beggar. Estimates of the population obtained using baptismal data also testify to the comprehensive nature of the Easter Books. The lists were reasonably up-to-date for additional names were entered in the margins and in some years the clerk noted ‘strangers and poor that come by chance’. As young people are listed separately it is not possible to examine the structure of the household using these ledgers.


This is a record of householders for the parish of St Michael’s which included a small market town and a rural area. They are listed by street with notes of their contributions towards the clerk’s wages and the communion silver, and of the number of communicants in each unit. The extent of the coverage has not been checked, but the comparison with population totals for the 1670s suggests that,
if numbers were static between the 1640s and 1670s, the lists include at least three-quarters of the householding population.


The clerks noted householders alphabetically by christian name and sums for houses, oblations, animals and ‘houselyng pecunia’. Widows are given at the end of the lists. The lists cover an area beyond the town proper.


A detailed listing of householders and the amounts contributed for oblations, houses, land and various other items. It was probably drawn up in circuit order as the names follow roughly the same order. Individual townships are specified. Paupers are possibly noted, a sign of reasonable coverage.


The Easter lists are found in a ledger containing memoranda about the various tithes and rents belonging to the vicar. They are detailed in character and probably reasonably reliable in coverage. In addition to the standard Easter duty, the householder was assessed on his house and garden and on crops and livestock. The individuals within a household are labelled, but not always named. St Mary’s was one of six parishes, which, with St Martin and St Margaret, encompassed most of Leicester’s population.

27: Leicester, St Margaret, Easter Offerings (1739-40). Transcript by H. Hartopp held at the LRO.

Details of the Easter assessment are given in a terrier dating from 1712. As noted earlier, houses were rated and individual contributions were graded according to income and age. Marginal notes indicating that an individual was poor or had recently entered or left the parish suggest a high coverage of the communicant population. The delineation of households is not always clear. If the individual paid more than a shilling, the highest personal offering, then he or she probably owned or rented a property. But, if the individual was poor, as was true of many solitary widows, the amount paid is not a good guide to household status.


The document is headed ‘The names of all housekeepers within ye Parish of Poole and also ye names of all Children and servants vnder ye age of 18 with their age in figures over each name ye mark K over all yt have been catechised and ye marke C over all yt were confirmed’. It is of limited use for analysis of household structure as inmates over eighteen are excluded. As this is also true of wives it is not possible to ascertain which men were widowers, although widows are normally designated as such.

An Easter Book covering the market town and the small hamlet of Drayton. It was found in a general tithe book. Householders are listed in order of wealth and status.


A series of Easter Books survives for the years 1657-9, 1674-83, 1692, 1745-65, 1810, 1811, 1821, 1828, 1837, 1838, 1840, 1843, 1847-69. Apart from the number of available listings, the records are unusual for in Oundle the inhabitants were assessed on trade and subsidiary items such as wax, gardens, wool, cows etc. Only householders are covered and by the eighteenth century only those with a specific trade or members of the gentry. Therefore although useful for certain purposes they are no longer an adequate guide to the size of the householding population.

A particularly valuable feature of the Easter Books is that they can be used to study the occupational character of the community, the lists being arranged alphabetically by trades. In addition to freemen they listed 'inhabitants that exercise no trade', a miscellaneous group which were again listed in alphabetical order and were probably labourers; 'those who only keepe shoppes on market day' and who were possibly non-residents; freeholders and copyholders, a group whose presence testifies to the semi-agricultural character of the town; and finally the inhabitants of the parish's rural townships, Elmington and Ashton. Caution is needed when using the records since a few individuals each year were assessed on two trades or on trade and land, alehousekeepers being a case in point. The other main problem concerning the Oundle listings is their coverage. The lists for the 1650s are the most comprehensive. Labourers, who amounted to almost a third of the householders, do not appear to have been assessed in later years, but comparison with the Hearth Tax of 1662, itself a source which is biased towards the better off, suggests that even these lists do not cover the entire community. If allowance is made for people who died or migrated between the two dates it can be suggested that the Easter Book covered roughly three-quarters of the householding population.

In the later listings, whilst husbandmen were noted as a distinct group, there is no separate section for Elmington and Ashton. The inhabitants of these townships were probably included in with those of the town proper. Comparison with the Hearth Tax for 1674 (more reliable than that for 1662), again illustrates that the Oundle Easter Books are less comprehensive than those found elsewhere.
This notes householders in each ward, the amount they were assessed at and the amount actually received. A few occupations are given. The assessors did not adopt a strict circuit order, for women are bunched together at the end of each ward. It is unclear whether the assessment was levied on all householders or not, although the inclusion of non-payers and of those of fairly humble status (such as labourers) gives one confidence that its coverage was fairly extensive. Moreover, notes about people who had recently died indicates that it was reasonably up-to-date. Yet the total population is too low when compared with other sources. The Lewn can be correlated with a muster of 1614.

33: Ludlow Easter Books, (1717-1734). The first ledger for 1717-24 is held by the Ludlow Historic Research Group; the second for 1725-34 is found at SRO, 2881/1/78.

The Easter Books list householders liable for Easter offerings in alphabetical order by ward. Coverage is thought to be fairly extensive for almspeople and other paupers were listed even though they could not always pay their dues. The Easter dues are itemised in a terrier dating from 1735. The ledgers for the first part of the century are unusually detailed and include notes of people who had not received communion, who were too poor to pay and who were receiving communion for the first time. The series begins in 1717 but few years in the first ledger covering the period 1717-24 are complete.

34: Ludlow Easter Books, (1741-1835). Books are available for the periods 1741-52 (SRO 3834); 1756 (SRO 356/34/487); 1763-72 and 1785-88 (Ludlow Historic Research Group); 1789-1880 (SRO 2881/1/79); and 1804-35 (Ludlow Historic Research Group).

These lists are slightly less detailed than the earlier series, but still provide details of names, relationships and occupations. The churchwardens found it increasingly difficult to collect Easter dues and the lists become less comprehensive over time. However, those for the mid-century still cover the bulk of the adult population.

Note there are four wards in Ludlow. Castle ward and the ward known as Gaolford or Old Street included areas of humbler dwellings in addition to a range of more substantial properties. Broad Street and Corve Street were more homogeneous in character, the former being centred on the fashionable street of that name, the latter covering a street which stretched beyond the town gates and, at its lower end had features echoing the suburbs in other towns.


The series is almost complete apart from a gap between 1723 and 1756. The inhabitants of the parish were assessed on Easter offerings, cattle, hay, corn and tithe wood. Householders are listed with the other members of the household, although sojourners and workmen who only lived in the parish for a short while were noted separately. The latter were normally single men. Seventeen
were listed in 1649, the year tested, of whom only two were married. The numbers dropped in later years and in some books they were probably entered with the households where they lodged. A large number of units contained two families. The clear delineation of other couples suggests that this was a genuine feature rather than a reflection of the way in which the lists were compiled. Some of the individuals in question were evidently kinsmen, others may have shared the property, but have had no functional role in the household. Madeley was a large parish encompassing a number of townships, including Madeley, Madeley Wood and the growing industrial centres of Ironbridge, Coalport and Coalbrookdale. Unfortunately it is not possible to distinguish where each household lay within the parish.


These paper books were kept to be put in evidence in a Chancery suit in 1768. Most are for Morville, a rural parish three miles north-west of Bridgnorth, and its townships (namely those for 1610-44, ref. 9661; 1655-8, ref 9573b-e; 1667, ref. 9573f - in bad condition; 1669-74, 9573h; 1689-97, 9573j and 1710-14, 9662). A few also survive for the chapelry of Aston Eyre (1654, 9573aj and 1667-83, 9573g).

The records are arranged by townships following roughly a similar order and give the Easter dues payable on every man, his wife, children, servants and kin. Payments for kine, sheep, horses, bees, herbage, fruit and occasionally a mill or a furnace are also recorded. Servants, who were often specially named, paid an additional element for their wages. The occasional note of a pauper and erasures and references to arrears testify both to the comprehensiveness of the source and that they were kept up to date. However, they have not been systematically checked for coverage or gaps.


The document is headed 'The names of all housekeepers within ye Parish of Oswestry and the number of souls in each Family (with) the ages of all under 18 yeares'. The marital status of householders is not indicated. Widowhood can be inferred if a woman had young people with her, but as wives are not noted this is difficult for the men. However, it is at least possible to assess the number of adults and children in each unit. A large number of similar listings survive for other parishes in the diocese of St Asaph, for details see A. Whiteman (ed.), The Compton Census of 1676, 1989, pp.492-503


Similar ledgers also exist for 1613 and 1595, although the earlier document omits one side of Earl Street. These documents record the Easter offerings which were collected in order to augment the clergy’s income. All inhabitants of communicable age paid a fixed rate with an additional rate based on rents.
for householders and a charge on wages for servants.

St Michael's parish covered a major portion of the city, which according to a census taken at a time of scarcity in 1587 was inhabited by 6502 men, women and children. However, it did not include Cross Cheaping or Bishop wards, ranked second and eighth in terms of population. As they both included wealthier and poorer elements of the population, results for St Michael's should not be too biased. The listing was relatively up-to-date, the clerk noting many changes of tenure and useful details about property holding and about servants wages.

Coventry contained two parishes and ten wards. Details of their ranking in the early sixteenth century can be found in C.V. Phythian-Adams, Desolation of a city: Coventry and the urban crisis of the late middle ages, 1979, pp.164-6.

39: Book of all tenants situated within the walls of Coventry, (1650). CRO.

A fiscal document which is interesting to compare with no.40. It also covered householders, although the occasional repetition of names suggests that owners were sometimes rated rather than occupiers, and yielded a similar population total. However, this list covers the area within the walls only and thus excludes a small part of Gosforth ward and larger sections of Spon Street and Bishop wards.

40: 1652 Rate for the Maintenance of Ministers. CRO.

The 1652 rate was assessed on houses, shops and other properties. Owners may sometimes be rated rather than the occupiers of properties. Cross Cheaping and Bishop wards do not feature in this listing, they may have been included with Spon Street. The population total, produced with a multiplier of 4.5 on the assumption that most taxpayers represent householders, seems too low when compared with totals obtained from the Compton Census and the 1641 protestation returns. See A. Whiteman (ed.), The Compton Census of 1676, 1986, pp.434, 450.


A record of householders only, who were listed in circuit order with the amount contributed for oblations, gardens, and various items of livestock and crops. A 'P' by some names may indicate paupers. The coverage of the listing has not been checked. Marriage Duty returns are available which could be used as a comparative guide, although households are not clearly delineated in the returns.


Fourteen lists survive between 1574 and 1607 of varying quality and content. Those for 1585, 1593 and 1594 are the most detailed. They include totals of
apprentices, a group which the churchwardens did not always record for they were paid for by the head of the household. In general, households are clearly delineated, and in 1593 the inmates in many household units are bracketed together. Servants and kin are not always precisely labelled. Comparison with lists of the poor suggests that at most only four per cent of the householding population is missing.


These Easter Books are similar to those of the neighbouring parish detailed above, but individual members of the household are less likely to be specifically named and it is not always possible to ascertain the sex of servants. It is also slightly harder to isolate one unnamed unit from another, although cross checking between ledgers reduces the problem. Coverage is good, the lists including almshmen and most of those listed in the Poor Census of 1635.


Sheffield at this time was a large parish covering the town and five rural townships. Consequently the Easter Book excludes Eccleshall, Bierlow and Upper and Nether Hallam. According to a contemporary survey of 1616 the town had 2207 inhabitants and, on the basis of the 1672 Hearth Tax, it can be assumed that the rural sector was rather similar in size. Householders only are recorded. The reliability of the record has not been checked.
ECONOMY OF TIME? WEDDING DAYS AND THE WORKING WEEK IN THE PAST

Jeremy Boulton

Jeremy Boulton is a research associate at the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure and a Fellow and College Lecturer in History at New Hall, Cambridge. He is currently investigating wage and price data in early modern London.

'Students of the history of time measurement have a déformation professionelle: they welcome every hint of time-discipline and love to add it to their compilation of evidence. This is due, I think, to the sparseness of such evidence, especially for earlier periods: time consciousness and temporal constraints are so obvious that, like Poe's purloined letter, they pass unnoticed.'


Introduction

As the quotation above suggests, historians of the measurement of time find it, not surprisingly, difficult to find accurate quantitative information as to popular attitudes to the working week in the past. It is suspected that traditional working patterns were very different from those which were produced by the forces of industrialization in the late eighteenth and nineteenth century, but efforts to measure such change are usually frustrated by lack of hard information. Without such evidence it will always be difficult to know to what extent customary leisure traditions undermined or constrained the efforts of employers to enforce more regular, and economically 'rational' working times. Some authorities believe that before the arrival of factory-based machine-powered industry working habits were irregular, punctuated by frequent holidays and the observance of a bucolic 'St Monday'. Domestic industries like the metalware manufacturers of industrialising Staffordshire 'followed the traditional work patterns for domestic workshops, that is, they took things easy on Monday and Tuesday, working longer hours towards the end of the week and sometimes working all night on Friday'. More recently, Mark Harrison has argued that one should look for different working patterns not in any transition from a traditional to a modern industrial society but in an historical distinction between town and countryside. Towns and cities are held to have exhibited an early attachment to a regular working week. His evidence showed that the working week in such urban environments has been 'very disciplined, formalized, surprisingly regular and long... since at least the mid-eighteenth century'. Rather than seeing St Monday as evidence of traditional irregular working patterns Harrison sees it merely as part of an urban weekend 'almost all employed people, particularly in the towns, were to be found at work...
Tuesday to Saturday..., their weekend was Sunday and Monday. 2 There remains agreement that patterns of work in rural areas may have been more irregular than that of towns and cities, not only in terms of a weekly cycle but also wide fluctuations in the seasonality of employment. 3 There seems to be some agreement, too, that economic pressures and fluctuations in employment opportunities affected the rhythm of the working week. 4 The gradual restructuring of the working week came in the second half of the nineteenth century with the establishment of the Saturday half day holiday and the introduction of more large scale machine powered industry. 5 New textile factory towns such as Manchester were early beneficiaries of the Saturday half holiday movement. 6

This preliminary essay is intended to introduce information which might help in the task of measuring attitudes to the working week in the past. It concentrates, primarily, on the experience of large urban and suburban districts that contained substantial numbers of poorer or ‘working-class’ inhabitants, since it is the working practices of such individuals that are of particular interest. This does not mean, however, that the general approach is not applicable to rural areas, although the latter possess greater problems of interpretation.

Methodology and problems of interpretation

The methodological approach is essentially that the timing of weddings during the week should tell us something about perceived patterns of leisure time during that week. In essence, wedding days should cluster on those days when work ceased or was pursued less intensively by the workforce. Before we can use the timing of weddings to infer patterns of weekly leisure time, however, we need to know about the constraints over personal choice of wedding day exerted by Anglican canon law. This is needed to ensure that the timing of weddings is not produced solely by strictly followed legal or administrative requirements.

Under Anglican canon law marriages were supposed to take place only in the morning, between the hours of 8 a.m. and noon in the parish church of the bride or groom, during divine service. 7 Guests and witnesses, whether comprising an entire village or more carefully selected friends and neighbours, might be present on either occasion. Recalling his first wedding in 1598, the shipwright Phineas Pett remembered that it had been ‘at Stepney church upon a Monday in the forenoon. I kept my wedding at my own charge in my new dwelling house at Limehouse, accompanied with my brothers and sisters, my wife’s parents, and divers of her friends and kindred’. When his daughter Martha was married in 1637, on a Tuesday, Pett recorded that ‘she was married at Chatham Church, accompanied with the best sort of our neighbours, who were entertained in the garden under a long tent, set up for that purpose, where they ate dined and supped’. 8 Thus, for the convenience of guests and to avoid loss of earnings, weddings should have fallen on days set aside for leisure. The extent to which they fell on what were ordinary working days therefore, should tell us something about the leisure time available to the bulk of the population.
Unlike the case today, where the wedding ceremony is usually a private occasion with only guests admitted, church marriages in the past were supposed to take place in the presence of the local congregation during service time, and might often have coincided with other marriages, baptisms and churchings. This feature of seventeenth-century marriage needs some attention not only because such a restriction might have limited couples’ choice of wedding day, but also because some churches in London, St Saviour’s, Southwark amongst them, charged higher fees for couples evading the prescribed times. In 1613 the latter parish charged 5s 4d for a marriage by licence, 3s 4d for a wedding by banns ‘at extraordinary times’ and only 2s 6d for such a wedding at ‘the accustomed time’. Under canon law divine service was to be celebrated on all Sundays and Holy Days. The Litany, a separate service, was to be held on every Wednesday and Friday. It is known that a few churches in London followed this schedule. In practice many London churches in the early seventeenth century accepted (and profited from) the desire of many couples to marry outside the permitted times and hours. Thus weddings on ‘Sunday or holiday at service time’ cost couples 3s 4d in St Olave Hart Street but those married ‘afore service tyme or upon a workeinge day’ were charged double. Weddings ‘at extraordinary times when no service is’ cost 6s 6d in St Clement Eastcheap compared to 4 shillings ‘in time of devine service in the church’. Marriages on ‘prayer days’, when morning prayer was read and divine service celebrated, attracted lower fees than those celebrated ‘upon any other day’ in St Dunstan in the West. Weddings in service time were charged at a fixed rate in St Mary Aldermanbury but ‘for private weddings the profits to be as the parties can agree with the Parson’. It should be stressed that parishes which charged more for weddings on unusual days were very much the exception. Most London parishes distinguished only between licence and banns rather than the timing of the ceremony.

The Directory of Public Worship of January 1645 abolished the canonical restraint over the timing of marriage. The ordinance ordered merely that marriage was to be solemnized:

> ‘in the place appointed by Authority for Publique Worship, before a competent number of credible witnesses, at some convenient hour of the day, at any time of the year...’

The Directory excepted only fast days and advised against Sundays. The inception of Civil Marriage in 1653 eliminated all official restrictions on the timing of the marriage ceremony. These legal changes mean that great care is needed when interpreting the distribution of weddings amongst the days of the week during the period 1645 to 1660. It is particularly difficult to disentangle patterns of leisure from the timing of marriage in this period and this has not been attempted here.

In addition, it should be noted, that interpretation of figures from any one locality is, in some periods and in some regions, complicated by the extent to which parishioners actually married in their local parish church. In some districts it may be that many of those marrying in a church had no previous connection with the parish. If this is the case then the social and economic
characteristics of a particular parish might not be reflected in those who married in the local church. This also means that if large numbers of parishioners married in foreign churches the social composition of the marrying population under study might not remain constant. Under English canon law all marriages should have taken place in the parish where either the bride or groom was resident. However, before Hardwicke's Marriage Act of 1753, it is demonstrable that many couples avoided the residential qualification, either by undergoing a technically 'clandestine' (but nonetheless valid) marriage often, in fact, by abusing the marriage licence system. Some churches in London married huge numbers of couples from other parishes after 1660. The consistent failure of the Anglican church to enforce local marriage surfaced frequently during the debates over the growing problem of clandestine marriage in the later seventeenth and early eighteenth century. Efforts to tighten up the residence qualification under Hardwicke's 1753 Marriage Act were, to some extent, subverted by the statutory clause imposing only a four week residential qualification on couples, even this was reduced to a derisory fifteen days in 1824. Exploitation of this legal loophole enabled couples to marry outside their parish church using addresses of convenience. There is a little evidence that this practice may have been commoner in urban areas, where the choice of churches was wider and temporary lodgings more readily available. This problem should be borne in mind when considering the information presented below.

The timing of marriage in early-modern London

'You know that Munday is Sundaye's brother; Tuesday is such another; Wednesday you must go to church and pray; Thursday is half-holiday; On Friday it is too late to begin to spin; The Saturday is half-holiday agen.'


In studying the timing of marriage it is probably advisable to concentrate on parishes or districts with large numbers of weddings every year. This reduces distortions from the effects of popular festivals, random fluctuations, the effects of the prohibited seasons for marriage and the potential risk of bias in the event of changes in the propensity to marry locally.

Three large suburban parishes were chosen for the study: St Saviour's Southwark, St Dunstan's Stepney and St Botolph Bishopsgate. The first of these, St Saviour's Southwark, was a large suburban parish located on the south bank of the river Thames adjacent to London bridge. The population of St Saviour's grew from some 3000 in the middle of the sixteenth century to 7100 by 1603. Its occupational structure was dominated by large numbers of watermen who lived in the two western liberties of the parish, the Clink and Paris Garden. Otherwise its economy was notable for large numbers of miscellaneous handicraftsman and some large scale manufacturing, especially brewing and soapmaking. A significant retail and service sector clustered around the Borough High Street. Although the parish was relatively poor it did contain
significant numbers of wealthy individuals who ran High Street shops and service industries and operated the large scale manufacturing concerns. The parish of St Dunstan, Stepney, an east-end suburban area, comprised nine rapidly growing hamlets. In the early seventeenth century its enormous geographical area contained a wide variety of occupations, but its economy was dominated by maritime trades, notably shipbuilding and sailors. Both parishes grew rapidly in the later sixteenth century, with growth in Stepney outstripping that of St Saviour's. It seems likely that Stepney was transformed in this period from a semi-rural parish of some 2000 people to a conglomeration of suburban communities containing some 11,300 inhabitants in 1606-10. Being a much older urban settlement, St Saviour's did not experience a comparable economic transformation. The third parish, St Botolph, Bishopsgate, was located in the liberties of the city, on the north eastern city walls, between Shoreditch, Stepney and Aldgate. Little is known about the occupational structure of Bishopsgate, although the likelihood is that its economy was dominated by low status craftsmen and tradesmen. It was one of the poorest parishes in the city of London in 1638. Its population had expanded rapidly from some 950 in 1548 to about 4700 in 1603. The timing of marriage in these suburban parishes is set out in table 1.

Table 1. Weekly distribution of marriages in early modern London

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>St Saviour's Southwark</th>
<th>St Botolph, Bishopsgate</th>
<th>St Dunstan, Stepney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>1581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>1611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>1633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>1632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1634</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean number per year</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: For this table and subsequent ones the day of the week on which the event occurred was calculated from C. R. Cheney (ed.), Handbook of Dates for Students of English History, London, Royal Historical Society, 1961. The percentage columns may not sum exactly to 100 due to rounding.

Source: St Saviour's, marriage register, Greater London Record Office, P92/SAV/3001-4.
A. W. C. Hallen (ed.), The registers of St Botolph, Bishopsgate, Edinburgh, 1886-95.
The following points emerge from a consideration of table 1. In all three periods every day of the week was available for marriage, on no day was the church ‘closed’ for weddings, which reassures us that the table does not reflect simply the idiosyncrasies of the local church administration. The similarity of some of the weekly patterns in the three parishes for the seventeenth-century is also encouraging, since it eliminates the possibility that other local factors, such as the availability of a minister, had a significant determining effect. Friday and Saturday were consistently unpopular days in all three parishes. The seventeenth-century figures for Saturday, suggest what might have been predicted, namely that before the widespread establishment (or perhaps re-establishment) of the Saturday half day holiday in the nineteenth century, that day remained a normal working day in the capital. Few couples married on Saturday in these suburban parishes. It may be of interest that in St Saviour’s and Bishopsgate there is a suggestion that Saturday had some preference in the sixteenth century, possibly reflecting the last vestiges of the medieval holiday.

Another interesting finding deriving from the table is that the data appear to suggest the absence of a regular and intensive working week. These early modern London parishes seem to follow a more irregular working pattern. In all three parishes weddings occurred in significant numbers in the middle of the week. In St Saviour’s, Southwark, Thursday was favoured, rising from 11.5 per cent of all weddings 1576-81 to between 22.2 per cent and 24.3 per cent thereafter. In 1633-5 it was the most popular day for celebrating marriage. In Stepney both Thursday and, in stark contrast to St Saviour’s, Wednesday attracted relatively large numbers of marriages. Indeed population growth in Stepney was associated with a remarkable increase in the popularity of Wednesday marriages. From being the second most unpopular day 1576-81, Wednesday became the most popular by 1611-13. From this peak, however, Wednesday’s popularity declined. Similarly St Botolph’s displays a mid-week peak on Thursday in the sixteenth century, and on Wednesday in the early seventeenth.

Bunching of weddings in the middle of the week does not seem to have been caused merely by the unpopularity of Fridays and Saturdays since, as will be shown later, the existence of the taboo Friday in nineteenth century London did not produce a similar pattern. It may be that the pattern of the working week was less regular than it was to become subsequently. Seventeenth-century suburban Londoners seem more often to have seen working days as suitable wedding days. This is consistent with the notion that the creation of a regular working week, was, in urban areas, produced in the eighteenth century by new commercial forces and a more regulated civic environment. It is possible to find contemporaries satirising the irregular working practices of the early seventeenth century. One of these, quoted at the head of this section, even suggests that Thursday was taken as a half holiday. This is not to equate large numbers of week day marriages as signs of leisure preference or voluntary abstention from work. They might as easily relate to extensive underemployment and irregular work opportunities in the capital which for many may have undermined the order of the working week. If volume and intensity of work may explain the weekly pattern of marriages then the sixteenth century figures are suggestive, since, as is noted below, they suggest a
more sharply delineated working week, with heavy concentrations of weddings on Sunday and Monday and only modest mid-week bunching. Could this be related to greater work intensity in the capital at this period, before population growth outstripped employment prospects and undermined the regularity of the working week?

However, the canonical restrictions, discussed in the previous section, also acted to influence the decisions of couples. In particular it seems likely that the bunching of marriages on a particular day during the working week can be explained in some cases by reference to the timing of local public worship. A dated list of 'money received at the church dore' in St Saviour's, Southwark, can be used to date the actual timing of weekly services. This list reveals that services were usually held on Sundays and Thursdays. Reference to table 1 reveals that the latter day was one of the most popular two days for marriage in the parish in the early seventeenth century. In this case, therefore, it seems reasonable to deduce that the canonical restrictions on marriage influenced couples in their choice of wedding day. Many couples, having decided to marry on an ordinary working day rather than on Sunday, preferred the cheaper service time. One might guess that the mid-week bunching of marriages in Stepney on Wednesday and the peaks in Bishopsgate reflect local variation in the timing of divine service during the week. Reference to table 1 shows that in the 1630s, 45.2 per cent of all weddings took place on Sundays and Thursdays, coinciding with the timing of divine service in St Saviour's. As the earlier discussion implied, the formal requirement of canon law was therefore being flouted in the majority of cases, and couples were preferring to spend a little more for that privilege.

Another means of finding out about the weekly distribution of church services is to look at the timing of christenings in a church. Canon law stated that baptisms were supposed to take place on the first Sunday or Holy Day after the birth in divine service. If baptisms show heaping concentrating on particular days these might well coincide with the local timing of church services. Table 2 presents the daily distribution of baptisms in St Saviour's, Southwark. As can be seen, baptisms in that parish coincided markedly with the timing of church services on Sundays and Thursdays in the early seventeenth century, with 87-9 per cent of all christenings occurring during a church service. In 1579, however, the church was used more promiscuously, with there being no obvious mid-week service time. The Thursday peak in weddings in the 1570s has no counterpart in the timing of baptisms, suggesting a preference uninfluenced by the effects of the timing of local church services. Otherwise table 2 is encouraging, insofar as it shows that weddings were less constrained than baptisms by the timing of local church services.

The weekly pattern of services in London churches only explains concentrations on certain weekdays. Attitudes to, and possession of, leisure time, best explain the timing of marriage. The bunching of marriages during the week must mean that many couples were prepared to celebrate their wedding on what was an ordinary working day, rather than waiting until labour ceased on the Sunday.
Table 2.  Weekly distribution of baptisms: St Saviour’s, Southwark, 1579-1634

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1579</th>
<th>1612</th>
<th>1634</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The percentage columns may not sum exactly to 100 due to rounding.
Source: St Saviour’s, baptism register, Greater London Record Office, P92/SAV/3001-4.

The timing of marriage in all three parishes indicates a weekend centring around Sunday and Monday, although the growing popularity of mid-week marriages in the early seventeenth century reduced the sixteenth century predominance. In Stepney and St Saviour’s, in 1576-81 between 61 and 67 percent of couples married on either Sunday or Monday. In both parishes this had diminished to between 36 and 42 per cent in the early seventeenth century. ‘St Monday’, if such it was, was remarkably visible in Stepney in the later sixteenth century. Bishopsgate showed the same trend, but Sunday and Monday weddings remained more popular, falling together from 66 per cent in the 1570s, to 53 per cent in 1611-13 to 49 per cent in the 1630s. In St Saviour’s, Southwark, Sundays were the most popular marriage day, reflecting the cessation of work on that day until the 1630s. Sundays were easily the most popular day in St Botolph’s. In all three parishes the proportion of Sunday marriages decreased between the sixteenth and seventeenth century.

At this point it would be useful to be able to distinguish the effects of differences in wealth and occupation on the timing of marriage. If available leisure time is important one might expect the better off to exhibit a different daily pattern of weddings. Accordingly, table 3 sets out the timing of marriage in St Saviour’s, Southwark, broken down by method of marriage. Marriage by licence, rather than by the calling of banns, was the more expensive method of marriage in the Anglican church. Purchase of a licence enabled couples to avoid publicity associated with the wedding service, dispensing with the calling of banns and often enabling them to be married in a church of their own choosing. Marriage by licence was also an accepted means of marrying on any day or outside canonical hours. Before the 1620s in London it was a method of marriage resorted to by only a minority of wealthier couples, after that date there is considerable evidence that the practice spread somewhat further down
Table 3. Weekly distribution of marriage by licence or banns: St Saviour’s Southwark, and St Botolph’s, Bishopsgate, 1576-1635

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>1576-81 Licence</th>
<th>1576-81 Banns</th>
<th>1611-13 Licence</th>
<th>1611-13 Banns</th>
<th>1633-5 Licence</th>
<th>1633-5 Banns</th>
<th>1632-5 Licence</th>
<th>1632-5 Banns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% by licence</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The percentage columns may not sum exactly to 100 due to rounding.
Source: See table 1.

the social scale, as the dramatic increase in licence marriages in St Saviour’s, Southwark, in 1633-5 reveals. However, if one takes those marrying by licence as a proxy for the wealthier sort, table 3 should enable us to disentangle any wealth effects on the timing of marriage. In general those marrying by banns were more likely to get married on Sundays than those marrying by licence. Despite the removal of the wealthier elements of the population, however, the mid-week peak in marriages remains. The banns population only differs from the general population in that Sunday marriage remained more popular, particularly in the 1630s when the increase in the use of marriage licences depresses the overall incidence of Sunday marriage. Sundays were always the most popular day for marriage for those marrying by banns in St Saviour’s, Southwark in the period examined here. The same popularity was also marked in Bishopsgate. It is noticeable that, controlling for wealth in this way, in both Bishopsgate and St Saviour’s the banns population appear to exhibit a preference for Monday weddings, Mondays being ranked either second or third in popularity in both parishes. Could this be some evidence for ‘St Monday’ amongst the poorer sections of the working population of the two parishes?

The essential difference, then, in the timing of marriage between those marrying by licence and those marrying by banns was that those couples marrying by licence consistently avoided marrying on Sundays. In St Saviour’s, 1576-81 the figure for the latter was 16.4 per cent compared with 45.4 per cent amongst the banns population, 10.1 per cent compared with 33.7 per cent 1611-13 and 8.6 per cent compared to 31.2 per cent 1633-5. In Bishopsgate in the 1630s the
licence population was half as likely to marry on Sunday as those marrying by banns. For the licence population weddings were commoner on other days of the week, notably Thursdays and Tuesdays. Fridays and Saturdays remained unpopular among both groups. Those able to afford the more expensive form of marriage probably also possessed more leisure time during the week. In particular the avoidance of Sundays might have been due to a desire for a more private wedding service, out of the hurly burly of Sunday divine service when so many of the poorer sort married. It is, however, noticeable that those marrying by licence in St Saviour’s also displayed some preference for Thursdays, when we know services were usually held.

The rôle of Sabbatarian thinking should also be discussed since Sunday marriages offended this code. Both the feasting and dancing associated with the marriage celebration and the preparation of food for such wedding feasts violated the Sabbath. Two influential puritan writers, Nicholas Bownde and Richard Greenham, both criticised Sunday wedding dinners explicitly. Greenham suggesting that, if necessary, weddings should be postponed to another day to avoid such profanation. Opponents of Sabbatarian thinking claimed that such opposition was taken to extreme lengths.30

The decline of Sunday marriage observeable in table 1 therefore might be related partly to the prevailing climate of religious belief. The Sabbatarian movement grew in importance and vehemence during the early seventeenth century and there is some evidence that London may have been penetrated exceptionally heavily by such thinking.31 If a link between the timing of marriage and puritan thinking could be established it would add a hitherto unsuspected dimension to the current debate on the effects of puritan religious thought and the extent to which the so called ‘reformation of manners’ was imposed on English society before the Civil War.32

To summarise the data on wedding days thus far. Sundays were popular in the early seventeenth century, notably among those marrying by banns, but other days such as Monday and Thursday were also favoured. Friday and Saturday were consistently unpopular in the seventeenth century, although Saturday may have been a little more popular in the sixteenth century. Those marrying by licence were particularly unlikely to marry on Sundays and, therefore, more likely to get married on ‘working’ days. All the large London suburban parishes exhibited mid-week peaks in weddings, one explanation for which might be a less regular working week.

A nineteenth century perspective

In order to place the evidence presented above for early-modern London into a broader time perspective, it is instructive to examine the available evidence for nineteenth century urban environments. Such an investigation enables us to make some assessment of whether the distribution of wedding days changed
Table 4. Weekly distribution of marriages: National sample and select Registration Districts, 1864 and 1881

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1864</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National sample</td>
<td>St George Hanover Square</td>
<td>East London</td>
<td>Lambeth</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>4057</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>1102</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: East London comprises the Registration Districts of St George in the East and Whitechapel. The percentage columns may not sum exactly to 100 due to rounding.


between the two time periods and if so whether such a trend might be related convincingly to changing patterns of leisure time between the early seventeenth and nineteenth centuries.

Marriage data for urban areas are selected from surveys conducted by the Registrar General in 1864 and 1881 (table 4). It should be noted that these figures are not as straight-forward as they at first may appear. The figures were drawn from different quarters of the calendar year, and this, because of the effect of the timing and effect of popular holidays and festivals, modifies some of the patterns slightly. Furthermore the national figure given by the Registrar General is an unweighted mathematical average of disparate samples, and in fact conceals interesting regional and social variations. In addition the Registrar's figures include, for the most part, those marrying outside the established church.

Table 4 suggests that Sunday, the traditional leisure day, was universally the most popular day to celebrate weddings, particularly in working class East London and the more socially mixed district of Lambeth. Constraints over leisure time may explain this pattern. 'Economy of time is an alleged motive for Sunday weddings' noted the Registrar in 1866. The distribution of marriages also lends support to the existence of 'St Monday' in these urban areas. The predominance of Mondays in London was not even as great as appears from
these figures due to the distortions imposed by the effect of popular holidays, although it was still the second most popular day for marriage in districts of the capital. There may, however, have been some exaggeration in the comments of a contemporary observer of early nineteenth century London, "we see Saint Monday so religiously kept in this great city...in general followed by a St Tuesday also." It was particularly in Birmingham and Manchester that the popularity of Monday weddings was most marked, indeed in Birmingham it almost equalled Sundays. Given the extensive observance of 'St Monday' reported in these towns this latter finding is, of course, precisely what we might expect.

Otherwise the distribution of weddings in the poorer urban districts suggests a working week running from Tuesday to Saturday. There is some suggestion that the intensity of work increased steadily until Friday, but there is little sign that any 'St Tuesday' was observed widely. This represents an interesting difference with the earlier figures. Only Manchester amongst the districts in table 4 displayed any mid-week bunching of the sort found frequently in seventeenth-century London. This suggests, therefore, the existence of a more intensive and regular working week in the capital in the 1860s. It is noticeable that in the 1860s Saturday was the third most popular day for weddings. This may be some evidence that a Saturday half holiday was being taken. Although pressure for a Saturday half day existed in the cotton districts in the early nineteenth century, pressure to observe the holiday increased with the formation of the Saturday Half Holiday Movement in the 1830s. Table 4 does suggest some degree of leisure activity on that day, often of course, pay day in many trades and crafts. The wealthy district of St George, Hanover Square, again reflects the more abundant leisure time possessed by the better off. Fridays remained unpopular but, although Sundays were the most popular day, their predominance was not marked (see above table 4).

Data for Manchester collected by the Registrar General for 1881 also suggest that that town adopted the Saturday holiday early, much as we might expect from the dominance of the industrialised cotton industry. Saturday weddings were unusually popular in Manchester in 1864. By 1881 Saturday was the most popular day, having taken precedence over business from Sundays and Mondays in that city. Otherwise the great unpopularity of Friday weddings in all areas is noticeable, either because the working week was at its most intense on that day, or because of superstitious avoidance of a day popularly thought to be unlucky.

Obviously more data would be required in order to draw firm conclusions about changes in the pattern of the working week. More information on wedding days in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries is needed to establish the chronology of any changes with greater confidence. As it stands, however, the figures suggest that, in marked contrast to the less regular pattern exhibited in the early seventeenth century, for poorer districts of London, the working week was reasonably regular, with a weekend centring around Sunday and Monday, in contrast to the less regular pattern exhibited in the early seventeenth century. The nineteenth century figures suggest that the Saturday holiday was becoming more popular, and are especially supportive of the
popularity of ‘St Monday’ in Birmingham and Manchester, both of which findings agree with substantial literary evidence.

**Wedding days and holidays**

Attachment to particular holidays might also have affected the timing of marriage. If a sufficiently large sample of weddings is available, therefore, it might be possible to make some quantitative measure of the extent to which known holidays attracted disproportionate numbers of marriages in this period. This is also important for the argument presented here, since if weddings bunched heavily on holidays one might need to recalculate the figures given in table 1 and 4 to allow for the effect. To pursue this the wedding days of those couples marrying during the year 1667 in the clandestine marriage centre of St James, Duke Place, were examined to measure the extent to which the most popular wedding days coincided with religious or civic holidays.

The results of this exercise are particularly informative. Of those days attracting relatively large numbers of marriages six Sundays, five Mondays, one Tuesday, two Wednesdays and two Thursdays did not appear to coincide with any known religious or civic festival. The remaining popular days did correspond to holidays. The Easter and Whitsun festivals accounted for exceptional numbers of marriages on Sunday, Monday and Tuesday. The festivals surrounding Christmas and the New Year were especially popular, including St Stephen (26 December) when 20 out of 286 couples (7 per cent) marrying on Thursday were married and New Years Day which attracted 17 couples (7.8 per cent of all those marrying on a Tuesday). The enduring popularity of these three major festivals is well established.

In addition to these major festivals, this exercise also revealed the popularity of May Day for marriage in London, which attracted seven out of the eighty-two couples (8.5 per cent) who married on unpopular Wednesday. May Day had long been associated with sexuality in the urban environment. The traditional London holiday of Shrove Tuesday also attracted disproportionate numbers of couples. Gunpowder Plot was also markedly popular. Lastly, February 14, St Valentine’s day, although not an official religious or civic holiday, does seem to have attracted a disproportionate number of couples, drawn one presumes, by the romantic overtones of the day in question and the customs of which are documented in the pages of Pepys’ Diary. Obviously such an exercise is little more than suggestive since it uses data relating to one year and one place only. In a larger study one would need to allow for the contradictory effects of unpopular days and the prohibited periods for marriage, of Lent, Advent and Rogationtide. In particular, for example, St Valentine’s day in 1668 fell in Lent, on a Friday, and hence attracted only one couple to marry in Duke Place in that year.

It should be stressed that the popularity of certain holidays, although measurable, was certainly not overwhelming in this period. It was rare for any day to attract even double its annual average in Duke’s Place which suggests
that controlling for the observance of such holidays would not alter the annual weekly distribution of wedding days presented above significantly. The fact that many popular wedding days do, in fact, coincide with festivals known from other sources to have been widely observed does, however, suggest that the timing of marriage can reveal something important about local attachment to particular holidays.

For the nineteenth century the Registrar General also noted, in both 1864 and 1881, how the observance of popular festivals affected the timing of marriages. In London during the quarter of the year 1st April to the end of June, no less than 75 of 253 (29.6 per cent) Monday marriages had taken place on Whit Monday, reflecting the popularity of the Whitsun festival in the capital. Similarly 69 out of 459 (15 per cent) of all Sunday weddings had taken place on Whit Sunday. In rural Surrey and Kent, Good Friday attracted no less than twelve out of twenty-eight weddings on that unpopular day. The bunching of weddings around the festivals of Easter and Whitsun, and on Christmas Day and Bank holidays was further remarked on by the Registrar in 1883.

Rural wedding days

The study of rural weekly patterns of marriages is likely to be a particularly difficult exercise. As table 5 illustrates the rural Registration Districts analysed by the Registrar General for 1864 exhibited a rather different pattern from that of most urban districts. Fridays remained unpopular, but Saturday rather than Sunday appeared to be the most popular wedding day, suggesting that abstinence from work was more likely on that day than in the urban districts. For Surrey and Kent the figures suggest a weekend stretching from Saturday to Monday, whilst for the northern counties they indicate a more irregular working week, with only Thursdays and Fridays attracting relatively few weddings. Early nineteenth-century Colyton showed a completely different pattern, with few weddings on Friday or Saturday and a more even distribution of weddings across the week. Interpretation of these rural figures is more likely to be complicated by the influence of popular holidays, however, since the number of weddings per annum in rural parishes is likely to have been small, in Colyton only about ten per year, the impact of a couple of widely observed holidays on the weekly distribution could have had a disproportionate effect. Such an effect could have been enhanced by the more marked monthly marriage seasonality in rural areas, which would have concentrated weddings into particular months, and possibly increased any tendency to marry on local harvest-related holidays. It is also unfortunate that we cannot control for the effects of wealth and occupation in the rural figures available. Changes in the tendency to marry locally might also have had an especially marked effect on parishes only celebrating a small number of marriages per year.

Bearing these limitations in mind it is still interesting that figures for Colyton in the sixteenth and seventeenth century resemble, in some respects, the London data from that period (see tables 1 & 5). In 1550-9 and 1600-9, weddings in Colyton fell most often on Mondays, Sundays being the next popular. In the
Table 5. Wedding days in Colyton, Devon and select nineteenth-century rural Registration Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Colyton, Devon*</th>
<th>Extra-metropolitan Surrey and Kent**</th>
<th>Cumberland, Westmorland and Northumberland**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1559</td>
<td>1609</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Totals         | 100  | 100  | 100  | 100  | 100  |
| n              | 79   | 155  | 96   | 595  | 505  |

Notes: The percentage columns may not sum exactly to 100 due to rounding.

sixteenth century Saturdays were reasonably popular, but few couples were marrying on that day by the first decade of the seventeenth century. The figures suggest a working week that included a long drawn out weekend of Saturday to Monday or Tuesday in the sixteenth century and Sunday to Monday or Tuesday in the first decade of the seventeenth. Yet unlike the London parishes there is no sign of any mid-week bunching. Such rural-urban contrasts suggest that more information on the determinants of wedding days in rural areas would be of particular interest and importance.

Conclusion

This paper is intended merely as an exploratory sally into relatively uncharted territory. The data on wedding days in seventeenth-century London, when compared with similar information collected by the Registrar General for the nineteenth century, suggest that significant changes took place in the timing of marriage between the two periods, which might best be explained by changing patterns of leisure time. If wedding days do reflect available leisure time then the earlier period suggests a less regular working week, with more individuals preparing to marry during that week. Sundays were favoured, especially by those marrying by banns, but many couples chose to marry on Wednesdays.
and Thursdays. In contrast in the poor and socially mixed districts of London in 1864, and in new industrial towns, a much more regular pattern of wedding days can be discerned. The 1864 data can be best explained by the existence of a more intensive working week and a weekend centring around Sunday and Monday. In particular, data from Birmingham and Manchester seem to illustrate clearly the existence of that 'St Monday' described so often in literary sources. The nineteenth century data also provide some evidence for the growing popularity of a Saturday half holiday in the later nineteenth century.

It is more than usually the case that such findings call out for further research. If the link between wedding days and leisure time has any validity then the eighteenth and early nineteenth century period might be one of transition from irregular to regular working patterns in towns and cities. Further research on the timing of weddings in towns and cities could shed further light into this dark corner of history. Much more work might also be done on wedding days in rural areas, although distortions imposed by wedding seasonality, small annual numbers and the observance of holidays might make interpretation of the results especially difficult. It might be necessary to collect large quantities of data on rural wedding days before systematic patterns can be identified. Many readers of LPS are peculiarly well qualified to perform such a task.

NOTES


4. Harrison, 'Time, work and crowds', p. 139; Reid, 'Saint Monday', p. 79. Hopkins, 'Working hours', argues, however, that economic depression merely caused an intensification of work later in the week, rather than the abandonment of 'St Monday'.

5. Harrison, 'Time, work and crowds', p. 140; Reid, 'Saint Monday', pp. 79-90; Hopkins, 'Working hours', p. 64; Rule, Labouring classes, p. 134

6. Saturday became a statutory half holiday in textile mills in 1850, Reid, 'Saint Monday', p. 86.

7. For the canon law surrounding the timing of marriage see, The Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical, London, SPCK, 1960, p. 27. A revision of canon law allowed a celebration as late as 3pm, this was extended to 6pm in 1936. The revisions to canon law followed earlier statutory changes in 1866 and 1934, see 'Miscellany', Local Population Studies, 39, 1987, pp. 59-61. The injunction to hold marriages during divine service was dropped in 1887. Civil marriage existed in England between September 1653 and 1660. It was reintroduced in 1837.


9. The fees for weddings in St Saviour's are set out in the broadside, A Rate of duties belonging to the Corporation of the Churchwardens of the Parish of St Saviour's of Southwark, London, 1613.

10. Constitutions and Canons, pp. 6-7, nos 13-15. St Bartholomew the Great charged women double fees for churchings 'upon a day not appointed for prayer viz. upon Mondays, Tuesdays,
11. Lambeth Palace Library CM7/5, 67
15. Constitutions and Canons, no. 62. This held for both those marrying by licence or by banns, nos 101-2.
16. The canonical position was complicated because the Archbishop of Canterbury possessed, or at least was commonly agreed to possess, the power to issue licenses breaking the residential requirements, despite the explicit wording of the 1604 canons. For contemporary concern over the canonical situation see, in particular, H. Prideaux, The case of clandestine marriages stated, London, 1691, printed in the Harleian Miscellany, 1, 1743.
17. The act also recognised the Archbishop of Canterbury’s right to issue licenses breaking this requirement. For 1824 see, 4 George IV, c. 76: 10.
18. Price in 1782 describing the marriage practices in Holy Cross, Shrewsbury, asserted that ‘the taking account of the marriages in this parish cannot be of any use in political arithmetic, because it is the custom of the fixed inhabitants to go out of the parish, and be married in distant churches; and the weddings performed in this church are generally between strangers who occasionally reside here so long as to make a place of abode according to the act of parliament made in 1754. R. Price, Philosophical Transactions, 72, 1782, pp. 56-7.
21. In 1605-10 55% of all those buried belonged to these occupational groups. Each hamlet contained distinctive elements. Bethnal Green, containing only a small percentage of Stepney’s population, possessed a large agricultural sector. The other inland hamlets, Mile End and Spitalfields, were dominated by miscellaneous crafts. The riverside hamlets were dominated by the maritime occupations. East London History Group, ‘The population of Stepney in the early seventeenth century’, Local Population Studies, 3, 1969, pp. 39-52.
22. The population of Stepney has been calculated from the totals of baptisms, an average of 350 per year, given in the East London History Group, ‘Stepney’, applying a birth rate of 32.5 per 1000, adding 5 per cent for underregistration of baptisms in relation to births. This produces a figure of around 11,300 for 1606-10. For the appropriate birth rate, see, R. Finlay, Population and metropolis, Cambridge, 1981, pp. 155-7. The population in 1548 can be calculated from the number of communicants listed in the parish, 1360, given in, C. J. Kitching (ed.), London and Middlesex Chantry Certificate 1548, London Record Society 16, 1980, p. 72. It has been assumed here that 25 per cent of the population were under the age of communion at that time. Ten per cent has been added to the final total to take account of any floating population. For this latter procedure, see, Boulon, Neighbourhood, pp. 18-19.
24. An example of extreme church control can be found in Wildberg, Germany, in the later sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Data kindly supplied by Sheilagh Ogilvie show that no one at all married on Thursdays, Fridays and Saturdays. The overwhelming majority of couples married on Tuesday, a concentration that increased during the seventeenth century. Such a concentration does suggest that local policy may have affected the personal choice of wedding day.
25. Harrison, ‘Time, work and crowds’, p. 141; P. Corfield, The impact of English towns 1700-1800, Oxford, 1982, pp. 85-6. It has been argued that the practice of beginning theatrical performances in early seventeenth century London daily, in the afternoon, reflected the privileged nature of the audience who had the time to spare. The poorer sort, working all through the day, six days a week, could not have attended. This is only one part of the evidence presented to support the central theme of A. J. Cook, The privileged playgoers of Shakespeare’s London, 1576-1642, Princeton, 1981, pp. 169-75, 224-8. If the working week was, in fact, less regular than this author supposes, then, clearly, the opening times may have been far less prohibitive to attendance by the less privileged.
28. For the use of marriage licenses in London see the discussion in V. Brodsky Elliott, ‘Mobility and marriage in pre-industrial England’, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge,
1978, pp. 10-17, 95-7. Note Elliott's claim as to the 'precision of banns: license ratios as an accurate guide to the social status of occupations' ibid., p.97. See also the helpful discussion in the introduction to B. Frith (ed.), Gloucestershire Marriage Allegations 1637-1680, Bristol) and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society, 2, 1954. Analysis of London parish registers, marriage license allegations issued by the Bishop of London 1600-1700, and information derived from other parish register evidence all points to a considerable growth in marriage by license in the capital commencing in the 1620s.

29. Bownde, in 1595, had requested the banning of marriage feasts, see R.L. Greaves, Society and religion in Elizabethan England, Minneapolis, 1981, p. 403. Greenham's exact words were as follows, 'If it be demanded, whether this day be fit for marriage or no: I answere, it is, because on that day as it is a day of rejoycing, there is a more lawfull libertie of speech, and a more liberall use of cheerfull behaviour. Howbeit, let them not on that day, if they marrie, make their solemn cheere: but seeing they may have a convenient compaine some other day, let them either both marrie and feast some other day, or marrie on the Lords day, and feast another'. R. Greenham, Works, London, 1599, p. 382. A Norfolk minister was claimed to have said that 'to make a feast or wedding-dinner on the Lord's Day is as great a sin as for a father to take a knife and cut his child's throat'. W.B. Whitaker, Sundays in Tudor and Stuart times, London, 1933, p.71 & 29 The link was made explicit when, following the return of the Anglican liturgy by the Directory of Public Worship in January 1645, it was added that of marriage 'we advise that it be not on the Lords Day'.

30. Firth and Rait, Acts and Ordinances, vol 1, p. 600. Hostility to Sunday weddings in Presbyterian Scotland in 1620 led to a Synod order 'that marriages were not to be solemnized on either Saturdays or Sundays unless the parties gave a ...bond that there would be no dancing or other prophanation of the Lord's Day'. See T. C. Smout, 'Scottish marriage, regular and irregular 1500-1940', in Outhwaite, Marriage and Society, p. 213. As a consequence of such strict Presbyterian Sabbath observance few Scottish couples married on the Sabbath eve, Saturday, or Sunday itself in the mid nineteenth century, as a survey made by the Scottish Registrar General showed, ibid, p. 228.


33. My thanks go to Kevin Schurer for his help in tracking down these reports. The national digest has been presented in T. C. Smout, 'Scottish marriage', p.228.

34. In 1864 in England and Wales 4 per cent of couples married with an ecclesiastical licence, 84 per cent in church or chapel and a mere 2 per cent by civil ceremony. In London the figure for marrying in a church or chapel was 88 per cent. Twenty Seventh Annual Report of the Registrar-General, London, 1866, p. xii. In London in 1864 78 per cent of all couples married by the rites of the established church, ibid, p. 2. Anderson found that the national figure for civil marriage was four times higher at 8 per cent. O. Anderson, 'The incidence of civil marriage', Past and Present, 69, 1975, p. 55.

35. A crude method of determining the social composition of these London districts was taken to be the percentage of domestic servants aged 20 or over in the total population of each district given in the 1851 census. Overall only 1.7 per cent of the population of St George-in-the-East and 2.6 per cent of that of Whitechapel were domestic servants in 1851, compared to a more substantial 5.0 per cent in Lambeth and no less than 19.6 per cent in the fashionable district of St George, Hanover Square (which included Mayfair and Buckingham Palace). For this census information see, BPP 1852-3 LXXXV Census of England and Wales. Population tables.


37. Thompson, 'Time, Work-Discipline', p. 73.

38. For Saturday holidays see, Reid, 'Saint Monday', pp. 99-100; Cunningham, Leisure, pp. 143-6. The history of Saturday working habits is somewhat obscure, but what seems to have been a fairly regular holiday in medieval and early modern times was probably like other holidays under pressure in the eighteenth century', Cunningham, Leisure, p. 145. Bienefield, Working hours, pp. 16-17 notes that masons in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century stopped work at 3pm on Saturdays. Landes has recently pointed out that Harrison's own evidence does, in fact, indicate that Saturday may have attracted a disproportionate number of crowds, Landes and Harrison, 'Debate', p. 197. Cunningham cites John Brand's comment (1777) on an earlier reference to 'the present custom of spending a part of Saturday afternoon, without servile
labour', Leisure, p. 145.

39. K. Thomas, Religion and the decline of magic, Harmondsworth, 1978, p. 740. The Registrar General noted that the unpopularity of Fridays may have been due to it being the day of the Crucifixion, Twenty Seventh Report of Registrar-General, p. xv. For intensive working patterns on Friday see, Hopkins, 'Working hours', p. 61.

40. A similar exercise examining the relationship between peaks in conception and fair and festival days has recently been undertaken by E. Lord, 'Fairs, festivals and fertility in Alkmaar, north Holland, 1650-1810', Local Population Studies, 43, 1989, pp.43-53.

41. The dates of these festivals were identified by reference to Cheney, Handbook of Dates. All the 1133 marriages taking place in Duke Place in 1667 were analysed. The criterion of popularity was to look at dates when the number of weddings was exceptionally large for that particular day. For the register, see, W. P. R. Phillimore and G. E. Cokayne (eds), The Registers of St James, Duke Place, London, 1900, I. For that parish's activities as a clandestine centre, see Brown, 'Fleet Marriages', pp. 119-20.


44. For Shrove Tuesday see, Burke, 'Popular culture', pp. 144-5; Cook, Privileged playgoers, p. 227.

45. For the popularity of the November the Fifth holiday see, R. Latham and W. Matthews (eds), The Diary of Samuel Pepys Vol X. Companion, London, 1983, pp. 163-4. For St Valentine's day see ibid., pp. 377-8. St Valentine's day had been observed since at least the fifteenth century, L. Whistler, The English Festivals, London, 1947, p. 92.


47. Controlling for this effect diminishes, but does not eliminate, evidence for the observance for 'St Monday' in the capital. The Registrar General did not break down the number of marriages taking place on Whit Monday and Sunday by district. If one assumes that the weddings on the two holidays were distributed in the same proportion as the totals of marriages in each district and then reduces the notional Whit Monday and Sunday figures to their quarterly norms (in the case of Whit Monday this would be the total of Monday marriages in the quarter minus the Whit Monday allocation divided by eleven) then the numerical effect is to reduce the percentage of marriages taking place on Mondays by 3-4 per cent in each district.


49. Good Friday was particularly popular in Manchester, the day attracting 36 couples in 1881 when the average was only 2.2, Forty-fourth Annual Report of the Registrar-General 1881, London, 1883, pp. xi-xii.

50. The Colyton figures available for the eighteenth century resemble those for the period 1800-09, the only difference being that there is no marked bunching on Thursday. L. Duchesne, 'Weekly patterns in demographic events', Local Population Studies, 14, 1975, p. 56.

EDITORS' NOTE

Methods of calculating the day of the week from a calendar date are not discussed by the author of this paper. Since it is anticipated that this is a subject that LPS readers will be interested in, a full and detailed account of techniques which can be applied to determine the day of the week of a particular date will be published in the following issue of LPS.
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Introduction

Migration and stability of population, which have been the subject of several studies,1 are examined here principally through the study of surnames. Migration and stability are detected in three different ways: firstly, from changes in the local stock of surnames; secondly from the continuity of families through successive generations, and finally, through the provenance of marriage partners.

Nantwich, a parish in South Cheshire, has been chosen for this study. During the eighteenth century Nantwich was mainly an urban parish with an additional four rural townships. The population of the parish at the start of the century was estimated from the Hearth Tax Returns of 1674 for Nantwich Hundred, using Gregory King’s multiplier of 4.4 for urban parishes.2 The population figures at the end of the century were taken from the Census Returns of 1801.3 During the period of investigation the population of Nantwich grew from around 2500 to nearly 4000.

The local stock of surnames

In studying Nantwich parish in detail, one soon becomes aware that certain surnames predominate, and that others, although not quite so frequent, occur regularly. By ordering the surnames alphabetically, and assessing their degree of stability or otherwise, it may be possible to reach some conclusions about the migratory movements of the local population. Families in Nantwich parish during this period were reconstituted from the registers of marriages, baptisms and burials, by the method first perfected by Henry.4 It is from these reconstituted families that the surnames of the parish were listed and counted. The surname was counted once only per reconstituted family, however many times members of that particular family appeared in the register. A marriage, or if there was not a marriage in the parish, a first baptism was used to initiate a family. An unrelated burial was not used because such an individual’s time in the parish could have been very limited. The years 1680-9, 1740-9 and 1800-9 were selected for attention. These periods are at the beginning, middle, and end of the reconstitution period; and since they are sixty years apart, approximately two generations passed between each (see table 1).5
From this study, it cannot be said with any certainty that any of the surnames present were medieval local names, or that the people living in Nantwich at that time were descendants of those who lived there from 1500 or so. However, in his study of Nantwich, Hall gives the surnames of individuals or families who were living in the parish prior to 1300. The surnames of Wetenhale, Venables and Brereton known in Nantwich before 1300 were still represented there at the time under review. Other names such as Mainwaring and Wickstead were present in the parish register more than one hundred years before 1680. The most frequent name in Nantwich during the study period, Wright, appeared in the parish register about one hundred years earlier than 1680.

In terms of their derivation most surnames can be divided into categories such as patronymic, occupational, topographical, or nicknames. The surnames most likely to be peculiar to an area are either topographical, or those not easily assigned to any of the categories mentioned above, for example, Hassall, the second most frequent name in Nantwich at this time. In fact, many of the surnames in the parish under study were common anywhere in England. It is unlikely that any new surnames came into existence in Cheshire after 1500. According to McKinley the formation of new surnames had virtually ceased in southern and midland England by the end of the fifteenth century, although in Lancashire there were still a few individuals without surnames. Wales was late in adopting surnames, and some Welsh surnames did not become hereditary before the eighteenth century. However, although this parish is within ten to fifteen miles of the Welsh border, the Nantwich register does not contain any name displaying Welsh prefixes, i.e. ap=‘son of’ or verch=‘daughter of’, although certain surnames such as Jones, Williams, Evans, Davies, Edwards and Roberts, suggest Welsh origin.

The Nantwich reconstitution produces 347 surnames in 1680-9, 422 in 1740-9 and 418 in 1800-9. Of the 1680-9 surnames, 175 were represented in 1740-9, and of the 1740-9 surnames 173 were represented in 1800-9. One hundred and two surnames were present in all three periods. If the continuity in surnames can be interpreted as genetic continuity it would seem that there was some population stability, but the appearance and disappearance of a proportion of surnames indicates an amount of migration. In-migration is represented by the introduction of new surnames, 247 in 1740-9 and 245 in 1800-9. Some of these surnames may be names of men who had moved in to marry wives already in Nantwich, as sometimes the baptism of the wife could be traced but not that of the husband. In other instances whole families moved in. The reverse movement of out-migration is to some extent represented by the disappearance of surnames, but some surnames will have died out rather than have migrated out. This may have been an important factor since for most of the period under review the population was barely replacing itself. The average family size was only 4.33 children, and as infant and child mortality together was approaching 500 per thousand in each generation, it may be predicted that something like one quarter of all families would not have had sons of marriageable age to carry on the name. However, this event would not automatically mean the disappearance of a name as more than one family might have possessed it.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1680-9</th>
<th></th>
<th>1740-9</th>
<th></th>
<th>1800-9</th>
<th></th>
<th>1680-1809</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n  %</td>
<td></td>
<td>n  %</td>
<td></td>
<td>n  %</td>
<td></td>
<td>n  %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>14 2.7</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>17 3.2</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>14 2.4</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>108 3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clowes</td>
<td>10 1.9</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>13 2.5</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>14 2.4</td>
<td>Hassall</td>
<td>72 2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>7 1.3</td>
<td>Hassall</td>
<td>10 1.9</td>
<td>Dutton</td>
<td>12 2.1</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>64 1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>7 1.3</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>10 1.9</td>
<td>Wilkinson</td>
<td>12 2.1</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>63 1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookes</td>
<td>6 1.2</td>
<td>Davies</td>
<td>8 1.5</td>
<td>Davies</td>
<td>11 1.9</td>
<td>Davies</td>
<td>58 1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittaker</td>
<td>6 1.2</td>
<td>Dutton</td>
<td>8 1.5</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>11 1.9</td>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>50 1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolis</td>
<td>5 1.0</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>8 1.5</td>
<td>Hassall</td>
<td>9 1.6</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>49 1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet</td>
<td>5 1.0</td>
<td>Barnett</td>
<td>7 1.3</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>9 1.6</td>
<td>Wilkinson</td>
<td>49 1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>5 1.0</td>
<td>Buckley</td>
<td>7 1.3</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>9 1.6</td>
<td>Brookes</td>
<td>48 1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>5 1.0</td>
<td>Wainwright</td>
<td>7 1.3</td>
<td>Bowker</td>
<td>8 1.4</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>48 1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>5 1.0</td>
<td>Wickstead</td>
<td>7 1.3</td>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td>8 1.4</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>48 1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although certain names died out, for example Clowes, Brookes and Bolis (see table 1), some others multiplied. For example, Walker went from one occurrence in 1680-9, to five in 1740-9, to fourteen in 1800-9. Dutton went from three occurrences to eight and twelve; Wilkinson from one occurrence to six and twelve; Davies from one occurrence to eight and eleven; Bowker from one occurrence to four and eight. Watson has illustrated a similar situation of surname-expanding for Cambridgeshire.\(^{12}\)

The stability of some names and the appearance or disappearance of others may represent a difference in behaviour between families in that certain families had greater residential stability than others. Of the 247 names first appearing in Nantwich in 1740-9, 169 had disappeared again by 1800-9. It is likely that those families with property, for instance yeomen, farmers and small land-holders, were more likely to have remained in the area than propertyless families, for example the landless labourer seeking employment. It has been suggested that those families with frequently occurring surnames within an area form a stable nucleus, and that on the other hand the individuals with rare surnames form a sub group which is unstable.\(^{13}\) Migration may have been habitual for some families, while others together with their descendants may have remained in the same place for a very long time.

Watson suggests that the stability of the population can be measured by the number of different surnames within the population. Drawing on the parish registers of Colne in Lancashire, 1599-1653 and a group of parishes in south Cambridgeshire, 1539-1640, he has used the frequency of the ten most popular surnames as an index to measure stability.\(^{14}\) The top ten surnames account for 34 per cent of the entries in Colne and 12 per cent in south Cambridgeshire (see table 2). Watson suggests that because Colne is more remote from London than Cambridgeshire, migration in Colne would have been less marked than in
### Table 2. The ten most common surnames in Colne, Lancashire and South Cambridgeshire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Colne, Lancashire 1599-1653</th>
<th>South Cambridgeshire 1539-1640</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>name</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Hartley</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Hargreaves</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Emmott</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Blakey</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Walton</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Holgate</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Cambridgeshire. However, as he only compares one chapelry in one region to several parishes in another region, his conclusion may not accord with findings elsewhere.

### Generational stability of surnames

Persistent families can be traced through the male line by following the surnames. In Nantwich it has been possible to trace six families through five generations, covering most of the time from 1680 to 1819. The Basfords started with Ralph, continued with son Daniel, grandson Daniel to great-grandsons Richard, Thomas and Ralph to great-great-grandsons John and William. Thomas Colley had a son, grandson, great-grandson and great-great-grandson all named Samuel. The Dutton family, in five generations were Gilbert, John and Gilbert, Thomas, John and William. The Mosse family started with John, son Robert to grandson, great-grandson and great-great-grandson Peter. William Nixon was followed by John and three Thomas’s. Equally, Jno. Penkethman was succeeded by four Samuels. There were twenty-four families who lived through four generations and seventy-two families who survived in the parish for three generations. About 350 families lived in the parish for two generations. More than four thousand families came and went within one generation. Consequently, while there was some stability with some families persisting for several generations, others came and went quickly over a very few years.

Of the six names above, not one appears among the most frequent names for the whole period. Dutton, with forty-six families of that name, appears in the 1740-9 period as a top name, whereas Nixon appears in 1800-9. There were twenty-one families of Nixons over the whole period. The Basfords comprised seventeen families, the Colleys twenty families, the Mosses thirty-nine families...
and the Penkethmans twelve families. It has been suggested above that a person with a surname which is common in their area is less likely to migrate than one with an uncommon surname. The implication is that strong kinship links inhibit out-migration supposedly because families support individuals.

In some families the male line failed, and the family continued only through the female line, with of course a change of surname. Thereafter the family line might continue in the male line, or wholly daughter to daughter. The Nantwich data were examined to see if there were instances of strong continuation through the female line. Only one family could be connected with certainty through the female line alone. Mary Goodwin married Richard Walker in 1693, their daughter Margaret married John Fox, their daughter Elizabeth Fox married Peter Moss, their daughter, Catherine Moss married Charles Higginson in 1792. The last couple had no children baptised in the parish. The Walkers had other children and descendants in the male line with the name Walker who were still in the parish in 1820. Margaret Fox had nine children, five dying in infancy, and although there were Foxes in the parish until 1820, they could not be connected with this particular family. Three families could be traced through three generations of the female line, and several through two generations. From the evidence of this parish the females were not as stable in residence as males.

From the evidence discussed so far, it is clear that many individuals and families did migrate from one locality to another. As the family reconstitution provides us with information at key points in the life-cycle it can be seen that some individuals went with their families not many years after baptism, others went for work or to get married elsewhere and some went after marriage. But a minority stayed put and it is these families or some of them that we were able to examine above. In some instances, continuity of a lineage could not be established, but it may be that there was kinship between individuals through connecting links in surrounding parishes. Without a more detailed study of these parishes it cannot be said whether or not this is the case. Where the out-migrants went to is open to conjecture, but at this time much migration would probably have been short-distance. Hence many individuals might well be found within a distance of fifteen miles or so after their movement away from Nantwich.

Provenance of marriage partners

The movements of individuals at marriage can give an important indication of migratory movements. For the parish of Nantwich, the declared residential locations before marriage of extra-parochial partners have been noted and are shown in figure 1. It is apparent that most brides and grooms found their partner from close at hand. The majority married partners who on the eve of their marriage were from the same parish (see table 3). This is not evidence for couples being born in the parish in which they married, as it has been found in registers with more comprehensive information that many who claimed to be 'of this parish' were not born there but presumably had migrated to and lived in the parish sometime before they were married. Some may have been servants in other people's households, and some may have come as farm workers, or as industrial or trade workers.
Figure 1  Marriage partners from the surrounding parishes to Nantwich, 1754-1819

Notes:  The map displays the parishes surrounding the parish of Nantwich, the outline of which is shaded in black. The Cheshire county border runs east-west across the map, separating Cheshire in the north from Staffordshire, Shropshire and Flintshire in the south. The figures printed within the parish boundaries indicate the number of marriage partners marrying in Nantwich yet originating from outside the parish. In addition, 102 marriage partners came from parishes located outside the area covered by the map.

The parish boundaries were plotted using the Institute of Heraldic and Genealogical Studies county maps of Cheshire, Shropshire, Staffordshire and North Wales.
Table 3. Distance travelled to Nantwich for marriage, 1750-1819

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Number of partners</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same parish</td>
<td>1423</td>
<td>80.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5 miles</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 miles</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 miles</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 15 miles</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside area covered by figure 1.</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the marriage partners who were not residing in the same parish were from nearby, mainly adjacent parishes. The numbers of individuals coming to marry from any particular place decreased progressively as the distance increased from the parish of destination. The individuals from outside the area came from all over England, one or two from as far away as London, and a few from Liverpool, Manchester and Birmingham and intervening distances from these places. However, the majority of marriage partners were living in the parish on the eve of their marriage, 80.3 per cent in Nantwich in the years 1750-1819 (see table 3). These figures are not unlike those offered by Hunter who found 32.7 per cent of marriages to be extra-parochial in the parish of Haynes, Bedfordshire 1774 to 1813, and by Millard who found 29.2 per cent extra-parochial marriages in Stony Stratford, Buckinghamshire in 1754-1793 and 32.2 per cent in the period 1794-1833.

Returning to the question of the birthplace of marriage partners, as stated previously, although it may appear from the marriage register that a high proportion of brides and grooms married a partner from the same parish, it does not follow that all of them were born there. According to the Nantwich reconstitution analysis for 1750-1819, only 314 grooms and 480 brides could be traced back from marriage in Nantwich to baptism in Nantwich, representing only about one quarter of those who were married there. The other three-quarters must have migrated to the parish sometime before marriage, if baptismal registration was complete, which I have argued elsewhere was the case.

Conclusion

Analyses of population stability and change in Nantwich have revealed a number of features. The study of surnames has shown that while there is a great deal of change among surnames over time, some surnames persist over long periods. There is some evidence relating to the minority of families who stayed put over several or many generations, that persistence in the male line was more likely than persistence in the female line. Even though more brides than grooms are baptised and married in the parish, the females do not continue through the generations to the same extent. Migration at marriage
occurred for about 20 per cent of the couples marrying, and although this gives some indication of the trend and direction of migration, it underestimated that total flow since migration clearly occurred at other times in the life cycle. Finally, it can be concluded that the population of this parish which constituted a stable element, persisting in the same parish over several generations, was not very large, however, such a stable core to the community can still be detected.

NOTES

14. R. Watson, p.28.
16. From the reconstitution the brides who were born in the parish were referred to their original family, the mother of the bride if she were married in the parish was entered against the bride. These entries were then sorted in two sequences by the bride’s name and the bride’s mother’s name. For each related pair the sequence of bride’s name were searched to find whether the bride’s mother has also been recorded as a bride earlier, if so the entries were extracted to form three generations and so on.
18. In the Nantwich parish register, place of residence is given for bride and groom from 1754 onwards.
RESEARCH IN PROGRESS

THE CHESHIRE PARISH REGISTER TRANSCRIPTION
PROJECT 1978-1989

P.E.H. Hair and C.B. Phillips

Unlike neighbouring Lancashire and Staffordshire, Cheshire has never had a parish register publishing society, hence only a very few registers, or segments of registers, have appeared in print. Furthermore, local church opposition has limited the amount of microfilming of registers by the Mormons. However, in the early 1970s the county and diocesan record office began its own programme of microfilming registers. These various factors led in 1978 to the county archivist, Brian Redwood, together with the authors of this note, founding the Cheshire Register Transcription and Computerization Project, a project active since.

The aim of the project is to produce an edition of the parish registers which will not only reproduce all the data in the entries in the Parish Registers (PRs) but will incorporate variant information from the Bishop's Transcripts (BTs). The edition will be stored in the computer and will be available as output from it. The data can be processed to produce, for instance, indexes of names, but it can also be 'interrogated', that is, certain data elements can be sorted out and assessed, for instance, quantitatively. In view of the general scholarly acceptance of the need for a national parish register index - one comparable in range to the post-1837 St Catherine's House index of secular registration - the present note records our progress so far. It indicates some of the very many problems we have faced and have overcome - or are, we believe, overcoming - in the expectation that this report will be of some assistance to later similar projects.

The two operating principles of our project are of equal importance - the adoption of up-to-date computer-based processing methods, and the large-scale involvement of volunteer labour. To date, some 300 volunteers have worked, for varying periods of time, in the project - mainly residents of Cheshire, Greater Manchester and Merseyside, mainly working at home. In Stage One of the procedure, volunteers transcribe from 'hard copy' (reprographic copy) of sections of individual registers, the hard copy generated from the relevant microfilm in the record office. Most volunteers therefore work on post-1700 easily-read material, while the earlier, more difficult but less abundant material is transcribed by a small number of specialist transcribers. The transcript of each volunteer is checked by a fellow worker.
Standardized transcription forms were designed at the beginning of the project, and are issued in 'pads', together with a book of detailed standard instructions. Despite the patent theoretical difficulty that the standardization had to precede the mass transcription, that is, before the range of anomalies in the material could be ascertained, in fact both the forms and the instructions have worked very successfully, on the whole. To date only one major revision of the instructions has proved necessary and that was at an early date.

An outstanding feature of the project is that the transcription takes note of the corresponding BT (if extant), this forming Stage Two of the procedure. Without going into details, it must be said that this extension of the evidential base has created a further dimension of difficulty when planning both the standardized transcription and the computer programing. The noting of BT variants (including additions), together with any necessary checking of the original registers (when the reprographic material is difficult or illegible), is undertaken by a team of volunteers working at the record office in Chester.

An absolutely basic point we have had to bear in mind, is that once volunteers have got under way, it is impossible to stop work when an improvement or correction in the system of transcription of the kind that affects all the earlier work is discovered - you cannot take on 100 volunteers and after years of labour tell them that their work is scrapped and they must start again. Fortunately, after the major revision mentioned above, we have needed only minor improvements, and we have a way of introducing these. Pads completed by volunteers and incorporating any BT material are ‘edited’ by a group of trained volunteers working under the direct supervision of the organisers. Since these editors check all pads, partly to deal with transcribers’ queries and to adjudicate on possible BT variants, they are thus in a position to insert minor improvements. This is Stage Three in the procedure. The instructions for transcribers need not change, the instructions for editors can easily be modified, and have been. However, such modifications have arisen mainly in respect of the occasional anomalies that turn up when dealing with hundreds of thousands of PR entries, anomalies that call for an additional rule. Once the transcription has been finalized, we are prepared to consider granting access to these manuscripts, a courtesy that has already proved of some help to a few local and family historians.

In 1978, probably the most novel part of the project was the intention to process and make accessible the transcribed material by computer. A pilot project at Liverpool in 1979 enabled MSC labour to input, by punch card, 10,000 entries, using experimental mainframe programs designed by volunteer programmers. Since then, these programs have been re-designed thrice, and input via micro-computers (currently the BBC series) has come to replace punch cards. Our present computerizing procedure is as follows. Transcribed and edited material is inputted on micro-computers, so far mainly at Manchester, forming Stage Four of the project. In Stage Five, the inputted material, in the form of ‘files’ on floppy discs, is checked (both
machine-validated and visually) and if necessary corrected. **Stage Six** sees the material from the floppy disc transferred to the mainframe, that is, the university computer.

Our intention is that ultimately the data-inputting, like the transcription, will be a home activity, to be carried out by volunteers who own or have access to micro-computers and who will be issued with instructions and program discs. Once again, then, the project is designed to involve and be dependent on volunteers among the general public. For inputting on micro-computers, like the transcription, requires both careful, intelligent attention and a considerable expenditure of time.

We estimate that the PRs of the ancient county of Cheshire between 1538 and our cut-off date of 1871 contain some three million entries. To date we have transcribed about a tenth of these, covering segments of about one third of the parishes. Computerization made a later start but is now speeding up. Currently we have 40,000 entries on the computer (on ‘tapes’), in a form in which they can be interrogated. A further 30,000 baptism and burial entries have been inputted but await checking and transfer to the mainframe. When the transcribed material has been computerized in sufficient quantities, perhaps in whole parish units, it will be made accessible in appropriate forms. At the moment we favour microfiche, and we have produced a trial fiche (of part of the PR of Macclesfield Christ Church) - now consultable in the record office.

**Problems**

Although Brian Redwood retired in 1986, the Cheshire RO continues to lend the project essential support. But the organisation of the project has always been undertaken by the authors, neither of whom can spare it more than a portion of his academic time. It was therefore necessary to organise the project in such a way that it was largely self-running. We have had to use volunteers almost entirely, because the project has run since 1979 on a shoe-string. Small annual grants from local government sources, together with overheads carried by the record office and our universities and our departments therein, have been its only financial support. Our expenses have been mainly on the printing of the transcription pads and the purchase of computer discs and tapes. The question that anyone considering a similar project in another English county will ask is therefore this - how practical is it to run such an ambitious project with volunteers only and without massive financial support?

Although Cheshire local history and family history societies have shown interest in the project, and do frequently inquire when our material will be available to them, recruitment of volunteers has seldom resulted from direct appeal to the local societies. Recruitment has been principally by personal approach, volunteer to volunteer, although many volunteers turn out to be members of local societies. The modest speed of the project
inevitably causes wastage of volunteers who lose interest, and we
regrettably also lose those who move away or die. Yet, in general, our
problem has not been that of finding volunteers, but of organising them.
Since it would not be practical for us to deal directly with individual
transcribers, we recruit local organisers, who then handle local recruitment
and who pass the material (pads, instructions, etc) up and down the chain.
Shortage of organisers limits the localities in which we have active groups
of transcribers. We meet our organisers at intervals, to discuss progress.
Editors, who work with us at Liverpool or Manchester on a more or less
regular weekly schedule, are more difficult to recruit; and we are deeply
grateful for the devotion of our present long-serving colleagues. The
authors divide Cheshire and organise the West and East sides respectively;
but to ensure consistency we and our editors meet regularly and exchange
queries.

Weeding out the occasional volunteer who cannot follow instructions or
whose transcription is more illegible than the original takes tact. But
almost invariably we gain volunteers who tackle the tedium of transcribing
with enthusiasm and care. They are encouraged to work in pairs, which
enables easy mutual checking. Although they often prefer to work on the
register of their own parish, they must undertake to accept any work they
are given, both because the process of obtaining hard copy is such that we
cannot guarantee always to have specific material available, and because
we wish to concentrate effort on a reasonable grouping of parishes.
Whether we will be as successful with volunteers for computerizing
remains to be seen - we may have over-estimated the rate of spread of
home computers. We certainly under-estimated brand incompatibility.

Certain problems with the computing will be familiar to anyone who has
worked on a large-scale computer project, and there is no doubt that we
under-estimated these at the beginning. Data input proceeds at a steady
pace, but the simple logistics of keeping a check on the whole process
whereby a transcription pad moves into and through the computer system,
are laborious and time-consuming. The scale of the data files necessitates
storage for mainframe use on magnetic tapes. Problems of strained
compatibility between our two university computers have proved at
various times exasperating. The technology in hardware and software
available at the start of the project has significantly improved over the
period, yet it has not proved possible to update some of our handling
routines to take advantage of the benefits - not at least without paying a
price in terms of work by transcribers and inputters that would have had
to be scrapped, a price we thought too high. Two changes of mainframe
computer have proved devastating, causing delays of probably three years
in the development of data handling programs. Finally, there has been a
change in the appreciation of computer data by historians: they are now
more sceptical of the value of unprocessed data banks. As far as this
project is concerned, with its emphasis on producing a computerised
edition, this is not a major objection, and in any case we believe that our
data files are capable of further manipulation for more specialised pieces of
research.
Why bother?

The recent realisation that demographic history provides an entry into the history of the masses in earlier centuries has concentrated attention on the PRs. But to date all historical studies based on PRs have had the limitation that the registers could only be considered individually, and hence multi-parochial conclusions could only be drawn by averaging the individual statistics of individual parishes. Integrating the data available in the registers of a group of parishes was very difficult. Most manuscript PRs have no index; the printed PRs with an index are only a small proportion of surviving PRs; and there are almost no district or regional indexes covering a number of parishes - let alone county or national indexes. Hence inter-parochial migration cannot yet be tackled on any scale, although some valiant pioneering research has suggested that migration may turn out to be the dimension which, when known, modifies certain of our present conclusions about English population history. Hence we in Cheshire are trying to achieve a county index that might be a model (warts and all) for a national index. Our computerized index would be several centuries ahead of the St Catherine's index, which only alphabetizes surnames - we will be able to sort most categories of data within PR entries. That is, we can isolate and analyse all the entries relating to, for instance, cordwainers, or children dying 0-5.

Archivists are happy to cooperate because parish registers are the most used documents in record offices and the flood of customers is wearing away the originals (but the customers complain about having to use microfilms - or having to make a six-weeks-ahead appointment to get on the machines). Most of the current pressure on record offices comes from the booming interest in family history, and area indexes will be a godsend to the family and local historian, as well as to the academic researcher into population history.

Is the attention we pay to BT variants worth it, particularly since only a small proportion of entries turns out to have variants? There can be no doubt that introducing BTs into our project has slowed it down, and made both the transcription and the computer work more difficult. Our defence is that we have learned that the PR-BT relationship is a complex, inconsistent and often puzzling one. Sometimes the BT is not a pale copy of the PR but an independent source, with entries not in the PR or with additional detail. The differences between these texts may well throw important light on the process of compilation of the PR - and hence confirm the value of the inclusion of BT 'variants' in editions of registers. From the point of view of the project, it might, in hindsight, have meant faster progress if separate files for PR and BT had been provided for and been compiled. Yet this would have meant the gross duplication of many identical items, and complicated, if not inhibited, aggregative analysis of the data.
How scholarly?

The question we are most frequently asked is whether, using volunteers, our transcriptions are accurate. No transcript is a facsimile and therefore literally exact, and no transcription is wholly accurate. Our transcriptions are checked and checked, as are the computer data files, since every stage of processing involves the likelihood of additional error. It is all very tedious, but we claim that our end-product is at least as accurate as the best of other PR editions. Moreover, it is consistent from one PR to another, since we follow the same system of transcription throughout.

Our transcription system, like all such systems, is not wholly literal, in our case partly because we wanted to limit the tediousness to our volunteers. Thus, we do not require them to write 'son' and 'daughter' in every baptism entry, but only M and F (or, in rare cases where gender is ambiguous, U); and a few other categories of data are similarly coded. Names and occupations are copied literally. Variants in placenames are assembled in editorial notes; any non-demographic material inserted in the register is listed in these notes. Nothing that is in a register is omitted, being either transcribed literally, or coded, or noted.

Was our aim too ambitious? Perhaps so, although not necessarily in respect of tackling a whole county, since what has held us up is the planning, organising and programming, as much as the amount of material. Perhaps what we have done will help others to telescope this part of the game. As to the length of period to be tackled, undoubtedly we chose 1871 as the end date for ambitious reasons. Our notion was to overlap the censuses of 1851-71 and the secular registration records of the 1860s - these being more accurate than their predecessors - because we believed that our computerized programme could provide a matrix into which these other nominal-linkage records could be inserted. This would enable a check to be made on the comprehensiveness and accuracy of both the nineteenth century PRs and the secular records. (We went no further than 1871 because at the date of decision no census later than 1871 was open). We also thought that our matrix would accommodate other categories of nominal-linkage records, such as probate records and also certain nonconformist registers. We certainly did not lack ambition, but have of course had no time to attend further to these thoughts.

When available?

The question next most commonly asked of us is this - when will it be available? Even our transcribers are often disappointed when our material does not immediately reach the stage of computer print-out. Our aim is to make all the Cheshire Project material accessible via computer process as soon as is consistent with the progress of the project. To finance the project we visualise a charge for libraries and research institutions wishing to hold large quantities of computerized data, and for those making business profits out of the material. But we hope that this will enable the project to
offer free access to Cheshire local and family historians, to ‘poor scholars’, and to bona fide academic researchers. Producing microfiche will cost money - and threats from various quarters of the imposition of access or handling charges may not always prove hollow. We have therefore to steer a course between maximising scholarly access and bankrupting the project, the latter a tack that would do no-one any good. However, until we have computerized more material, we need take no final decisions on this tricky issue. But the project will not attain its scholarly aims until all its material is available.

It is now clear that the project will take somewhat longer than first envisaged - to be frank, about two decades longer, if we may judge by the current rates of transcribing and computerizing. At the age of one of us this is an interesting forecast. However, if the same calculation of rate of progress be done in relation to other long-term PR transcription projects, no county PR society continuing to use its present method of having registers individually edited and then printed in book form will put itself out of business before the year 2400. The difficulty is, of course, that there are only two of us, and not only our personal but our university life-spans are uncertain. We have therefore thought of turning the project into a PR society, even although we shudder at the thought of the complications in many directions this would cause. Perhaps the present note will produce a rush of good advice - or even a rush of successors:

**Note**

We cannot list by name our many volunteers, other than our indispensable chief programmer, John Clegg of Manchester Computing Centre. Nor can we mention by name all those in our universities and departments who have advised us or made our travail possible, or all those in the Cheshire Record Office who have taken on extra duties to help us. All the institutions mentioned have provided essential facilities. Our finances, after a 1978 MSC grant, have come from Cheshire County Council, Greater Manchester County Council and Greater Manchester Record Office.
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A GLOSSARY FOR LOCAL POPULATION STUDIES

A revised and enlarged edition containing articles on demographic terms and methods, on simple statistics and on sources for local population studies. A bibliography and a list of useful addresses are included.

£1.80 (postage and packing 24p) (1979)

THE PLAGUE RECONSIDERED - a new look at its origins and effects in 16th and 17th century England

The book sets out for the historian and for the general reader the medical and epidemiological facts essential for the understanding of plague and its effects and exposes the areas of controversy still remaining. It illustrates them by case studies of plague at Bristol, Colyton and Eyam.

£3.65 (postage and packing 43p) (1977)

ORIGINAL PARISH REGISTERS
in Record Offices and Libraries

£3.00 (postage and packing 37p) (1974)

THE FIRST SUPPLEMENT TO
ORIGINAL PARISH REGISTERS

£3.75 (postage and packing 37p) (1976)

THE SECOND SUPPLEMENT TO
ORIGINAL PARISH REGISTERS

£3.75 (postage and packing 37p) (1978)
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THE FOURTH SUPPLEMENT TO
ORIGINAL PARISH REGISTERS
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Guides for the historian, historical demographer and genealogist to the whereabouts of deposited parish registers in England and Wales, giving details of the place of deposit and of the dates of the registers deposited. Further supplements will keep the changing situation up to date.

To be obtained from booksellers or from Mrs M. Ballington, Local Population Studies, Tawney House, Matlock, Derbyshire DE4 3BT.

Special prices are available to members of the Local Population Studies Society.
NOTES AND QUERIES

AGE AT MARRIAGE OF SCOTTISH WOMEN,
CIRCA 1660-1770

Contributed by R. A. Houston

The population history of Scotland before the nineteenth century is no new topic of research. We know that numbers grew during the sixteenth century, stagnated and in some decades fell during the seventeenth then began a sustained rise in the mid eighteenth century. Such broad outlines of change are probably correct but population estimates are subject to a large margin of error. Information is very scarce before c1600 and most discussion has focused on trends after c1660. Unfortunately, very few reliable statistical data are available which could resolve the important issue of the relative importance of fertility and mortality in seventeenth and eighteenth century demographic trends. Scotland apparently shared the North West European marriage pattern yet it remains unclear whether mortality, nuptiality and fertility patterns resembled those of, say, England or Sweden. Mortality and fertility were of approximately equal importance in accounting for English demographic trends until the eighteenth century when fertility became primarily important; for Sweden, mortality improvements seem to have been the main reason for eighteenth century population increase. The principal problem is the poor quality of vital registration. Baptism and marriage records are frequently imperfect and burial registration often non-existent.

Received wisdom has it that population trends were primarily determined by fluctuations in mortality with frequent crises holding back later seventeenth and early eighteenth century growth. The late eighteenth century rise in population was mainly attributable to improved life expectancy: mortality stabilised, presumably at a lower level, thanks to improved nutrition, poor relief and medical care. This implies an improvement in expectation of life at birth from the high twenties to the high thirties between the late seventeenth and early nineteenth centuries - similar to France. There is evidence to support this view and Scotland seemed to have been subjected to periodic, if localised, outbreaks of famine mortality until well into the eighteenth century. Aberdeenshire may have lost a seventh of its population thanks to harvest disasters in the 1690s though the shortages of 1740-1, 1763 and 1782 became mainly Highland phenomena. Yet, without firm figures on nuptiality and fertility it is difficult to assess their part. Some information on age at first marriage and proportions never married has been presented though this is based on single communities or specific social groups and suffers from problems of typicality and small sample size. Add to this growing religious divisions in the eighteenth century and a small surname pool, which makes accurate record linkage very difficult and the uncertainty which surrounds even the crudest of demographic
estimates is readily understood. Further advances in knowledge are likely to come from the use of different techniques on apparently unpromising sources.

In 1953 John Hajnal showed that it was possible to derive the ‘singeulate mean age at marriage’ from census documents in countries where registration of vital events was inadequate for statistical measures. By summing the proportions of women unmarried in five year cohorts between 15 and 49 and making allowances for the population under fifteen, Hajnal was able to derive the mean number of years lived in the single state by women in his sample populations, the equivalent of the average age at first marriage. He allowed that the chances of women marrying could be influenced by levels of out-migration, mortality fluctuations and the age structure of the population while arguing that his technique had its own merits as a measure of nuptiality even where full and accurate registration existed. A worked example of Hajnal’s technique is provided in the following article.

Seventeenth and eighteenth century Scotland does not possess usable census documents except for a few isolated communities. However, one unused source can provide material to which Hajnal’s technique can be applied. The minute books and papers of the High Court of Justiciary contain records of statements of evidence concerning the cases brought before it: depositions. The Justiciary court dealt with serious offences such as murder, rape, arson and treasons and was the highest criminal court in Scotland. Its seat was in Edinburgh but after 1708 circuit judges were also sent out to try cases in regional centres. Deponents were required to give their name, occupation or status, residence, age and marital status (single, married or widowed), information which precedes the statement. Not all depositions contain this information.

Criminal court depositions are not an ideal source for demographic analysis and suffer from a number of biases the importance of which is vital to the strength of the conclusions since the data represent neither a cohort nor a census. We must show that the chances of appearing in a deposition are, as far as possible, independent of the chances of being married or single. It was legally possible for a female to marry at age 12 (males at age 14) though it was rare so to do. Women probably accounted for over a half of Scotland’s population in our period but for only one deponent in five. Indeed, the legal system placed restraints on anyone of defective judgement (such as the insane) or in an obviously dependent position giving evidence in court on the grounds that they might be subjected to influence. This meant the very poor, young children, household servants and, in theory, married women giving evidence for or against her husband. Seventeenth century legal theory held that women were more passionate and compassionate than men and that their evidence should therefore be treated with caution. However, the eighteenth century did see a growing recognition both of women’s personal responsibility before the law and their appearance as witnesses in court. Increasing numbers of women appeared as deponents during the eighteenth century and this means that the estimate derived below applies most properly to the first half of the eighteenth century.
There was clearly a preference for evidence given by independent adult males but where the case depended on female testimony they were used. Such practical considerations meant that women in the married and unmarried state appear in the records as deponents to events to which they were usually accidental witnesses. There is no evidence that the court discriminated against married or unmarried women when it came to taking evidence even if its attitude to women as a gender was at best ambivalent. Nevertheless, there are certain biases which should be borne in mind. First, the very poor are under-represented and the respectable middling sort over-represented. A fifth of all women deponents were classed as ‘servants’ and were therefore probably drawn from the lower classes. Servants were usually unmarried and their proportion in the larger towns during the 1690s was approximately the same as among deponents as a whole. Second, town dwellers account for about two fifths of the sample as a whole compared with perhaps a sixth of the total population. There is evidence to suggest that they married younger, thereby reducing the aggregate figure, thanks to superior employment opportunities and different social climate in the towns. Third, while the High Court was notionally a national institution there were large tracts of the northern and western Highlands and Islands which in practice never sent cases to Edinburgh. Private or ‘heritable’ jurisdictions, prevalent in this region, were abolished in 1747 but even in the 1750s there were very few deponents from the Highlands proper. However, geographical mobility from Highland to Lowland was increasingly common in the eighteenth century and some of those who said they lived in the Lowlands may have married in the north before moving. On balance, it is safer to take the figure presented above as representing Lowland Scotland, although there is some inconclusive evidence that in the north west Highlands women married at a younger age. Finally, women who appeared several times to give evidence were only counted once and can be treated as independent samples.

In short, there are biases in the source but not such as would vitiate the conclusion arrived at here. The data are imprecise but the figure presented here does offer a benchmark for comparison. A total of 6088 deponents are recorded in the records of the High Court of Justiciary between 1660 and 1770 of whom 5653 were of known age and marital status. Of these, 1203 were women of whom 849 were aged between 15 and 49. It is assumed that the marital structure of those for whom status is not given is the same as the known population since knowledge of marital status must be independent of the chances of being married or otherwise. Age information supplied by deponents is probably approximate with a pronounced digital preference for ages ending in, for example, six and for rounding to, say, 40 or 50 years. Nevertheless, the ages given are unlikely to be wildly inaccurate for our purposes. The average number of years lived in the single state of those ever married by age 50 was 26.6 years. The youngest married woman recorded was aged 18 years. Of women aged 50 to 88 (the oldest female deponent) 11 per cent described themselves as single rather than widowed or married and can thus be treated as celibate throughout their reproductive careers. This figure is much lower than the 20 per cent or more suggested in Scottish Population History. However, since the unmarried population may have experienced higher mortality the 11 per cent figure is likely to be a minimum one. If the age at
first marriage for women at the very end of the seventeenth century and during the first half of the eighteenth was of the order of 26 or 27 and celibacy 10 per cent or higher this would exert a considerable restraint on population growth. This is what happened in contemporary England, where between c1650 and c1750, mortality and fertility were of roughly equal importance in accounting for population stagnation. Celibacy was approximately 15 per cent over this period and the mean age at first marriage for English women just under 26.7 Conceivably, Scotland’s demographic regime before the nineteenth century was less completely determined by mortality than is conventionally assumed.

NOTES


4. I.D. and K.A. Whyte, ‘The geographical mobility of women in early modern Scotland’, in L. Leneman (ed.), Perspectives in Scottish Social History Aberdeen, 1988, p.97. Houston, Scottish literacy, p.60 provides an occupational breakdown of the 719 women whose occupation or social status is recorded 1640-1770. Direct evidence of female status is often lacking. An adult male would normally be described, if at all, by his occupation but servant is one of the few occupational designations given to women in early modern sources; women are usually described in relation to father or husband. Servants made up 37 per cent of all known designations, crafts and trades 43 per cent, gentry and professionals 11 per cent with the remainder drawn from farming backgrounds. Servants were usually younger, of lower status and more likely to be single than other female deponents.


6. Flinn, Scottish population history, pp.271-83.

A NOTE CONCERNING THE CALCULATION OF THE
SINGULATE MEAN AGE AT MARRAIGE

Contributed by K. Schurer

Introduction

In the absence of a system of registration in which marriages are recorded, or in a system in which the recording of age at marriage is deficient, for example in the case of many developing countries, demographers will often attempt to estimate the mean age at marriage from other sources.

If a census or census-type survey exists for the area under investigation, recording accurately the ages and marital condition of the population, then since it records a retrospective statement of the populations age-specific marital behaviour, this can be used to provide an indirect measure of the mean age at marriage. The Singulate Mean Age at Marriage, or SMAM as it is often known, is one of the most widely used of such measures. The index was originally developed by John Hajnal in 1953 to investigate aspects of the post second world war 'marriage boom' across Europe, America and Australasia,¹ and subsequently used to examine historical variations in the marriage patterns of Europe, concluding that the continent was divided into two by a line running from Leningrad in the north to Trieste in the south, the western half of the continent being characterised by relative late marriage and high proportions remaining unmarried, compared with a marriage regime in the eastern half dominated by early marriage and the virtual absence of people never marrying.² In essence, the SMAM measurement compares the age-specific proportions of those who are single – or to use the demographic term, never-married – with those who are married or widowed – ever-married – calculating the mean age at which the transition between the two states was made.

Calculating SMAMs

Using data for the Registration County of Essex from the published returns of the 1851 census, the following example illustrates how SMAMs are calculated. In the standard calculation two key assumptions are made. Firstly, nobody will marry under the age of fifteen; secondly, those still never-married at age fifty will remain so for the rest of their lives. With these assumptions in mind, one should preferably separate the population by sex and then extract or calculate from the census data the proportions never-married in the seven quinquennial age groups 15-54, as listed below. It is these that will form the basis of the calculation of the SMAM and with the figures to hand the calculation can now be made.
Essex Registration County 1851, Females

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>% never-married</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>15,497</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>14,694</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>13,205</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>11,705</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>9,970</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>8,812</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>7,412</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>6,746</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first stage is to calculate the mean number of years of ‘singleness’ lived per hundred persons for the population in question (i.e. percentage). For those aged under fifteen, since it is assumed that no one of this age will marry, the calculation is straight-forward, being 15 years of 100 per cent:

\[15 \times 100 = 1,500\]

To calculate the years of singleness for those aged 15-49 one simply aggregates the quinquennial means of the six age groups and multiplies the result by five to gain the figure in single years:

\[(97.5+64.8+35.8+21.3+15.3+12.6+11.3) \times 5 = \text{total years of singleness 15-49}\]

\[258.6 \times 5 = 1,293\]

Therefore the total number of years of singleness experienced per hundred persons of the population up until age fifty is:

\[1,500 + 1,293 = 2,793\]

However, since some individuals in the population will remain unmarried throughout their lives, one needs to adjust this figure to take account of this situation. On the assumption that those who are still unmarried by the age of fifty will remain so, the proportion of the population who remain permanently celibate or never-married can be measured from an estimation of the proportion never-married at age fifty by averaging the proportions never-married for the two quinquenial age-groups 45-54:

\[(11.3+10.0) / 2 = 10.65\]

Therefore the estimated number of years of singleness experienced by those never-married by age fifty is:

\[10.65 \times 50 = 532.5\]

Consequently, for those in the population marrying, the total number of years of singleness experienced per hundred of the whole population is:

\[2,793 \times 532.5 = 2,260.5\]
However, the actual proportion of the population who married by age fifty is:

\[
100 - 10.65 = 89.35
\]

This relates to 89.35 females per hundred in the 1851 population of Essex experiencing a total of 2,260.5 years of singleness before they married, giving a Singulate Mean Age at Marriage of:

\[
2,260.5 / 89.35 = 25.299
\]

**Words of warning**

Although an extremely useful measure, it must be realised that SMAMs are not the same as a straight-forward mean age of marriage. Firstly, SMAMs calculate ages at marriage by looking across the whole range of experiences of individuals aged between fifteen and fifty at a single point in time, with people of differing ages marrying at various different points in time, compared with true mean marriage ages which may be period and/or cohort specific measures. This may be important if the marriage patterns of an area are changing rapidly, with the result that those currently in their forties experienced a very different situation from those currently in their late teens and early twenties. Secondly, since unlike true mean marriage ages SMAMs are calculated retrospectively from census data, they are influenced by variations in both age and marital specific mortality and migration rates. For example, in the case of migration, if an area experiences a large-scale influx of young unmarried persons, say domestic servants, this will artificially inflate the proportions never-married and therefore also the SMAM. Equally, a relative out-migration of married couples would have the same effect. Clearly, one has to be aware of such effects especially when calculating SMAMs for local regional populations, the age structures of which can be significantly influenced by short-term shifts in age-specific mortality or migration levels.

Despite these reservations SMAM provides a useful index which in the absence of data yielding the ages of individuals at marriage can be used to compare the marriage patterns of populations over time or for different geographical regions. Although the standard model imposes assumptions concerning marriage under the age of fifteen and over fifty, if appropriate, these can be over-ridden simply by expanding the number of core quinquennial age groups under observation. Equally, if data are not available for the standard quinquennial age groups, but in say groups 15-19, 20-24, 25-29, 30-39, 40-49 etc., the basic equation can be adjusted accordingly to take account of the variation. Consequently, SMAM is a standard yet flexible index of marital behaviour that can be calculated easily from a variety of census-type information and applied in a comparative context.
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FAIRIES, DOBBIES AND THE WILL O’THE WISP

Readers of LPS may be interested in the following extract which is taken from a short article originally published in the Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society in 1945. The editorial board of LPS would like to thank Mr R. Hall of the Society for kindly granting permission for the extract to be published.

Upon the death of an uncle, the author of the article, Revd S. Taylor, inherited a bundle of papers which had originally been in the possession of his grandfather. Among these documents was a sheet of brown foolscap paper upon which the following entry had been written, apparently in the early eighteenth-century.

Deaths taken out of the Register of Lamplugh from Janry ye i. 1658 to Janye ye i. 1663.

Of a five-bar gate, stag hunting        4
Two duels, first with frying pan and pitchfork  1
Second between a 3 footed stool and a brown jug  1
Kild at Kelton fell races                3
Crost in love                           1
Broke his neck robbing a hen roost      1
Took cold sleeping at Church           2
Hanged for clipping and coynig         7
Of a sprain in his shoulder saving his dog at Culgate  1
Mrs Lamplugh’s cordial water            2
Knockd on ye head with a quart bottle  1
Frighted to death by fairies            4
Of strong October at ye Hall            4
Bewitchd                               7
Broke a vein in bawling for a knight of ye Shire  1
Old women drowned upon a trial for witchcraft  3
Climbing a crow’s nest                  1
Led into a horse pond by a will of the wisp  1
Overeat himself at a house warming     1
Died of a fright in an exercise of ye train bands  1
By ye parson’s bull                     2
Vagrant beggars worried by Esq. Lamplugh’s house dog  2
Chokd with eating (barley?)             4
Old age                                57

Total                                   113
Commenting on the document, the author noted that:

'The squire of Lamplugh Hall at the time was John Lamplugh, the tenth of his name, who was born in 1618, succeeded his father in 1636 and died in 1689. While still a young man he raised a regiment during the Civil Wars, commanded it himself in the King's cause, fought with Prince Rupert at Marston Moor and was there taken prisoner. Released from prison, he was back at Lamplugh in 1658, but a recusant and heavily fined, agitating and plotting, as were all the Squires of his views in England, for the speedy return of good King Charles. It is not surprising therefore that he gathered his partisans at the Hall to partake of 'strong October' and he is more than likely to have kept more than one watch dog to protect himself and his property from 'vagrant beggars', the disbanded soldiers of both parties in the state. His wife (she who kept the cordial water) was his third, the daughter of a neighbour and distant relation, Thomas Lamplugh of Ribton Hall, one of those astute men, of which there were a great number, who managed to enrich themselves and to prosper in these difficult times.

The Squire's brother George, twelve years younger than himself, became Rector at Lamplugh, at the age of 28, in 1660, the year of the King's return. His predecessor, John Myriell, who is stated in the Church register to have been buried in London on August 6, 1660, may have been the ejected Anglican Rector, waiting for the King's return to regain his living, while his pulpit was occupied by stray Presbyterian or other preachers. Whether it was he or young George Lamplugh who kept a savage bull and so became responsible for the death of two of his parishioners we shall never know.

The ordinary folk of Lamplugh Parish, yeomen and labourers, were much as they had always been, it may be supposed, good Cumbrians, who hunted recklessly, drank deep and fought with frying pans, pitchforks, stools, brown jugs and quart pots, while their youngsters robbed henroosts and climbed for rooks' nests. They retained their ancestors' fears of fairies, dobbies and will o'the wisps and put down many a natural death to the evil powers of harmless old women, who doubtless were too curious about their neighbours' affairs and took to interfering where they had no business, as old women have always done in all ages. The poor things suffered for it!

And here perhaps the reason for this extra spasm of wildness and violence in these troubled years may be found.

Was it the puritanical ministers and preachers who egged the parish on to the hunt and the death of witches? Was it they who added the fears of troubled consciences to the inherited superstitious fears of witches and fairies?

The writer can remember thirty years ago a certain game of football, played in a Lakeland village between two teams of boys, when, after the game, sitting beside him on the grass, a sixteen year old remarked, "My father says that I'll go to hell if I play football." "That's a pity, because you've just played a game
and a very good one too." "Aye", replied the lad, "I'll do that and a lot more before I'm done. If I'm to go to hell I may as well go to hell for a sheep as for a lamb!"

Between 1658 and 1663, the Lamplugh folk, suffering from the reactions of civil war, attacked by superstitious fears on one side and by troubled, worried consciences on the other, may have decided that they may as well go to hell for a sheep as for a lamb.

As so the wheel of history turns, bringing back to men the same evils and the same virtues as it turns.'

NOTES


An LPS Supplement

POPULATION STUDIES FROM PARISH REGISTERS

A Selection of Readings from Local Population Studies with an introduction by Michael Drake

A selection of contributions from LPS compiled around a series of topics: Marriage, Baptism, Burial, Migration and Area Studies. It brings together some of the most valuable items to have appeared in LPS during the last sixteen years.

Michael Drake's introduction outlines some of the basic procedures of parish register analysis and identifies the pitfalls and difficulties which can so easily trap the unwary.

252 pages including an index. Soft cover. ISBN 0 9503951 7X

Population Studies from Parish Registers can be obtained from booksellers or direct from Mrs M. Ballington, Tawney House, Matlock, Derbyshire DE4 3BT. Price £6.00 (plus 70p postage and packing).

Paid-up members of the Local Population Studies Society can purchase Population Studies from Parish Registers at the special price of £5.00 plus 70p postage and packing).
Naming Society and Regional Identity

Organisers: Marc Fitch Fund and the Department of English Local History, University of Leicester.

Venue: University of Leicester.

Date: 6th - 8th July 1990

Preliminary announcement.

The objective of this symposium is to attempt to collate and distill recent approaches to anthroponymy in relation to the wider concepts of social organisation, demographic change, and regional identity. In these aims, it intends to be both interdisciplinary and international in perceptions. Over three days, the themes explored will include grouped papers on:

- The genesis of surnames: Scandinavian influences, French influences on ME surnames, surnames and regional variation in the later middle ages, the evolution of bynames in England;
- Naming patterns in colonial and post-colonial North America;
- Naming patterns in England and continental Europe in the early modern and recent past;
- Isonymy and genetic structure in the British Isles.

The following speakers have agreed to present papers to date:
Professor Gabriel Lasker (Wayne State University) Dr Evelyn Lord (University of Leicester)
Dr Malcolm Smith (University of Durham) Dr Dan Smith (University of Illinois)
Dr Jeremy Boulton and Dr Kevin Schurer (CAMPOP) Roger Thompson (UEA)
Dr Gillian Fellows-Jensen (University of Copenhagen) Dr Ingrid Hjertstedt (Sweden)
Dr Richard Smith (All Souls College, Oxford) Cecily Clark (Cambridge)
Dr John Langton (St John's College, Oxford)

A further two or three papers may be arranged.

The purpose of the symposium is to be participative. The business will take place in Marc Fitch House, the new premises of the Department of English Local History. The seminar room provides comfortable accommodation for about 30-35 participants. Attendance at the symposium is therefore limited to the first twenty applicants (in addition to the speakers). Confirmation of a reservation needs a deposit of £30.

The cost to participants:

£90 Residential (including two nights of accommodation in the Hall of Residence, dinner on two evenings, and buffet lunches)

£45 Non-residential (including buffet lunches, but not dinners)

Enquiries are now invited to: David Postles, Department of English Local History, University of Leicester, Marc Fitch House, 3-5 Salisbury Road, Leicester, LE1 7QR.
A full programme will be available very shortly.
CORRESPONDENCE

Letters intended for publication in LPS should be sent to Kevin Schurer, 27 Trumpington Street, Cambridge CB2 1QA

A plea to readers

Dear All

Some readers may have noticed that few letters have been published in the recent issues of LPS. In case some people are wondering if this is due to a change in the editorial policy of the journal, let me assure that this is not so. The simple fact of the matter is that over the last two years very few letters have been sent to the journal for publication. So why not put pen to paper (or should it be finger to word processor keyboard?) right now and dash a letter off to me without further ado. This section of the journal is under a serious threat of extinction, please help contribute towards its survival.

Yours faithfully
Kevin Schurer
27, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, CB2 1QA

Why not join

THE LPS SOCIETY

For conferences, regional contacts and project work in local population studies.

For further details, payment of subscriptions and renewals please contact the Honorary Secretary:

Mrs Grace Wyatt
302 Prescot Road,
Aughton,
Ormskirk,
Lancs L39 6RR.
THE GEOGRAPHY
OF ENGLAND AND WALES IN 1910:
AN EVALUATION OF LLOYD GEORGE'S
"DOMESDAY" OF LANDOWNERSHIP

BRIAN SHORT, UNIVERSITY OF SUSSEX.

104pp. Price £4.95 (incl. p & p)

The monograph discusses the evidence of the Finance Act (1909-10) 1910 as it relates to matters of landownership and society in Edwardian England and Wales. The source is discussed and the enormous potential of the evidence for an understanding of the geography of England and Wales in the early twentieth century is revealed in a number of case studies.

from whom further information on the Series can also be sought.

Cheques made payable to 'Historical Geography Research Group'
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