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EDITORIAL

CSO and OPCS to merge

On September 20 this year a press release was issued from 10 Downing Street announcing that the Prime Minister had decided, together with the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Secretary of State for Health, that the Central Statistical Office (CSO) and the Office of Population, Censuses and Surveys (OPCS) are to merge to form a new 'Next Steps' Agency. This new body is to be called the Office for National Statistics, with the merger taking effect from 1 April 1996. The decision seems to have been a fairly swift one. Proposals for the merger were first announced on 25 April in the wake of the departure of the Director of the CSO, Mr Bill McLennan, who is returning to his native country as The Australian Statistician. Although a consultancy period took place, this was comparatively brief with a decision being reaching, in effect, by early July. In a separate press release issued by both Tim Holt the new Director of the CSO and Peter Wormald the current Registrar General and Director of OPCS a joint statement claimed that:

'The merger will unite the two central offices within the Government Statistical Service. This is a logical extension of the long-standing collaborative relationship between them. It will help us to improve the range and quality of our work, and also to give strong leadership to the Government Statistical Service on statistical standards and practices. We particularly welcome the remit which the new Office has been given to improve the co-ordination and accessibility of Government statistics generally, and to create a database of key statistics, whose aim will be to give a comprehensive statistical picture of the UK, its economy and its society.'

So what will this mean for those interested in the history of local populations? OPCS, of course, incorporates the General Register Office (GRO) which in turn is the body which historically has been responsible for the implementation of the Civil Registration process (from 1837) and the taking of the decennial census of England and Wales (from 1841). Despite the merger the GRO will technically continue with Dr Tim Holt officially taking over as the new Registrar General in April next year upon the retirement of Peter Wormald. To have discontinued the post would have required new acts of Parliament to continue the registration and census processes. Yet continuity need not preclude change. In particular, although the functions of the GRO will supposedly be 'transferred unchanged', there may well be a number of long term implications with regard to access to historic registration material. At a meeting between a Certificate Services Users Consultative Group, consisting of, amongst others, representatives from the Society of Genealogists and the Federation of Family History Societies, and Mr Bill Jenkins the Deputy Head of the Registration
Division it was revealed that the fees payable for the reproduction of marriage, birth and death certificates were being reviewed, but it was hoped that there would not be any increase for full certificates in April 1996. This is part of a wider review of the situation regarding access to the registration records which is scheduled to be concluded by the end of this month. This is likely to propose a tightening-up of access to recent registration material, but may also recommend legislation to facilitate ‘easier’ access to historic materials, something that would clearly be welcome to all readers of this journal – we are also told that legislation might even be introduced this session! A prerequisite, it would appear, is that the records be co-located with the Public Records Office and/or run as a joint building. Given that the GRO have to out of St Catherine’s House by the end of 1999, and that similarily the PRO has to vacate its central London census reading room when the lease expires in March 1997, the search is now on for a new joint location. Harmsworth House in Bouverie Street has already been inspected, yet was rejected as unsuitable. If readers wish to submit their own suggestions we shall be happy to pass them on!

Seasonality!

This issue unfortunately arrives to you a little later that usual. This is neither a result of the long, hot, dry summer pushing autumn further to the end of the calender year, nor an indicator of LPS ‘slipping back into a less than seasonal publishing cycle. Rather it is an indication of changes that have taken place in Cambridge. Although she will continue to be employed as librarian at the Cambridge Group on a part-time basis, Ruth Bridgen has recently accepted a new job in the Wren Library of Trinity College, Cambridge. As a consequence, Ruth is no longer able to dedicate as much time as previous to working on the production of LPS. Ruth has assisted in the production of the journal for over eight years and we should like to take this opportunity to thank her for all the splendid work that she has done on behalf of LPS, as well as to wish her well in her new job. Arrangements are currently in hand to cater for the inevitable changes that Ruth’s change in employment has brought.


Tom Arkell
Christopher Charlton
Terry Gwynne
Mary Hodges
Dennis Mills
May Pickles
Roger Schofield
Kevin Schürer
Geoffrey Stevenson

October 1995
NEWS FROM THE CAMBRIDGE GROUP FOR THE HISTORY OF POPULATION AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE

On 1 October 1995 the Cambridge Group began a new quinquennium as a research centre of the Economic and Social Research Council with a substantial new grant that with funding from other sources will make possible the prosecution of a new programme of research. Two major monographs, representing the fruits of research during the Group's previous period as a research centre were submitted for publication in September 1995.

The progress of one of these publications, English Population History from Family Reconstitutions has been the subject of reports in Local Population Studies on two previous occasions. This book since its conception has grown significantly in size and when published will be almost as large as The Population History of England 1541-1871, the volume which it is designed to complement. Much of the analysis that underpins this volume is based upon the data that have been pooled from the family reconstitution of 26 English parishes. These parishes were chosen because of the high quality of their registration and because their combined occupational structure in the early nineteenth century was similar to that of the country as a whole. Furthermore, the shape assumed by the time series of baptisms, marriages and burials for these combined parishes was very similar to that from the 404 parishes on which The Population History of England was based. There are strong reasons, a priori, for supposing that the 26 parishes yield a demographic data set akin to that which would have been drawn from a random sample of 10,000 ancient English parishes.

This book is divided into two parts, the first of which contains 4 chapters introducing the reconstitution parishes, tackling the issue of their representativeness and assessing the reliability of the data. The second section which accounts for almost three quarters of the book, is divided into five further chapters which deal in turn with nuptiality, mortality, fertility, the reliability of the findings from family reconstitution relative to those from inverse projection and a conclusion which reflects on further research priorities.

While this volume very largely endorses the outline of English demographic history provided in The Population History of England it offer much more detail relevant to a deeper understanding of key demographic processes and also reveals some new research methods. The evidence concerning changes in marriage ages is distinctively unambiguous. Age at marriage fell markedly from the end of the first quarter of the eighteenth century. By the early nineteenth century women were marrying 2.5 years earlier than their great grandmothers. This trend towards more youthful marriage was found with remarkable consistency in the 26 parishes, although they were very different in their social and economic constitution.
There are strong reasons for viewing these shifts in marital behaviour as the product of economic forces. Such an explanatory framework seems less relevant for an understanding of mortality changes. Reconstitution confirms the picture known from earlier research that expectation of life at birth was worsening over the seventeenth century to reach a low point in the 1680s before improving, especially sharply in the late eighteenth century. However, family reconstitution now confirms that age-specific mortality rates did not all move in ways that mirrored the summary measure of life expectation at birth. Between the late sixteenth and the end of the first quarter of the eighteenth century mortality rates among those aged over two months and up to 15 months rose markedly. For instance, rates in the third quarter of the first year of life almost doubled. Rises for 10.5 were very modest by comparison and mortality in the first month of life barely hardly at all. In the eighteenth century the rates that in the previous century had risen most of all barely declined whereas rates for the first month of life fell by one half and 10.5 fell almost by one third. This new book also reveals the results of new and securer methods for estimating adult life expectancies. Changes in adult life expectancies were striking during the eighteenth century; mortality between age 25 and 60 fell by an average of 31 per cent. Such developments among the parishioners of the 26 family reconstitutions have been confirmed independently by research on English Peers, MPs and Scottish advocates, suggesting, since it was an experience common to such diverse social groups, that explanations which focus upon changes in per capita well being are unlikely to be very convincing.

Another finding, in part related to the divergent and sometimes contradictory movements in age-specific mortality rates, concerns the dangers of using model life tables for the analysis of historical populations. Such model life tables are likely to reflect the mortality experiences of contemporary populations or those of the recent past and are clearly inappropriate for the more distant past. In general in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, viewed from the perspective of Princeton model life tables, adult mortality was far too high relative to rates in infancy and childhood. It was only in the late eighteenth century when infant mortality had risen and adult mortality had fallen that the age patterns of mortality used in model life tables approached those observed in those populations that had been used to construct such life tables as those that emanated from the Office of Population and Research at Princeton.

Fewer new findings emerged from the analysis of fertility. Very little variation in levels of marital fertility is detectable between the 26 parishes. It has been possible to show that marital fertility rose steadily, although slowly, over the course of the eighteenth century. One factor contributing to this rise was an enhancement of marital fertility rates above age 35. By the late eighteenth century the onset of sterility was delayed relative to earlier periods. Another surprising finding has been the discovery that fecundability stayed at a relatively constant level throughout the marriage and did not fall, as is often supposed, because of a decline in the frequency of coitus or other factors linked to the birth of previous children.

While these findings lift our detailed knowledge of demographic behaviour in England from the reign of Elizabeth to the end of the reign of George III a very
considerable number of notches, there is clearly much more to be done. While there are individual chapters, unparalleled in their statistical detail on marriages, births and deaths, there was little attention given to the relationship between those variables. It was to be regretted that little space in the book could be allocated to differences between individual families or individual parishes. While it is unlikely that all that is presented in this volume will be accepted, it is clear that this volume identifies a host of new problems and has led to the refinement of techniques that can be profitably employed for their investigation. The findings regarding mortality changes have proved to be especially exciting and accordingly in the coming quinquennium they will receive a good deal of attention from the staff of the Cambridge Group.

A second book has been completed at the Cambridge Group. With the working title of 'As others do around us': place, class and demography in England and Wales 1891-1911, it explores the phenomena of the turn-of-the-century decline in marital fertility and infant and child mortality using data provided to the Group by the Office of Population Censuses and Surveys. This data comprises some 100,000 or so individual responses from each of the 1891, 1901, 1911 and 1921 census, drawn from 13 communities scattered throughout England and Wales. To comply with OPCS requirements for the preservation and confidentiality all names and addresses were removed from the records before they arrived in Cambridge.

The new book focuses principally on the 1911 data, for in that year the census included four special questions to be answered by married women: how long had they been in their present marriage, how many children had they borne within that marriage, how many of those children were still alive, and how many had died.

While the answers given refer only to married couples at one point in time they allow us to ‘recreate’ measures of fertility and child survival for the previous twenty years, thus covering a period when these two features of life were undergoing rapid and dramatic changes. Seldom before has individual level data been available to shed light on this particular part of the path towards today’s modern demographic regime. Thus, while the story the new book is telling is not new, the plot takes on previously unsuspected twists.

The social class gradient in fertility and infant mortality, highlighted by the Registrar General in one of the reports published for the 1911 census, are shown to be a result of geographical distribution of the different classes across a set of ‘environments’. If one imagines England and Wales to be divided up into ‘Well-off’ areas, ‘Industrial’ areas, other ‘Urban’ areas and ‘Rural’ areas, it requires little further imagination to see that the middle classes would have been concentrated in the ‘Well-off’ areas, whereas agricultural labourers would have congregated in the rural areas and that few of either would have been found in the Industrial areas.

Looking at the individual level census data, it becomes clear that if couples from the very lowest range of the social ladder could find accommodation in either the rural areas or middle class suburbs, then their children’s survival
chances were every bit as good as those of the offspring of doctors, lawyers and school teachers. In the industrial heartlands, however, everyone's children suffered high mortality, although those with wealth could alleviate the scourge a little. Such high risk environments were the lot of the majority of the working classes, while only a few of the middle classes lived there, the opposite of the situation in the 'Well-off' areas. Victorian ideas that the poor were ignorant and careless of their children's lives are thus shown to be misplaced; the children of the poor died because they lived in lethal localities.

The OPCS data have also revealed that the number of children people had was determined by the behaviour of their neighbours. Where middle class couples in the industrial towns were much more fertile that their counterparts in the southern coastal resorts and fast growing suburbs, so unskilled men and their wives in the latter areas were producing rather fewer children than the working-class norm. Couples of all classes tended to marry younger if they lived in an industrial town; women living in agricultural areas, be their husbands parsons, shepherds or innkeepers, had to wait longer, on average, than any other woman for their wedding day.

The final chapter of the book attempts to take the findings derived from the individual level data of 13 communities and re-examine the national picture in their light; and to suggest that, perhaps, England fails to live up to its reputation of being a homogenous entity, riven by class. It was not 'who you were' that mattered in forming one's life chances and those of one's children, but 'where you stayed', and 'who you lived amongst'.

The benefits of having more than one or two communities available for comparison have proven to be enormous in this study. Perhaps readers of Local Population Studies might like to replicate this opportunity by pooling the various communities they have been studying at earlier periods to see whether such differences were new phenomena in the late nineteenth century, or whether they were of much longer standing.

NOTES

NEWS FROM THE LOCAL POPULATION STUDIES SOCIETY

Conference reports


An LPSS day Conference designed to help Open University students taking course DA301 'Studying Family and Community History, 19th and 20th centuries' was held at the Institute of Historical Research, Senate House, University of London on June 17th 1995.

In the plenary session which began the day John Golby, staff tutor at the Open University, spoke on the theme of community history which, we learnt, was concerned with residence persistence, work base patterns, kinship networks, marriage and special interest groups. Golby went on to discuss the links between community research and (his other research interest) the historical development of popular culture. He demonstrated how community history might help in the study of matters as diverse as the historical development of sport and changing fashions in the celebration of the Christmas holiday. In particular, using the census enumeration books and other sources, Golby showed us how he had been able to examine the extent to which the Oxfordshire village of Eynsham could be said to form a 'community'. In particular the local paper mill was seen to be a major force not only in providing employment for both males and females, but also in providing support for local organisations and sports clubs such as the village cricket team.

After Golby's lecture the rest of the day was divided into a number of workshops. In Diane Rau's workshop we learnt about the study of poverty in the late nineteenth century through the pioneering work of Charles Booth, who developed the social survey as a research technique, and produced a series of pretty maps showing where London's rich and poor were living in the 1880s and 1890s. Booth's research was shown to represent a new ideological view of the poor that was more humanitarian than that of the early nineteenth century, stressing their powerlessness and their inability, because of low wages and ill-health, to improve their lot.

In Jim Etherington's workshop we looked at the problems of nominal record linkage and the problems involved in linking the same individuals in different sources as distinct as the CEBs, parish registers, poll books and tax records. As examples, to illustrate the difficulty of undertaking such an exercise, members attempted to link distinct records for individuals printed on separate slips of paper. This was a most enjoyable workshop which involved, in one example, trying to sort out four or five distinct John Smiths and their families.

Christine Fowler ran two workshops. In one we looked at trade directories and the problems of mapping names on maps of Southampton – there were many
pitfalls for us in this admirably practical session: plenty of coloured pens were needed! In the other Christine introduced us to oral history with an excellent introductory session followed by practical work. We worked in groups of three, one interviewing, one being interviewed and one observing; this proved to be both amusing and informative.

Simon Pawley introduced the use of census enumerators’ books in studying villages and small towns. This session brought theory and practice together and students were able to see how, for example, central place theory linked with the reality of data. Anne Burke took us through a fascinating review of political life in St Albans in the 19th century. Poll Books were the focus here and the links made with other sources made it possible to understand how political influence worked.

Jackie Cooper – a student on DA301 in 1994 – stepped in at almost the last minute to give a survey of her DA301 project on Methodism in Essex; Andre Palfrey-Martin being indisposed. This proved to be a session full of helpful advice for this year’s students already planning their projects.

Members could attend three workshops in the course of the day and this, together with an excellent buffet lunch and a chance to browse in the local history library of the Institute, made a packed and very useful day.

**Week End Conference at De Montfort University Bedford 14-16 July 1995**

Our weekend conference was on the topic of The Rural Population and we gathered on Friday evening to start the weekend with a lecture by Dr Peter Dewey of Royal Holloway College on the English agricultural labourer 1850-1914. This formed an excellent back drop to the more detailed lectures which followed. The AGM of the Society took place on Saturday afternoon with a good turn-out of members and some lively discussion.

Nigel Agar gave two sessions for us, one a lecture on the nineteenth century Bedfordshire agricultural labourer and the other a workshop on official reports as evidence. Catherine Crompton’s lecture on village self-sufficiency in services in 19th century Hertfordshire again took a local theme in detail and provided much food for thought in considering the same theme in other areas; she then took a workshop on directories and census enumerators’ books as sources. The County Archivist for Bedfordshire, Christopher Pickford, gave a lecture on sources for the history of Bedfordshire villages. His encyclopaedic knowledge of the resources of his records office made for a fascinating evening. Leigh Shaw-Taylor, a new recruit to the CAMPOP research team, gave us the benefit of hearing his recent research on customary rights and non-wage income in the life of labourers, both male and female, in the nineteenth century. His survey provoked very interesting questions and comments from members including a graphic description of exactly how gleaning was done. Our final session by Dr Nigel Goose on computerising the 1851 Hertfordshire CEBs made a rousing end to the weekend, his enthusiasm and knowledge were infectious - even for those not usually involved in database work. All in all a most successful and rewarding conference.
Forthcoming Day Schools

Saturday March 23 1996 A joint conference organised between Staffordshire University and LPSS on Computerisation of the nineteenth century printed census volumes and vital registration statistics. For more information contact Dr David Gatley, 114 Thornton Road, Shelton, Stoke on Trent, ST4 2BD, telephone 01782 294780.

Local Population History Book Club

Dr Peter Franklin organises and runs the Book Club. Members of LPSS can buy books at reduced prices and these can be ordered and sent by post. Peter runs a book stall at our conferences and this is a good opportunity to browse as well as buy (and most people do!). For more details contact Peter at 46, Fountain Street, Accrington, Lancs, BB5 0QP.

Membership and Subscriptions

Well, the two do go together. Members receive LPS Journal and a Newsletter, as well as membership of the book club and details of forthcoming conferences. Members subscription is £12.00 per annum, for students £10.00 per annum, and for overseas members outside the EC £15.00 per annum. It would be very helpful if existing members could check that their Bankers Orders are running for the current subscription - for membership details contact Sir David Cooke Bt, 78, Harlow Terrace, Harrogate, HG2 8AW.

Getting into Community History

This is the title of a new LPSS publication. The day school held on June 11 1994 proved very popular with students taking Open University course DA301. It was decided that the lectures could be usefully made into a publication with the title Getting into Community History. Michael Drake’s article ‘Community – What Community?’ starts with the sentence ‘I live in a classic, picture postcard village’ but we all know that the village is called Milton Keynes! Yes, it really is a picture postcard village, and Michael was able to build a very valuable survey of the theme which focuses on structures, processes, institutions, and the relationships within and between each of these. Dennis Mills contributes ‘What is Community History?’ He urges that community history concentrates on people rather than objects and asks questions of more than purely local interest - and he gives the excellent advice ‘start with appropriate documents, and think of appropriate questions to go with them.’ Mary Hodges’ article ‘Projects and Sources for Villages and Small Towns’ is designed as a practical introduction to finding sources of information. She then makes numerous suggestions for using the material discovered to answer questions about the place and its community. The article, like the previous one, has a check list of documentary and other sources. Diana Rau’s article follows a similar theme to that by Mary Hodges but concentrates on the large city. Here possibilities arising from sources and the projects which can be designed from them are made clear and Diana adds some excellent advice – ‘limit yourself to the realistic, have a clear idea where you are going, and remain open to ideas as they occur’. We hope this new
publication will help researchers in just this way.

Getting into Community History, published by LPSS, price £1.95, 1995. Copies may be obtained by post from Dr D A Gatley, 114, Thornton Rd, Shelton, Stoke-on-Trent, ST4 2BD. Please send cheque/postal order for £2.50 to cover postage and packing, payable to Local Population Studies Society. Special prices are available for multiple copies – write to Dr Gatley for information.
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For conferences, regional contacts and project work in local population studies.

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

Colonel Sir David Cooke (Bt)
78 Harlow Terrace,
Harrogate, North Yorkshire,
HG2 0PN
THE PROTESTATION RETURNS OF 1641-1642:
PART I, THE GENERAL ORGANISATION

Anne Whiteman

Anne Whiteman is a retired Fellow of Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford, and the authority on
the Compton census. She has edited, with the assistance of Mary Clapinson, The
Compton Census of 1676: a critical edition (1986) and also contributed to
the LPS supplement Surveying the people.

Introduction

The genesis of the Protestation returns of 1641-1642,\(^1\) extensively used as an
historical source by demographers, social historians and genealogists, lies in the
political crisis of the late spring and early summer of 1641, at the time of the
threatened impeachment and later attainder of the Earl of Strafford, lately Lord
Lieutenant of Ireland, and widely believed to be the strong man behind Charles
I. Although it was to be over a year before fighting began between Royalists
and Parliamentarians, tension was high in both houses of Parliament and in the
City of London. Rumours were rife that the king planned to use an army –
perhaps an Irish, Catholic army – to overawe Parliament and secure Strafford’s
release, and the king’s own appearance in the Lords on 1 May and the abortive
tempt to seize control of the Tower of London seemed to give substance to
these claims. In the debate in the House of Commons on 3 May Pym declared
that the king must have ‘good counsellors about him’, and from the discussions
emerged the demands that were to form the basis of the Protestation: ‘Let us’,
declared Henry Marten, ‘unite ourselves for the pure worship of God, the
defence of the king, and his subjects in all their legal rights’. A committee of
ten was appointed to draft a national declaration along the lines of the Oath of
Assocation of Elizabeth’s reign.

The resultant Protestation required the swearing of an oath to maintain and
defend, first, the true Reformed Protestant religion as ‘expressed in the Doctrine
of the Church of England’ against all ‘popery and Popish Innovations within
this realm’; secondly, ‘according to the Duty of Allegiance’, the king’s royal
person, honour and estate; thirdly, the powers and privileges of Parliament;
and lastly, the lawful rights and liberties of subjects. This was preceded by a
preamble, which gave prominence to the fear of Popery and arbitrary
government. Members of the House of Commons took the Protestation on 3
May, and the Lords the following day. It was also circulated to citizens and
clergy in the City of London. A bill to enforce it on all Englishmen failed to
pass the Lords, but a Commons resolution of 30 July declared that those
refusing to take it were unfit for service in Church or Commonwealth; the bill
had included a provision that refusers were to be accounted convicted
recusants, reinforcing the impression that the identification and control of
recusants was in the forefront of the minds of members of the Commons.\(^2\)
Although some delay ensued in launching the taking of the Protestation nationwide, the congregations of some City churches took it in May, and from June to September 1641 it was tendered in parishes as far afield as Cornwall and Westmorland, and as near London as Essex and Kent, probably, as Cressy suggests, as the result of enterprise on the part of MPs and their agents. Effective general action, however, only began with a letter from the Speaker of the House of Commons, dated 19 January 1642, no doubt reflecting serious deterioration in the political situation, following the king's attempt to arrest the Five Members and the resulting panic. The Speaker asked the sheriff and JPs of each county to meet together in one place to take the Protestation themselves, and then dispersing yourselves into your several Divisions, that you will call together the Minister, the Constables, Churchwardens, and Overseers of the Poor in every parish, and tender to them the Protestation, to be taken in your Presence; and to desire of them, that they will very speedily call together the Inhabitants of their several Parishes, both Householders and others, being of Eighteen Years of Age and upwards, into One or more Places, according to the Largeness of their Parishes, and to tender unto them the same Protestation, to be taken in their Presence; and to take their Names, both of those, that do take it, and do refuse to take the same Protestation; and to return them to yourselves, at such time as you shall appoint; which the House desires may be so speedily, as that you likewise may return such Certificate [sic], as you receive from them, to the Knights and Burgesses serving for that County, before the — Day of — ; Wherin the House desires your greatest Care and Diligence, as a Matter very much importing the Good both of the King and Kingdom...

The Printer was ordered to print a sufficient number of Protestations and also of the Commons' declaration about the recent breach of privilege occasioned by the attempt against the Five Members, and MPs were likewise ordered to write to the JPs to urge them to do their best to ensure that the Protestation was duly taken throughout each county. The Speaker's letter was also sent to the Vice-Chancellors of Oxford and Cambridge, to the Benchers of the Inns of Court, and to cathedral and collegiate churches.

The organisation was thus a matter for secular officers, the sheriffs and JPs, but working together with the officers in each parish, the minister, churchwardens, constables and overseers of the poor, since the parish was the normal unit of local administration. When the Speaker's letter reached the sheriff in each county is not known, but its distribution to the JPs must have begun at least by the second week in February. Twelve JPs for Cornwall met the High Sheriff at Lostwithiel on 16 February 1642 and took the Protestation there; similar meetings presumably took place in other counties. At a division or hundred level, little time was lost in some areas; a small number of JPs (sometimes just one) appointed a day, time and place for a meeting of the ministers and officers of each parish or borough. Action in East Kent was immediate; letters to the
constables of the hundred of Whitstable and of Seasalter borough, dated 11 February, required the presence of the ministers and officers of the respective jurisdictions at Bridge Hill at nine o'clock in the morning on 15 February to take the Protestation.7

Similar meetings of JPs and parish officers took place in two hundreds in Huntingdonshire on 14 and 16 February; in West Sussex on 12, 14, and 17 and 25 February, and at Appleby in Westmorland on 3 March.8 The Mayor and three aldermen of the city of Lincoln sat at the Guildhall on 8 February to administer the Protestation to the ministers and parish officers in their jurisdiction; the Speaker's letter and the Declaration of the House of Commons were read 'to the end that they might see both warrant and ground for their taking the said Protestation'.9 There appears sometimes to have been a difficulty about the arrival, presumably from London, of the printed papers to be circulated. The return for Appledram in Sussex notes that some had arrived 'at the Swane' on Saturday, 12 February; in Toseland hundred, in Huntingdonshire, the taking of the oath on 16 February was held up for 'want of the printed protestation'.10 One of these papers was almost certainly distributed to each parish, and some made use of the back to list those who had taken the Protestation, as in several Buckinghamshire parishes.11 There can be no doubt that the instructions from Westminster were being taken seriously; the mood of the country is shown by the petitions to Parliament in late January and early February, urging a general taking of the Protestation.12

Once the minister and officers of each parish had attended their regional meeting and taken the Protestation themselves, it was their duty to summon or 'warn' their respective parishioners, being of 18 years and upwards, to come to the place appointed each to make his protestation. The parish church seems to have been the designated place, at any rate in most instances, but on occasion the oath was administered to members of the household in the 'big house'.13 The day appointed was in many cases a Sunday, but no day in the week seems to have been barred. In 1642 Sunday fell on 13, 20 and 27 February and on 6 March, all days chosen by a number of parishes. But in some areas a later date was arranged; it was not until the third and fourth weeks in March and the first half of April that those liable to take the Protestation in certain Staffordshire parishes assembled for this purpose.14 If the Protestation was administered on a Sunday, attendance may have been easier to arrange than for a weekday. In Birchington, in Kent, for example, the time chosen was after Sunday evening service, but ten persons took it next day.15 Easter Day, 8 April, was the day appointed for Beckbury, in Shropshire.16

The time interval between the regional meeting of the ministers and the parish officers and the appointed day for the parish was sometimes very short, which suggests that a timetable must have been worked out in advance of the regional meeting. The ministers and officers in the West Sussex parishes of Edburton, Kingston Bowsey, Lancing, Patching and Sompting, for example, made their own Protestation on 25 February, while those liable to do so made theirs in their parishes on Sunday, 27 February.17 But in Penwith hundred, in West Cornwall, where the regional meeting was at Helston on 3 March, the Protestation was taken in some parishes on 4 March, and in others on 5 March,
a Friday and Saturday respectively. There are plenty of references to the process of warning, but exactly how it was carried out is not clear; it seems likely that the task fell to the constables of each parish. The return for Thanet St John (i.e. Margate), in Kent, reported that 40 or 50 had not yet taken the Protestantation, most of them being 'at sea', but others 'out of warning'; some of those warned at Coventry had not complied; a man at Mullion 'had no notice of the occasion'.

Refusers and non-takers

Naturally enough, not everyone liable to take the Protestantation turned up at the right place, on the right day, and at the right time. Local officers were anxious to distinguish those who had received a warning from those who, being away from the parish, could not comply with it, or did not know it had been issued. The officers also offered excuses for the non-attendance of the sick or bedridden, or those too old to come, like the two men of Drewsteignton in Devon who at 94 and 86 were too decrepit to appear. Many of these parishioners, they averred, would certainly have taken the Protestantation had they been able to do so.

By contrast, recusants or 'refusers' reported were a different matter. The return for Warnham, in Sussex, lists four 'recusants', 'warned to appeare, but came not', contrasted with six men 'employed about iron workes, & worke in other Parishes', two men 'abroad in a journey', and one sick man, none of them suspected of popery. Excuses for absence are offered for two men at Thannington in Kent, one working in the Isle of Thanet, the other sick of the smallpox. Recusants are almost always named, including members of well-known Catholic families, like the Thimblebys of Irnham in Lincolnshire, and the Mores at Fawley in Berkshire where among the household was 'Nicholas...the Lady Mores gardiner'. Sometimes the local officers took great pains to track recusants down and confront them with the Protestantation; Sir Ferdinand Phythian and his servant were sought many times but were prudentially away from his home at Aswardby, and at West Rasen, also in Lincolnshire, Philip Constable and others were warned by a visit of officers to their houses that the rector and others would offer the Protestantation to them and the rest of the parishioners at two o'clock in the afternoon, but Constable and 12 of his servants refused it. Special attention, it seems, was sometimes paid to women recusants, as at Brough under Stainmore, Kirkby Stephen and Brougham in Westmorland; it was commonly recognised that women were particularly important in maintaining Catholicism.

Puzzling are the returns for a considerable number of parishes reporting persons who could not take the Protestantation because they were at sea. Those absent from the parish of Thanet St John have already been mentioned. Sometimes the seamen are named, such as the 18 reported from Northam, but those from Bideford, also in Devon, are not. The absentees from Endellion in Cornwall are named, but not those from Fowey. Seven from Punchknowle in Somerset who were at sea are named, and some of the 14 from Swyre were said to be engaged in voyages to Newfoundland. Obviously many of these must have been out of warning, but it is surprising that those who constituted
a large fishing and seagoing population at a place like Bideford are not individually identified. By and large, however, the evidence strongly suggests that local officers were assiduous in trying to ensure that all those liable took the Protestantation, and felt concerned when circumstances made this difficult. As we have seen, if a man did not, or could not, come to the church, they would often do their best to visit him, but it was not always possible; in the case of Newlyn East and Lanliverty, in Cornwall, time was reported to be too short to allow this.30 Absentees were frequently said to be sound Protestants; officers were confident that when they were reached, they would take the oath. The Rector of Singleton in Sussex reported that some in his parish had failed to comply, but added with confidence that they would so do 'as soone as I can get to them'.31

Taking the oath

Exactly how the Protestantation was presented by the minister and officers and in what way assent to it made must have differed from parish to parish. It is relying on supposition rather than on much evidence to think that each man of the required age read the oath aloud, and then confirmed 'his consent by adding his name in his own hand, or putting his mark by the scribe's writing of it; some, no doubt, could not read it for themselves. Such a procedure might have been possible in a small parish; in a large one, it would have taken a great deal of time. Cressy quotes what happened at St Katharine Cree, in London, where the minister declared that to save time '...the people expressed themselves after this manner as follows: I A.B. do in the presence of Almighty God freely and heartily promise, vow and protest the same which the leading person...did'.32 But in Irnham parish in Lincolnshire, with 89 names recorded, the incumbent explained that each man repeated the oath after him, 'according to the manner prescribed'; if this entailed a full reading of the Protestantation, it must have been a lengthy process.33 Some curtailing of the full oath, or an assent to it taken in groups, seems probable in at least some places. At Orton, in Westmorland, the oath was 'publicklie read' to the 345 men who assented to it; at Milburn, after evening prayer, the parson communicated 'the busines of the protestation to the congregation', who then took it by general consent.34 What appears to have been required is that the Protestantation was sworn in the sight and hearing of the minister and officers; this is specifically said to have happened at Brightwalton in Berkshire, and at Stranton, in County Durham.35 Exactly what the detailed procedure was in each parish seems irrecoverable, and perhaps it is of little importance.

Format of the returns

It must be recognised that, for many parishes, the returns of names of those who took the Protestantation are fair copies, often written by a scribe in a uniform hand, without any signatures or marks made by those unable to sign their names. These tell us little about how the return was made at local level; indeed, were it not for the various asides found on a number of them, a cynic might assert that they are mere lists of names collected without any participation from the parishioners supposed to swear the required Protestantation. This is obviously not the case; but it is those returns which bear signatures and the marks of the
illiterate which carry a different conviction. Not all the returns are dated; most are signed by the minister and some at least of the officers. They are written on paper of varying sizes, but mostly foolscap either as single or double sheets, or folded up into smaller sheets, sometimes stitched to make a little book. Some, in a scribe's hand, are marvellously uniform and neat lists, in careful columns, like those for Coventry and West Bromwich, presumably fair copies of much less tidy originals.36 Those with signatures presumably written when the actual Protestation was being made, and with marks accompanying names written out by another hand (sometimes identifiable as that of the incumbent or curate), are seldom as neat, but bring the scene of signing much closer. Possibly a roll call was used to make the ceremony more orderly; a note on the return from Willoughton, in Lincolnshire, explains that a cross in the margin by certain names indicates those who did not take the Protestation, and some further crossings-out also point to the checking of a previously prepared list.37 Sometimes, perhaps, signatures and marks were made at the same time on separate sheets, with different officers supervising the procedure; this may be indicated by sheets not fully filled up, and would, of course, have saved time overall.38

Protestation returns are not, all of them, simple lists of those in a parish who have taken the oath. In some cases, the names are arranged under settlements or tythings, or some division of the parish which presumably made the checking simpler. Excellent examples of arrangements under farms or hamlets are the returns for Newlyn East and Crantock in Cornwall, Aldworth in Berkshire, Eaton under Heywood in Shropshire and Crowland in Lincolnshire.39 In Somerset, the returns for Ilminster, Bishop's Lydeard, Wellington, Pitminster and Trull are set out in tythings, Stoke St Gregory in 'villages', and South Petherwin in streets.40 Hamlets sometimes made separate returns, like the six settlements in Bampton parish, and so did chapelries, like Kelmscot in Broadwell parish, all in Oxfordshire.41 Another form of return is that separated into social groups, like that for North Witham in Lincolnshire, where esquires, gentlemen, clergy, husbandmen, cottagers, sons and servants are distinguished, and the returns for Hemswell, Raithby cum Maltby, Linwood and Thornton Curtis, all in the same county, which are alive to social distinctions.42 In many lists, respect is shown to the 'quality' by putting them at the head of the names, a fairly universal practice.

Age and sex

The letter from the Speaker of the House of Commons specified that inhabitants, 'both Householders and others, being of Eighteen years of Age and upwards' should take the Protestation. Almost all the returns consist of the names of men; a number state that they were of the age laid down, or say nothing about age. How carefully the ages of those who gave their consent to the Protestation were checked it is impossible to say, though of course research for places with good parish registers would probably throw some light on this. Sixteen was the more usual age to denote adulthood in the eyes of both the church and of the military authorities, and why eighteen was chosen in this instance it is difficult to say, though it was also retained for the subscribing to the Solemn League and Covenant but not for the Vow and Covenant of 1643.43
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Some local officers, in any case, ignored this direction and reverted to sixteen, as at Attenborough, West Bridgford, Lindy and East Leake, in Nottinghamshire. In Westmorland, taking of the Protestation was limited to those between 18 and 60, the upper age limit generally accepted for the militia, at Bolton and Patterdale and Hartsop. The list for Barton under Needwood, in Staffordshire, is said to be of 128 persons between 17 and 60 and upwards.

Women were explicitly neither included nor excluded from taking the Protestation; the Speaker’s letter talks only of ‘inhabitants’. Although it seems to have been the general assumption that only men of 18 and upwards were required to take the oath, some returns include women. When only a few are named, it seems likely that they were persons of property or widows of prominent men. But in some parishes, the proportion of women to men suggests that the whole female population, presumably over 18, were brought in. This seems to be the case, for example, in 19 out of 33 parishes in Allerdale-above-Derwent ward, Cumberland, six parishes in North Buckinghamshire, and nine in Oxfordshire, and a number of others such as remote St Tudy in Cornwall and, near to London, St Leonard Bromley and Stratford-le-Bow in Middlesex. However it is most unlikely that the parliamentary organisers intended the inclusion of women, and clearly only a few parish officers thought they should be involved. It is noteworthy nonetheless that female recusants were sometimes recorded.

Some returns make the big claim that all men of 18 years and over in the parish have taken the Protestant, and that their names are all included in the list, alongside any known refusers and/or recusants. It is one thing to be asked to believe that in a small parish like Poling in Sussex, with 28 names listed, ‘every male Inhabiting or residing...being eightene yeares of age, have in our presence taken the Protestant, and that none refused’, and another to trust the preamble to the return for Holsworthy, in North Devon, with 250 names recorded, that all the inhabitants of the required age have done likewise, again with no refusals. Such statements are, however, unambiguous. More difficult to interpret are the many returns which state that all the names given (‘underwritten’ is generally the phrase used) have signed the Protestant, but do not explicitly claim that they are all those in the parish required to do so, though some add that there are no ‘neglecters’ or ‘refusers’.

Support for the Protestant

There is impressive evidence of how seriously the requirement to make the Protestant was regarded. Cressy notes that at Harleston, in Suffolk, a public fast and a collection for ‘the distressed kingdom of Ireland’ took place when the Protestation was tendered. Not very far away, at Birdbrook in Essex, the inhabitants of 18 and upwards, with the minister, to show their concurrence with the House of Common in ‘so necessary and pious a work’, witnessed it by ‘their joynet receiving of the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper together, and by the subscription of their hands’. Obedience to the orders of the Speaker of the House of Commons, transmitted through the sheriffs, JPs and local parish officers was a clearly stated civil obligation but one that might also be given religious overtones. In fact there was little reason for any protestant to refuse
the Protestation; possible opposition from those with Presbyterian views had been obviated by excluding any reference to 'discipline' and specifying only 'doctrine' in referring to the Church of England in the oath.\textsuperscript{55}

There are a few references to opposition from Anabaptists, however; at Wilton, in Somerset, Mathew Pococke refused to come to the church and take the Protestation, and an Anabaptist at Scotter in Lincolnshire likewise refused it.\textsuperscript{56} Only to recusants did it offer anything totally unacceptable, and some were no doubt well aware of the perils in store if they did not join with the rest of the parish in accepting it. Nevertheless a few persons, some of them clergy, showed a proper seventeenth-century scruple in making their subscription. One was the Vicar of Leamington Hastings, in Warwickshire; there were several objectors in Lincoln city, and a number of clergy in Dorset, one of whom had doubts about how the Protestation accorded with God's work, the standing laws of the kingdom and the oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy.\textsuperscript{57} In the parish of Exeter, St Lawrence, one man refused the Protestation, another 'utterly'; at Colyton a man was reported as 'not obstinately refusing but scrupulously forbearing' it.\textsuperscript{58} But there is no evidence of any general reluctance to take the Protestation, and very little of individual opposition.

General supervision was active to ensure that the returns were collected and sent up to London. In a letter of 25 March from the High Sheriff of Nottinghamshire to the two MPs for the county, the dispatch of a bundle of Protestations to London was reported, together with the promise of a further batch to come, and a schedule of all the JPs who had taken the Protestation in his presence. Three days earlier two JPs wrote to assure the same MPs that although in Rushcliffe hundred some had not yet taken the oath, this was the result of their necessary absence, rather than to 'any willing neglect, or Willfull refusal'.\textsuperscript{59} Similar assurance of compliance with the Commons' orders was sent to the knights and burgesses for Sussex by the JPs on 28 February.\textsuperscript{60} The House of Commons must have intended to scrutinise the results, for on 16 April a committee was set up 'to consider of the Number and Quality of the Persons in all Counties, that refuse the Protestation; and what Course is fit to be held towards them'. Moreover, MPs were told to 'view the Protestations themselves', and then to refer the refusers to the committee.\textsuperscript{61} Nothing appears to have resulted from these provisions, but that they were made is testimony of the seriousness with which the House regarded the responses to the Protestation.

Conclusion

This general survey of the Protestation returns, based on those for well over 400 parishes in 14 counties, leads to the conclusion that they should be taken seriously as in effect a census of men over 18 years of age and over living in a parish. The officers making the return stated in many cases that the list was a complete record; great care was taken to alert those liable to take the Protestation oath when and where it was to be administered, and to note recusants and refusers, and to name those who ought to have been present but were not. It is therefore not unreasonable to regard the returns as providing a true account of men over 18 living in a parish. But in default of corroborative evidence this must always be an assumption and, as with all other lists with a
local provenance, it must always be borne in mind that the men responsible for 
organising the oath-taking must have varied in ability and conscientiousness. 
Moreover, the problem of boundaries is an ever-present one; the return for a 
parish—in may not always include those living in a chapelry or hamlet, for which 
there may have been a separate list which has not survived. Nevertheless when 
all the provisos have been taken into account, the Protestation returns are 
unquestionably a unique source of information of great value, deserving a more 
careful examination and assessment than has sometimes been the case.
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Appendix I

What follows is a list of those Protestation Returns which have been published 
in printed form. For convenience the list has been arranged by order of county.

Cornwall
T.L. Stoate, ed., Cornwall Protestation Returns, 1641, (Bristol, 1974).

Devon
A.J. Howard and T.L. Stoate, eds, Devon Protestation Returns, 1641, (Bristol, 
1973).

Berkshire
See entry under Oxfordshire, Gibson item, for North Berkshire parishes.

Derbyshire
See entry under Nottinghamshire for three Derbyshire parishes.

Dorset
E.A. Fry, ed., Protestation Returns...1641-2, (Dorset Records, 1912).

Durham

Huntingdonshire
Granville Proby, ed., 'The Protestation Returns for Huntingdonshire', 
Transactions of the Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire Archaeological 
Society, 5 (1937).

Lincolnshire
W.F. Webster, ed., Protestation Returns 1641/2, Lincolnshire, (Nottingham, 
1984).

London and Middlesex
A.J.C.G., ed., 'London and Middlesex (parts)', Supplement to Miscellanea 
Genealogica et Heraldica, (1920).
Northumberland
See entry under Durham for two Northumberland parishes.

Nottinghamshire
W.F. Webster, ed., *Protestation Returns 1641/2 – Notts./Derbys.*, (Nottingham, 1980).

Oxfordshire


Somerset

Surrey

Sussex

Westmorland

Wiltshire
Die Mercurii: 5° Maii. 1641.

This day Ordered by the House of Commons now assembled in Parliament, That the Preamble, together with the Proclamation, which the Members of this House made the third of May, shall be forthwith Printed, and the Copies Printed brought to the Clerk of the said House, to sit under his hand, to the end that the King, citizens, and Burgesses may send them down to the Sheriffs and Justices of the several Shires, and to the Citizens and Burgesses of the several Cities, Boroughs, and Cinque Ports, respectively. And the King, citizens, and Burgesses are to intum into the Shires, Cities, Boroughs, and Cinque Ports, with what willingness of the Members of this House made the Proclamation, And further to signify, that as they judge the taking off in themselves, so they cannot but approve it in all such as shall take it.

The Knights, Citizens, and Burgesses of the Commons house in Parliament, finding, to the great grief of our hearts, that the doctrines of the Popes and Bishops, and other adherents to the See of Rome, have so lately been more boldly and frequently put in practice than formerly, to the undermining and danger of the true reformed Protestant Religion in this King's Dominions established: And finding also that there have been, and having just cause to suspect that there shall be, even during this sitting in Parliament, machineries to subvert the fundamental Laws of England and Ireland, and to introduce the exercise of an Arbitrary and Tyrannical Government, by most pernicious and wicked Councils, Plots, and Conspiracies: And that the long intermission, and unhappy breach of Parliaments, hath occasioned many ill-calls Statutions, whereupon the same hath been protected and grievous; and that divers Innovations and Superstitions have been brought into the Church, multitudes driven out of this Majesty's Dominions, Treasurers raised and maintained between the King and His people, a Popish Army landed in Ireland, and two Armies brought into the bowels of this Kingdom, to the desire of His Majesty's Royal Person, the consumption of the Estates of the Crown, and Credit of this Kingdom: And lastly, finding great cause of solicitude, that misdemeanours here have been, and are used to bring the English Army into a misusing of this Parliament, whereby to reduce that Army, with force to bring to utter ruin of this Council. Sabe therefore thought good to sign our letters in a Declaration of our united Affections and Resolutions, and to make this ensuing Proclamation.

A. B. do in the presence of Almighty God, Promise, Vow, and Proclaim, to maintain and defend, as far as lawfully I may, with my life, power, and estate, the true Reformed Protestant Religion, expressed in the Doctrine of the Church of England, against all Popery and Popish Innovations within this Realm, contrary to the same Doctrine, and according to the duty of my Allegiance, His Majesty's Royal Person, Honour, and Estate; As also the Power and Privileges of Parliament; The lawfull Rights and Liberties of the Subject, and every Person that taketh this Proclamation, in whatsoever he shall do in the lawfull pursuance of the same. And to my power, and as far as lawfully I may, I will oppose, and by all good ways and means endeavour to bring to condigne punishment, all such as shall either by Force, Pratise, Councils, Plots, Conspiracies or otherwise, do any thing to the contrary of any thing in this present Proclamation contained. And further, that I shall in all just and Honourable ways and means endeavour to preserve the Union and Peace between the three Kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland; And neither for hope, fear, nor other respect, shall relinquish this Promise, Vow, and Proclamation.

Whereas some doubts have been raised by several persons out of this House, concerning the meaning of the words contained in the Proclamation lately made by the Members of this House, (viz.) The true reformed Protestant Religion, expressed in the Doctrine of the Church of England, against all Popery and Popish Innovations within this Realm, contrary to the same Doctrine, this House do declare, that by these words, and is meant, only the publice Doctrine professed in the said Church, so far as it is opposed to Popery and Popish Innovations; And that the said words are not to be extended to the maintaining of any form of Bishop, Discipline, Government, nor of any Arts or Ceremonies of the said Church of England.

Imprinted at London by Robert Barker, Printer to the King's most Excellent Majesty: And by the Assignes of John Bill. 1641.
1. The original Protestation returns, in the custody of the Clerk of the Records, House of Lords Record Office (hereafter HLRO), are filed by county and hundred or division etc. in the order given in the Appendix to the *Fifth Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission*, 120-34; a few only have survived elsewhere, generally in a contemporary copy: see the checklist by I.W. Lawson Edwards, *The Genealogist's Magazine*, 19 (1977), 84-5 (kept up to date by the HLRO), and J. Charles Cox, *The parish registers of England*, (London, 1910), 199-200. I am grateful to the Clerk and his staff for allowing me access to the returns, making me various photocopies over the years, and giving me much help of various kinds. A guide to the returns, Jeremy Gibson and A.J. Dell eds, *The Protestation Returns 1641-42 and Contemporary Lists*, (Federation of Family History Societies, 1995) has recently been published. The returns have now been published for a number of counties, but on differing principles; those produced for mainly genealogical purposes sometimes have the names rearranged alphabetically, and much detail on the returns, including the date, omitted. The originals have been consulted for well over 400 parishes; some of these have now been printed.


3. David Cressy, *Literacy and the social order*, (Cambridge, 1980), 66-8: St Austell, 8 June (Stoate, *Cornwall*, 132); Ravenstonedale, 18 July and Morland, 22 August (Faraday, *Westmorland*, 28, 50); Tilbury juxta Clare and Ridgewell, 4 July, Steeple Bumpstead, 7 July, Sible Hedingham, 18 July (HLRO, Essex, Hinckford hundred); Cowden, 27 September (HLRO, Kent, Somerden hundred).


5. *Journal of the House of Commons*, II, 389. A copy of the Speaker's letter, filed with the returns for Norman Cross hundred in Huntingdonshire, adds that those in counties within 60 miles of London were expected to send in their returns before 20 February, and those in counties over 60 miles, by 12 March: Proby, *Hunts*, 332. Spaces were left in the text of the letter for inserting dates, but they are not commonly found.

6. Stoate, *Cornwall*, viii; there is a reference to what may have been a similar meeting of the JPs for Nottinghamshire at Southwell, 28 February 1642, Webster, *Notts*, 97.

7. HLRO, Kent, Whitstable hundred.


11. For example, Adstock, Lillingstone Dayrell, Preston Bissett, Thornborough (HLRO, Bucks, Buckingham hundred).


13. In Westmorland, for example, the church as the place of assembly is noted for four parishes (Duffton, Kirkby Thore, Milburn and Brougham, Faraday, *Westmorland*, 12, 18, 20, 43). Sometimes the proceedings took place at the 'big house'; thus the Earl of Kingston and his servants took the Protestation at Woodhouse Hall, in Cuckney parish, in Nottinghamshire on 6 March (Webster, *Notts*, 33).

14. For example, Elford, 21 March; Clifton Campville and Haunton, 25 March; Hanbury, 27 March and 11 April; Hamstall Ridware, 30 March; Tutbury, 9 April; Handsworth, 15 April (HLRO, Stafford, Offlow hundred, South and North divisions).

15. HLRO, Kent, Ringslow hundred.

16. HLRO, Salop, Wenlock liberty.


18. HLRO, Cornwall, Penwith hundred.

19. The *Association, Agreement and Protestation of the Counties of Cornwall and Devon*, (Oxford, 1643), a pamphlet about a local protest during the course of the war, describes the way in which it was to be organised, with copies delivered by the sheriffs to the hundred constables, and by them to the petty constables; the minister was to publish it the Sunday following its receipt (p.6). This was probably the customary procedure.

20. HLRO, Kent, Ringslow hundred; Warwick, Coventry City and County; Stoate, *Cornwall*, 18.


23. HLRO, Kent, Westgate hundred.
24. HLRO, Lincoln, Beltisloe wapentake; Berkshire, Newbury division.
25. Webster, Lincs., 68, 93.
26. Faraday, Westmorland, 9, 17, 43.
27. HLRO, Devon, Shebbear hundred.
28. Stoate, Cornwall, 185-6, 107-8.
29. Fry, Dorset, 169-70.
32. Cressy, Literacy, 67.
33. HLRO, Lincoln, Beltisloe hundred.
35. HLRO, Berks, Newbury division; Wood, Durham, 185.
36. HLRO, Warwick, Coventry City and County; Stafford, Offlow hundred, South division.
37. HLRO, Lincoln, Aslackoe wapentake.
38. For example, Paul (HLRO, Cornwall, Penwith hundred).
39. Stoate, Cornwall, 81-3, 73-4; HLRO, Berks, Newbury division; Salop, Wenlock liberty; Lincoln, Elloe wapentake.
41. Gibson, Oxon, 6-9, 14, 25.
42. Webster, Lincs., 25, 49, 62, 91, 107.
44. Webster, Notts, 48, 84, 54, 79.
45. Faraday, Westmorland, 42, 52.
46. HLRO, Stafford, Offlow hundred, North division.
47. For example, Ashen and Gestingthorpe (HLRO, Essex, Hinckford hundred); Bishop’s Norton and Coates (Lincoln, Aslackhoe wapentake).
48. HLRO, Cumberland, Allerdale-above-Derwent ward.
49. Addington, Adstock, Lillingstone Dayrell (where some of the women themselves signed), Twyford, Winslow; Aston Abbots (HLRO, Bucks, Buckingham hundred; Cottesloe hundred).
50. Asthall; Cokethorpe, Hardwick and Yelford; Ducklington; Minster Lovell; Steeple Barton; Wilcote (a chapelry of North Leigh); South Leigh; Combe; Stanton Harcourt and Sutton, (Gibson, Oxon, 4-5, 22, 23-4, 93, 120-1, 133, 134-5, 135-6, 140-1); those for Cokethorpe, Hardwick and Yelford and Ducklington give married couples (22-4). I am grateful to Mr Jeremy Gibson for allowing me to see, before publication, the proofs of his new edition of the Oxfordshire Protestation returns.
52. Rice, W. Sussex, 139-40; HLRO, Devon, Black Torrington hundred.
53. For example, Sancreed (HLRO, Cornwall, Penwith hundred).
54. Cressy, Literacy, 67-8; HLRO, Essex, Hinckford hundred. At Finchingfield in the same county, the congregation 'entered into Covenant according to the Protestation injoyned by the Parliament', – a splendid Puritan form of words from Stephen Marshall's former parish (HLRO, Essex, Hinckford hundred).
55. See Appendix II.
56. Howard and Stoate, Somerset, 120; Webster, Lincs., 89.
57. HLRO, Warwick, Knightlow hundred; Webster, Lincs, 43; Fry, Dorset, 31, 52, 62-3, 129.
58. Howard and Stoate, Devon, 321, 155.
59. Webster, Notts, 47, 77.
60. Rice, W. Sussex, 7.
61. Journal of...Commons, II, 530.
Local Population Studies
Supplements

A GLOSSARY FOR
LOCAL POPULATION STUDIES

A useful handbook providing notes 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 +50p p&p]

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 +50p p&p]

Available from booksellers or from Mrs R.
Bridgen, Local Population Studies, 27
Trumpington Street, Cambridge, CB2 1QA
POVERTY IN NORTH-EAST LANCASHIRE IN 1843: EVIDENCE FROM QUAKER CHARITY RECORDS

Rex Watson

Rex Watson is a lecturer at Homerton College in Cambridge, with a longstanding interest in the nineteenth-century history of north-east Lancashire.

Introduction

The plight of the handloom weavers, particularly the Lancashire handloom weavers, during the earlier part of the nineteenth century is well-known. The definitive work on the cotton handloom weavers by Bythell tellingly entitles its last chapter ‘Displacement and disappearance’. Estimates of the numbers of cotton handloom weavers year by year are given by Mitchell and Deane: from a figure of 240,000 in the period 1821-31, they declined to 188,000 by 1835, 123,000 by 1840, 60,000 by 1845, 43,000 by 1850, and a mere 3,000 by 1862. Handloom weavers in other materials, for example silk and wool, disappeared later by and large, partly at least because the early power looms were not able to weave these other fibres with the same success as cotton.

The early 1840s was a period of general depression in the cotton industry, with many weavers lacking work, or only having part time work. Piece rates for those who had work were low. Bennett gives some detail for Marsden in north-east Lancashire in the 1830s, which also experienced problems of depression. Also in 1842, according to a nineteenth-century writer on the history of Burnley, Marsden had 2,000 paupers out of a population of 5,000. The consequent poverty, particularly for handloom weavers, was such as to render public poor relief insufficient in some areas. In the Marsden area public relief was supplemented by the efforts of the Quakers, who provided mainly clothing and bedding in substantial quantities. Such work had been undertaken at times of depression since 1819 and probably earlier, and was to continue until at least 1853.

Records of this charitable work survive in a series of notebooks and papers kept by Ann Ecroyd of Edgend in Marsden, the Ecroyds being a leading Quaker family in the area. A description of these documents is provided by Rayson and does not require repetition in this article. This essay will focus on the detailed analysis of one of the notebooks; that of 1843 which gives much information on the condition of 440 households (2,196 people) occupying part of the area. Sections of this notebook have already been used quite extensively by Frost in his History of Briercliffe-with-Extwistle, in which he gives many examples of the dire conditions in which some families were living. This article will concentrate mainly on some overall quantitative aspects of poverty and its relief, aspects which could not be determined, for example, from the 1841 Census. Consequently, it is hoped that the analysis will show something
of the considerable value of the documents in the collection, and maybe lead to
greater use of a relatively little-known source.

The study area

The geographical area covered by the notebook is indicated by the map
reproduced in Figure 1. In summary this can be divided into three key areas, as
follows:

1. Forty households at Cop Row, a long row of cottages in the north-
east corner of Burnley township, but close to the main nucleus of
settlement in Briercliffe-with-Extwistle township (see 2 below). The
total population of these households numbered 196, with a mean of
4.9 per household. Most of the cottages still stand today.

2. One hundred and sixty-seven households in the township of
Briercliffe-with-Extwistle (including one just over the boundary with
Little Marsden township), all but six in Briercliffe, the more easterly
parts of Extwistle being excluded. It is clear from a comparison with
the Ordnance Survey six inch map of 1844 that quite a number of
places even within Briercliffe appeared not to be included. In some
cases this would no doubt be because the inhabitants were clearly not
needy; also there might simply have been a limit to the coverage that
the 'visitor', John Chapman, was able to achieve. The population of
these 167 households numbered 872 (834 in Briercliffe), giving a mean
household size of 5.2. Frost gives the 1841 Census population of
Briercliffe as 1,256 (Extwistle 242), consequently about two-thirds of
the Briercliffe population seems to have been included. These 1,256
people were in 232 houses, giving a mean of 5.4 per house.9 Whilst
one needs to be wary in relation to the household/house distinction,
there seems to be little difference between the mean household size of
those visited and the general such mean for the township.

3. Two hundred and thirty-three households in the township of Great
Marsden (also including one just over the boundary with Little
Marsden township). Again a comparison with the 1844 Ordnance
Survey map shows that some places are excluded, and in particular a
section of the township in the north-west seems to be absent. The
population of the 233 households numbered 1,128, giving a mean of
4.8. The 1841 Census population for Great Marsden was 1,987,
recorded across 373 houses, a mean of 5.3 per house. This would
suggest that the notebooks cover rather under two-thirds of the total
population. Again, in terms of household size, those visited seem
quite typical of the wider community, though possibly the better-off
tended to have slightly larger households.

It is worth making a few additional observations about the area of study. The
western part of Briercliffe included the substantial 'village' of Haggate, with 54
households visited. Quite close were Hill End, where 30 households were
visited, and Holt Hill, where 15 households were visited. Otherwise the
township of Briercliffe-with-Extwistle consisted of scattered farmsteads and small groups of cottages, generally becoming more sparsely populated towards the east as the terrain becomes more rugged away towards the moors. There is, however, hardly any mention of farming activity under 'Occupation' in the notebook, and it seems that those principally engaged in farming were not generally visited. Frost indicates that by this time there was a power weaving mill near Hill End, called Hill End Mill and owned by William Smith. In the Briercliffe section of the notebook there is no mention of 'factory' weavers, unlike in the Great Marsden section (see below). It seems unlikely, therefore, that it was regarded as unnecessary to visit those factory weavers living nearby, though it may be that some of the 'weavers' given as living, at, say, Hill End and Holt Hill, and employed by William Smith, were at the factory. (William Smith also employed many handloom weavers). There was also a factory at Rakehead in Burnley township about a mile towards Burnley town from Cop Row, and this may similarly have provided employment for a few Cop Row inhabitants. Further comments will be made later on this and related points concerning occupations.

In Great Marsden, to the north of Briercliffe, the most substantial settlements were in the extreme north, at (Colne) Green with 32 households visited and Lenches with 35 households visited. These lie just to the south of Colne Water, which marked the boundary with Colne township. Colne town itself is only about half a mile away. Some of the inhabitants of these and other smaller places nearby are given as weavers in factories in Colne. Another fairly substantial settlement was that of Bradley Lane Head, 21 households visited, in the west of the township: much of the township with adjacent parts of Little Marsden was to grow into the modern town of Nelson in the next 50 years. In the south were the adjacent settlements of Catlow, which had 9 households visited, and Southfield, with 11 household visited. There were large quarries in Catlow, and some occupations are given as 'delver' (quarryman). For the rest, Great Marsden, like Briercliffe, consisted of farms and small groups of cottages.

An indication of the living conditions in the study area can be gained from the description arising from William Cooke Taylor's 'Tour in the Manufacturing Districts of Lancashire' of 1842, taken on behalf of the Anti-Corn Law League. Cooke Taylor visited Marsden, also Colne, Burnley and nearby Pendle Forest, and in relation to the houses he found there noted that, 'Externally and internally everything was scrupulously clean, but the houses and their inmates had neither clothes, food, nor furniture'. He also paid tribute to the help given by the slightly better-off to the poorest elements of the population. He met the father of Ann Ecroyd, who was himself involved in textiles as a manufacturer, and who indicated to Cooke Taylor that the number of handloom weavers was greater than ever before, giving also his views on the prevailing distress. Cooke Taylor was unable to meet Ann Ecroyd, but reported on her efforts on behalf of the local community: '[her] praise was literally in all the houses in the neighbourhood. She has devoted her moderate income and all the energies of her life to elevating the condition of the poor; not merely relieving their physical necessities, but remedying their moral wants by affectionate instruction and kind remonstrance...in the neighbouring village of Marsden, I heard of husbands that she had recalled from extravagance, and children that
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Children Employed</th>
<th>Name of Employer</th>
<th>Age of each with his 22.3.71 weekly earnings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dole, 3</td>
<td>36.3.71, 10.7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hollows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.5.71, 10.7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jane Watson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dole, 3</td>
<td>45.2.71, 10.7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Watson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ellen Simpson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Weaver, 3</td>
<td>32.10.7.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simpson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Henry Watson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Halstead</td>
<td>48.4.9, 19.12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Watson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Eli Watson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ragaburne</td>
<td>39.3.9, 19.10.7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Watson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.7.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

It should be noted that reference to Parish Reeler might more accurately be styled Township Reeler. Brercliffe-with-Exkele, Barnley and Great Marsden were three of a large number of townships of the ancient parish of Whalley, covering much of northeast Lancashire. The term "parish reeler" is used in the ensuing discussion.
she had rescued from profligacy.14

The evidence of the notebook

The 440 households recorded in the notebook are numbered sequentially from 1 to 426, with one number not used and some 'halves', such as 43 1/2. As is indicated in Figure 2, for each entry the name of the household head and residence is given, followed by 'Employ', 'Name of Employer', 'No. in each Family', 'Total Weekly Income', 'Parish Weekly Relief', 'Ages of each with his or her weekly earnings' and 'No. of Beds'. Not all of these column heads are recorded fully, yet the sex of children within the household is often also given. Often the entry is followed by some comment about the families' circumstances, with details of their material needs. As noted earlier these needs were usually formulated in terms of clothing or bedding: a possible reflection of the fact that the survey took place in February. For some families the detail is only partial, particularly in the few cases where a family is stated as not being needy. The first page of the notebook is reproduced as Figure 2, and the entries shown there can be taken as fairly typical. The ninth column across from the left is the most complex with the income of the individual household members being written above their age, or alternatively a 'B' or 'G' being inserted indicating the sex of the child. It can be seen, therefore, that the information given in the source is extremely rich; however, the article will primarily concentrate on an analysis of the following three columns of information: beds and bedding, earnings and parish relief.

Beds and bedding

Information about the number of beds is available for 222 households. Table 1 summarises this according to the household size. It should be noted that in no case is the number of beds given as zero, although it may have been the case that some of the households for which no information is given might have been in this situation. It must also be remembered that the notebook generally covers only the less well-off households.

With reference to Table 1 a reasonably steady increase in the number of beds as household size increases can be seen, however the numbers of households represented for sizes nine and upwards are small. The survey covers a total of 1,239 people who apparently slept in 410 beds, giving an overall mean of 3.02 people per bed. However, too much stress must not be placed on this mean figure since the ratio of people to beds across the reported households varied very considerably. In general it would seem likely that three or four to a bed was not uncommon, unless, that is, some members of the family slept on the floor or in chairs. Another possibility might be some sort of shift arrangement implemented around differential working hours, as was the case in Richard Arkwright's early mill at Cromford.15 The lack of bedding is specifically noted in the case of 31 households.
Table 1  Number of beds, related to household size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household size</th>
<th>Number of beds</th>
<th>Mean number of beds according to household size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey includes no information on size of beds, nor the use of cradles for babies. There are a few specific mentions of the need for further beds or bedding, for example: ‘has to lie on the floor on a little straw and his sister’s cradle clothes’; ‘need another bed very much’; ‘has another bedstead but no bed’; ‘17 [year-old] has to lay with father and mother’; ‘all [mother and children of both sexes aged seven to eighteen] lays in one bed for want of more bedding’. Each of these would point to a marked concern about not only the lack of suitable bedding but also the undesirable situation of children and adults sleeping together.

Earnings

In his book on handloom weavers Bythell devotes two chapters to wages, one on the piece-rate, and the other on earnings and the standard of living. He discusses in detail the problems of deriving reliable measurements of wage levels, and it is not intended here to rehearse these, but rather to discuss the type of ‘financial’ information available in the notebook, and then to explore a limited number of aspects for which the available information seems particularly suited.

As noted earlier, typically the information for households includes ‘total weekly income’, which consists of the weekly earnings of the members of the household and any parish relief granted. This is illustrated by the example given in Figure 2. Sometimes, however, the information for a household is partial or missing. This section which follows concentrates on an analysis of the earnings of male heads of household, particularly handloom weavers.

The survey only gives details of ‘actual’ earnings, in a current week, or occasionally notes an average over a small number of weeks. Such amounts would of course depend upon a variety of factors, notably the amount of work
Table 2  Earnings of male heads of household by occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>amount</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Earnings</th>
<th>amount</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Handloom Weaver</td>
<td>- to 2-0d</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5-1d to 6-0d</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-1d to 3-0d</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6-1d to 7-0d</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-1d to 4-0d</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7-1d to 8-0d</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-1d to 5-0d</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory Weaver</td>
<td>5-0d</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10-0d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-0d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11-2d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-6d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12-0d</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8-0d</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>12-0d</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14-0d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delver (Quarryman)</td>
<td>10-0d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15-0d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14-0d</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collier</td>
<td>4-0d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12-0d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10-0d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14-0d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td>3-0d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7-0d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sizer (coated warp cloth with 'size')</td>
<td>7-0d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12-0d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>12-0d</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beamer (factory worker, preparatory process)</td>
<td>10-0d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20-0d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rag Gatherer</td>
<td>7-0d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winder</td>
<td>1-0d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Bottomer</td>
<td>2-0d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailor</td>
<td>4-6d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Jobs'</td>
<td>1-6d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warper (as for Beamer)</td>
<td>10-0d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine Tenter</td>
<td>14-0d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasman</td>
<td>8-0d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 'Gassing' is a treatment applied to yarn, though the occupation may have some other meaning.

obtained. For many handloom weavers, current work was only part-time (they are sometimes described as 'shorted' of work), and for some, the unemployed, there was no current work at all. Another important factor for weavers was the piece-rate, which varied from employer to employer, and according to the type of cloth. The majority would probably have been weaving plain calico, though there is one mention of worsted, and two of 'delaines', a type of woollen cloth. The piece-rate is discussed later on. The earnings of male heads of household is summarized in Table 2; however in interpreting this table it must also be remembered that the better-off in the community were not visited, and that for some in the notebook not receiving poor relief no earnings are given. The table also excludes those who received 'dole' money, generally for working on the roads; those are considered later. It should also be remembered that a few of those given in the table as handloom weavers may actually have been factory weavers, as already noted.
It is immediately noticeable how low handloom weavers' earnings were in comparison with most other contemporary occupations. Factory weavers clearly had the ability to earn more, though the best-paid handloom weavers could rival some factory workers, if the assumption that these did not work in a factory is correct.

In his general discussion of earnings, Bythell points out that 'It is erroneous to think that most factory workers - many of whom, again, were women and children - received high wages in the early nineteenth century'. He goes on to cite Leonard Horner, a Factory Inspector, who reported in 1842 that 'with the exception of the mule-spinners, dressers, overlookers, mechanics, and a few others, all of whom constitute but a small proportion of the whole, the majority of workers in a cotton mill receive very moderate wages'. However, at this desperate time for handloom weavers in our area the male head of household factory weavers were generally substantially better off than their handloom counterparts, and also there would probably be other factory workers not visited, being not needy.

Piece work is often seen as an important element of the structure of early nineteenth-century textile working. In the case of the notebook chosen for this study there are three specific references to the 'piece-rate'. One for 7 1/2d can be seen in Figure 2, another entry gives 'cotton at 5d and 7d', and a third gives '6d a piece for one employer, formerly, but now 1s-6d for another employer', with a note that '[she] [aged 67] can do 3 [in a week]'. Bythell gives a series of piece rates for calico from 1814 to 1841, though for the last few years these are based on only one set of figures. For all years these rates are above 1s-0d, though since 1836 had not been above 1s-4d. From the evidence of the notebook it would seem that things had worsened even further by 1843, coupled with the increased problem of lack of work.

Absent as an occupation is that of spinner. Whilst it is true that later in the century the area came to specialise in weaving, with little spinning being undertaken, at this relatively early period of the development of the cotton industry there were spinning factories in the region: indeed powerloom weaving would often start up as part of an existing spinning establishment. Such factories were concentrated on Colne Water, Pendle Water, and on the smaller rivers. Despite this no heads of household were noted as spinners, suggesting that spinners, as no doubt some factory weavers, were not visited.

The information in the notebooks enables an analysis to be undertaken on the earnings of handloom weavers by age. This information is summarized in the form of a scatter diagram presented in Figure 3. As expected, older men had less earning capacity than younger men, only two over the age of 42 earned more than 5s. This is not surprising given that handloom weaving was quite demanding physically, placing strains on various parts of the body with its repetitive movements. Wages in fact peaked between the ages of 28 and 35. The low earning power of the youngest might be explained by the fact that weaving was semi-skilled and that it would take some time to develop skills fully. However, the activity could be learnt at a basic level fairly quickly, and
Figure 3
Scattergraph of earnings of male heads of households, handloom weavers, against age
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it may be that the higher earners were weaving a type of cloth requiring greater skill than plain calico. Perhaps more likely is that workers were not considered by the employers as warranting a mature adult's wage until they had reached their late twenties and thirties.

Parish relief

For 326 of the 440 households surveyed there is 'full' information on total weekly income and the part of this, if any, which was parish relief. Thirty-eight of these come under the special category of 'dole' workers. This is not a contradiction in terms, but refers to those with no ordinary income who received money from the parish for taking on 'parish work', usually road mending. This second category will be discussed separately.

Of the 288 non-dole receiving households, 105 received some parish relief, including 32 who had no earnings at all, that is, all their income was relief. As Boyson points out, the pre-1834 system of making up wages by 'outdoor' relief persisted for many years in Lancashire, not least because of the scale of the needs of the poor.\(^{20}\) The 32 households with no earnings at all consisted mainly of one or two people. These were usually the older members of the population; younger male heads of household with no ordinary earnings normally being on dole work.

Table 3 provides detail on the amount of relief payments in relation to the earnings gained through work and presents this information according to size of household. Considering the mean total income by household sizes for those households for whom part of the 'total' income was relief, it would seem that wages were increased on average by an amount which very roughly generally made the income up to 1s-6d per head, though the amount was rather less in the case of some middle-sized households. This figure of 1s-6d may be compared with amounts made under the Old Poor Law of 2s-6d for Wilmslow in 1826, and 2s-0d for Manchester in 1834.\(^{21}\) For northern industrial areas generally under the New Poor Law, Rose gives approximate payments of 1s-0d to 1s-6d (2s-0d to 2s-6d for an old person), as amounts for those with no regular earnings, acknowledging, however, that an applicant for relief would often have some other source of income such as sporadic earnings, or indeed charity.\(^{22}\) One may wonder in fact whether the public relief granted, in whatever form, was sometimes lessened on account of the existence of charitable efforts.

The variation in payments given in Table 3 by household size is considerable. Returning to the notebook it is possible sometimes to speculate why the total income for particular households is well above or below the appropriate mean. For example, one of the households of size two having total income of only 1s-6d (all relief) consists of a widow aged sixty-eight who 'begs', and her son, who 'jobs'. As a converse example, in the household of size five with total income 12s-3d (1s-0d relief), the seventy-three year old head of household has himself no earnings, and has 'bad sight', though the rest earn quite well: maybe the authorities were sympathetic to an older person with a sight disability. Of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household size</th>
<th>Total income when relieved (N = total number)</th>
<th>Total income when not relieved (N = total number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(M = mean total income)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-0d (5) 2-3d</td>
<td>2-6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-6d (3) 2-6d (4)</td>
<td>3-0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-0d (7) 2-9d (2)</td>
<td>5-0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 22 M = 1-10d</td>
<td>N = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-6d (2) 3-6d (4)</td>
<td>1-6d 4-0d (2) 9-0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-0d</td>
<td>2-9d 4-3d (2) 13-0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-9d</td>
<td>3-2d 4-6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-0d (2)</td>
<td>3-6d 4-9d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-3d</td>
<td>3-9d 5-0d (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 12 M = 3-1d</td>
<td>N = 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2-0d</td>
<td>2-0d 5-8d 12-6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-6d</td>
<td>4-4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-6d</td>
<td>6-0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-0d (2)</td>
<td>4-0d (2) 6-9d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-3d</td>
<td>4-6d 7-0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-5d</td>
<td>5-0d 7-5d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-0d (2)</td>
<td>5-2d 11-9d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-3d (2)</td>
<td>5-6d (2) 12-0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 18 M = 4-6d</td>
<td>N = 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2-0d</td>
<td>2-0d 6-0d (5) 8-0d (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-6d</td>
<td>6-4d 8-6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-0d</td>
<td>6-6d (5) 9-6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-9d (2)</td>
<td>5-0d (4) 7-0d (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-6d</td>
<td>5-2d 7-3d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-0d</td>
<td>5-6d (2) 7-6d (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 9 M = 5-6d</td>
<td>N = 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3-0d</td>
<td>4-0d 8-0d (2) 13-9d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-6d</td>
<td>5-0d 6-3d 14-0d (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-6d</td>
<td>6-0d (2) 14-6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-6d</td>
<td>6-6d 15-9d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-9d</td>
<td>7-0d (6) 20-6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8-0d</td>
<td>7-6d (4) 21-0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9-6d</td>
<td>7-9d 12-0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 9 M = 8-1d</td>
<td>N = 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5-0d</td>
<td>3-0d 9-0d 13-0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-9d (2)</td>
<td>6-0d 9-4d 14-0d (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-0d (2)</td>
<td>6-6d (2) 15-0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8-0d (2)</td>
<td>7-0d (4) 16-7d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8-3d</td>
<td>8-0d 12-0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8-6d</td>
<td>8-6d (2) 12-3d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 11 M = 7-10d</td>
<td>N = 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3-0d</td>
<td>5-0d 9-9d 13-2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-0d</td>
<td>7-3d 10-0d 14-0d (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8-6d</td>
<td>7-10d 15-0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9-6d</td>
<td>8-0d 16-6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10-0d</td>
<td>8-6d (2) 17-8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-6d</td>
<td>9-2d 18-0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 6 M = 7-11d</td>
<td>N = 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8</th>
<th>8-0d</th>
<th>13-0d</th>
<th>7-6d (2)</th>
<th>13-6d</th>
<th>30-0d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9-0d</td>
<td>13-6d</td>
<td>8-6d</td>
<td>15-6d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10-6d</td>
<td>15-6d</td>
<td>10-0d</td>
<td>17-0d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-0d</td>
<td>16-9d</td>
<td>10-4d</td>
<td>20-0d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-6d (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>12-0d</td>
<td>20-3d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 10</td>
<td>M = 12-0d</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11-6d (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4-6d</td>
<td>14-0d</td>
<td>15-0d (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15-4d</td>
<td></td>
<td>10-8d</td>
<td>14-6d</td>
<td>17-0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 3</td>
<td>M = 12-9d</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12-6d</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-6d</td>
<td>13-0d</td>
<td>18-0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-0d</td>
<td></td>
<td>12-9d</td>
<td>16-0d</td>
<td>20-0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 2</td>
<td>M = 14-3d</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>16-3d</td>
<td></td>
<td>18-0d</td>
<td>18-6d</td>
<td>28-0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 1</td>
<td>M = 16-3d</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>15-0d</td>
<td>17-0d</td>
<td>18-6d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 2</td>
<td>M = 16-0d</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

course there could be many relevant factors not revealed by the detail given in the notebook, and it is no doubt safest to stick to general trends.

For the larger household sizes, say from about four upwards, there is, of course, considerable variation in household composition. Yet, equally it is interesting to look in some detail at some specific cases of the smaller households in order to gain a full insight to the operation and structure of relief. This is done by taking each of the household sizes one to three in turn.

*Household size one* – Of the 22 ‘households’, 19 of the individuals were aged 65 or more, the next youngest being 35. The mean income figure of 1s-10d is not too dissimilar from that quoted earlier for older people from Rose. Of the 19, nine were men, ten women. Using the Mann-Whitney U-test, no significant difference between the total income of the sexes was found at the ten per cent level. Next, the 19 elderly relief recipients were ranked according to age and according to total household income, and the Kendall rank correlation coefficient calculated. Again testing at the ten per cent level, no significant correlation emerged.

*Household size two* – Of the 12 households, it is a reasonable assumption that six of these were old married couples given they had ages of 59 or upwards. The youngest of these, by eight years in terms of combined ages, had a total household income of only 2s, whereas the others received at least 3s. The lowest two households, each receiving 1s-6d, were both formed of an old person and, presumably, a son. In contrast, the highest of the 12, receiving 5s-6d consisted of an old person and, presumably, a daughter.
Household size three – Of the 18 households, seven consisted of, presumably, a widow with two young children. The total income for these, in three cases all relief, ranged from 2s to 4s-3d, with a mean of 3s-4d. The four highest, at 6s or more, each contained at least one old person, as well as at least one younger adult, probably earning.

Taking all households together the information in the notebooks allows investigation into the basic question of whether some age groups were treated more generously than others in terms of relief. For each member of a household that received some relief, the total income for the household divided by household size gives a figure of ‘notional income’ (NI). This can be applied equally to earners, unemployed adults, children, old people, and so on. Table 4 gives the mean NI values for seven age groups. These age groups are generally arbitrary, however, the 10-14 group corresponds roughly to an age where small earnings were quite common, and the 61 plus group to an age where earning potential had declined. The approach adopted is not without its problems. For example, children in the first three or four groups would usually be in households with one or two parents in the fifth and sixth groups. Thus there is probably considerable interdependence between the groups, rendering formal statistical testing using analysis of variance of doubtful significance.

The mean NI values in Table 4, with one exception, are positively related with age. This might suggest that young recipients would not have required so much food as the more elderly and, young children apart, would have had greater earning potential. Conversely the older recipients would have required more by way of clothing and fuel, and have had little earning potential. As already noted, Rose found that old people tended to receive more. The small dip in the mean NI value for the most ‘able-bodied’ group 21-40 may perhaps indicate that relief was administered according to earning potential, however, as noted above, members in this age group would often share a household with children recorded in the three younger age groups.

NI values were also calculated for the 14 households headed, presumably, by widows, with no children of age 15 or over, and 19 households with, again presumably, both parents and no children of age 15 or over. For the widows' households the mean NI value is 15.21d, for the second group it is 15.16d. Consequently it seems there was no greater support available for the households of widows with children none of whom was aged 15 or more than for the corresponding households of married couples. However, the latter group unsurprisingly tended to have rather larger household sizes and it was noted earlier that generally middle-sized households had rather lower total incomes per head. Thus, if anything, it seems that there was a tendency for widows' households to be less well supported than those of married couples.

Lastly, the situation of those relieved is compared with those who were not. Table 3 shows quite a few examples of households not relieved with earnings well below the mean total income of households of the same size receiving relief. It is, of course, not possible to do more than speculate why relief was not
Table 4  Mean Notional Income, within households relieved, according to age group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Mean Notional Income (pence)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>15.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>16.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>17.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>17.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>17.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>19.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td>20.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

obtained in the case of those low-earning households. The details of material wants and needs provided by the source would indicate that income level was often insufficient.

‘Dole’ relief

As noted earlier, the heads of thirty-eight households were recorded as being on ‘dole’, often noted to be road work. Such ‘dole’ workers received relief under the Outdoor Labour Test Order of 1842, which was introduced for able-bodied males in many Poor Law Unions in the manufacturing areas as an alternative to the 1834 Workhouse Test. This ‘working’ form of relief was granted only to male heads of household with sizeable families where the household had no other earnings and was not combined with other forms of relief. Of the thirty-eight household heads receiving dole, six were in their twenties, twenty-five in their thirties, six in their forties, and one aged fifty. With few exceptions the Guardians worked to a sliding-scale dependent on the size of the household: 9s-0d for a family of five, and just 1s-0d for each extra member. Compared to non-dole households, the dole worker’s household seem generally to have been rather better supported, except for the largest households.

According to the Test Order, half the relief was to be in kind and half in money.23 Boyson suggests that the central authority, namely the Poor Law Commission, took the view that ‘the pauper was not to be trusted and was likely to misappropriate relief given wholly in money’. He also indicates however that the local Guardians took an opposite view, believing that the pauper had a right to decide how to spend his relief.24 The notebooks give just two examples of relief received ‘in kind’. One male head of household in Briercliffe lived ‘5 1/2 miles from Burnley and goes thither for their relief in meal or flour’, whilst the other, also from Briercliffe, received ‘6s-0d a week and his meat’. In view of the favourable comparison with households relieved by supplement to wages noted in the previous paragraph, and the fact that the notebook is almost totally lacking in reference to relief in kind, it seems likely that the Burnley guardians did not conform to the requirements to relieve dole workers partially in kind. This is in part supported by evidence from the Lancashire Unions studied by Boyson, for which, throughout the period 1834-71 a lower proportion of relief was given in kind than had been the case by the
autonomous pre-1838 township authorities.\textsuperscript{25} Equally, Rose notes that in the case of the industrial West Riding of Yorkshire, local Boards of Guardians did not find themselves too restricted by the Labour Test Order.\textsuperscript{26}

\textbf{Conclusion}

Before summarising findings, it is perhaps worthwhile stressing again that caution is needed with this source, in that by its very nature it largely covers only the poorer sections of the community: about two-thirds of the population. Yet still a number of interesting findings are forthcoming in regards to sleeping arrangements. The mean of three people per bed, together with the considerable variation in the ratio of people to beds within households, would imply either some overcrowding in this respect, or substantial use of floors, chairs, etc., with maybe some 'shift' arrangements. Concerning earnings, there is reasonably firm evidence that handloom weavers were generally behind their factory counterparts, though it must be borne in mind that a few of those designated handloom weavers may in fact have worked in a factory.

The stated earnings are usually just for the current or recent week, and only occasionally are given as an average over a number of weeks. Thus the notebooks provide a 'snapshot' view and as such would have been influenced by fluctuating conditions, for example the current state of trade, and the weather (if this were particularly bad, handloom weavers might have difficulty obtaining supplies of yarn, or delivering their finished product). Equally, the piece-rates would have varied according to the type of material. In the case of household heads, handloom weavers' earnings peaked between the ages of around 28 to 35. This would have been influenced by physical factors and the ability to establish contacts.

Turning to relief, income within households was generally made up to about 1s-6d a head, and somewhat more for older people. This confirms the findings of Rose. Indeed the Mean Notional Income values given in Table 4 clearly indicates how notional income increased with age. Tentative evidence also suggests that widows with no older 'children' in their household were slightly less well supported than married couples similarly placed, but one must be careful in drawing too strong a conclusion from this. Examining incomes of all households, both relieved and not, reveals that many were badly off. In some cases a special set of circumstances can be seen as an explanatory factor, but for most poverty was a general way of life. For 'dole' workers, normally 1s-0d for each family member was given on top of 9s-0d for a family of five. For many middle-sized families this level of payment resulted in the fact that the 'dole' household tended to be rather better-off than those in receipt of relief paid conventionally.

Lastly, it can be seen that relief in kind seemed very much the exception, though the document may, of course, have tended to disregard this issue. It is hoped that the detail presented in this article will have proved of intrinsic interest, and illustrated some of the aspects of the 'Hungry Forties', in a community that is perhaps typical of a rural Pennine area in this period.
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ST MARY’S CHURCH, WORSBROUGH, SOUTH YORKSHIRE: A REVIEW OF THE ACCURACY OF A PARISH REGISTER
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Introduction

Parish registers have long been recognised as an invaluable resource for both demographer and historian; their many deficiencies have been equally recognised, ranging from omissions and illegibility to the ravages of mice and men. Before their more general deposition in the sanctuary of Record Offices improved accessibility, the researcher could turn to the Bishops Transcripts, (hereafter BTs), which had been submitted to the diocesan registry as copies of the parish record. Often poorly preserved and chronologically incomplete, being but ‘fitfully and slovenly kept’, they were the foundation for early studies into parish affairs. Despite their inadequacies and presently reduced importance as a primary source, where the original register is now available, BTs are still considered to have their uses, in a secondary capacity, to check illegible original entries or for the additional information they frequently contain. Unfortunately, even they fail to restore to usefulness entries such as one in the Worsbrough parish register recording: ___ son of ___ buried 3 April 1669.

Having two copies of what are supposedly the same series of events offers an opportunity to check the accuracy of recording. A possibly unique situation arises at Worsbrough where an eighteenth century copy of the register covering 1741-1796 was preserved in the parish chest in addition to duplication of marriage records from 1754-1810 following the Hardwicke Marriage Act which provide further versions. As part of current research on the township, transcriptions of all the registers, the eighteenth century copy, duplicated marriage entries and the BTs were combined as a composite register for comparison. From attempts to reconstitute as many Worsbrough families as possible it was soon apparent there were major significant differences, for example in names and dates, with important consequences for demographer and family historian. This paper summarises the findings.

The Registers

Thomas Cromwell issued an injunction in 1538 ordering that ‘every church keep one book or register’ in which to record baptisms, burials and marriages. Each Sunday the minister was to enter all the events of the previous week in the presence of the churchwardens, failure to do so rendering the responsible persons liable to fines payable to the church. It is generally assumed that loose
sheets of paper were used but, in 1597, it was decreed that the events be recorded more diligently and on parchment, to include copies of the earlier paper record. It was further ordered in 1603 that each parish provide, at its own expense, a bound parchment book in which to record the events and transfer to it all previous records, especially since 1558.

The Worsbrough BTs are preserved at the Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, York, and a certificate attached to that for 1812 states there were six register books at Worsbrough ‘kept in a dry & secure place’ but ‘there is a period of nine years deficient in the Marriage Entries’. These missing marryers are amongst the burials as a result of a muddled rebinding of the books last century when the pages were cut smaller, incidentally removing the certification signatures of incumbents and churchwardens. The books are on parchment, leather bound, and deposited on loan at Sheffield Archives, though frequently released for church use. The books are not numbered but the designation 1, 2, 3 etc. used hereafter follows the archive deposition list. They contain an unbroken sequence from the sixteenth century to the present day, but this review is limited to a closing date of 1812 when the new format for registration was introduced.

During the research which initiated this analysis, notice had to be taken of the position of Worsbrough church as a ‘chapel of ease’, until the 1930s, with a perpetual curate, under the parish church of St John, in the neighbouring township of Darfield. The origins of this dependency are unknown, but both churches were pre-Norman foundations and Worsbrough may then have been part of a large parish centred on Darfield, in the wapentake of Strafforth. This wapentake appears to have contracted some time before the Conquest, with the transfer of Worsbrough into the adjoining Staincross wapentake, where it became a leading township. No pre-Conquest documentary evidence survives for the region, but the earliest medieval records show Worsbrough was closely tied socially and economically to Staincross, having little association with Strafforth, or even its ‘mother’ church at Darfield, other than the latter’s claim to all Worsbrough tithes and an obligation to provide a priest.

Worsbrough church had clearly acquired the rights to conduct baptisms, burials and marriages, virtually running its affairs as an independent parish with a full range of parish officers. However, it was necessary to examine the Darfield registers to judge any effect the attractions the ‘mother’ church may have held for Worsbrough inhabitants. The need was reinforced when checks on the plausible completeness of the Worsbrough registers showed that, taking the seventeenth century for example, whilst a baptism rate of 34.3 per 1,000 and burial rate of 24.3 per 1,000 met criteria for plausibility, the marriage rate failed to achieve the 8 per 1,000 its population figures might suggest. Although there were no marriages in 1647-1648, the baptism and burial totals at the time were not unusual. The search positively identified only one Worsbrough woman marrying at Darfield, five baptisms of Worsbrough infants but no burials. A search in other parishes adjoining Worsbrough was equally unproductive, suggesting that the registers are as complete as might reasonably be expected.
Book 1 shows clear evidence of the early period of copying where the pages are ruled in neat lines and all entries are in the same hand until 1599. However, the events begin in different years: baptisms in May 1559, burials April 1570, and marriages January 1565. This might suggest that records kept prior to the 1599 edict had been in separate books and, at the time of making the parchment copy, only the latest book of each had survived with consequent loss of the earlier records. A further period of copying is indicated from 1600 to 1603, in a different hand, with subsequent entries commonly made in year groups, becoming progressively untidy with frequent corrections and insertions. The year normally begins at Lady Day but, between 1609-1615 entries are grouped from Easter Day (see later, under BTs) and the curate describes the 1613 baptism list as 'Baptisms last yeare from Easter 1613 until this Easter 1614', his year ending 18 April, so adding to the problem of ascribing a year to an event. The book ends in 1674 with a statement confirming payment for its rebinding in 1782.

Book 2 continues from 1675 until 1740-1741, a minor complication being a rebinding error where the burials are preceded by the 1717-1740 marriages, but followed by the 1675-1716 marriages.

Book 3 contains baptisms and burials from 1741 to 1812, but marriages end in 1810. The script style suggests the entries from 1741 to 1796 have been copied from elsewhere in two hands and both copyists attempted to correct the problems of chronology created by the 1752 calendar change, but with limited success. Entries after 1779 follow the new calendar.

Book 4 is the original register book commencing 1741 which was discontinued in 1796. After its entries had been copied into a new volume, book 3 above, it was fortunately preserved in the parish chest so providing two copies of the register for these years. The circumstances which led to this unusual duplication are perhaps strange, but possibly not unique.

Following the calendar change in 1752, the incumbent, Revd Jeremiah Dixon (also a farmer and main brewer), tried the new system in 1754-1755 beginning the year on 1 January, but in 1760 reverted to the old style, losing most of 1758-1759 in the subsequent muddle. Fortunately these entries are preserved in the BTs. At his death in 1773 he was succeeded by his son, John, who was concerned at the confused state of the register and in 1778 added a note to the Burial register:

'The Register has been kept so far as if there had been no Alteration in the Style, the year not commencing till the 25th of March, which without some attention may cause mistakes. From this time therefore the year shall always commence the first of January'.

To the researcher this confusion is an irritation but not insuperable; to the archdeacon of York on his Visitation in October 1796 it was considered below the required standard and unacceptable. He ordered that:
there be a new folio parchment Register and that the Entries in the old Register be transferred to it beginning at the year 1741'.

This new register, book 3 above, thus contains the copied entries from the original register (book 4) and continues with new entries until its closure in 1812. Were it not for the fortuitous retention of the incomplete book 4, containing the original register entries to 1796, it might not be recognised that the volume now preserved and presented as 'the' parish register from 1741-1812 (book 3) in fact contains 55 years copied from another register. It is inconceivable that, amongst over 10,000 parishes, Worsbrough alone was required to tidy up its registers in this way and perhaps others have gone unrecognised. In view of the number of differences this copy reveals, doubts must be raised on the accuracy of any parish register, as it will have been compiled initially by copying from a collection of diary entries, in addition to having been copies into new register books at least twice by 1603, and possibly again later as at Worsbrough.

Books 8 and 9 contain the printed forms recording marriages in accordance with the Hardwicke Act for the years 1754-1803 and 1804-1812 respectively. They duplicate the register marriage record from 1754-1810 and provide the entries for 1811-1812 missing from book 3.

**Bishops transcripts**

The transcripts originated from the 1597 decree which included an order for a copy of the register to be sent annually, by the churchwardens, to the diocesan registry within the month following Easter. Those for Worsbrough commence in 1600 but, during the 213 years to the end of the period under review (1812), there are 53 missing, including 21 between 1640-1660 partly because the decree was cancelled under the Commonwealth.

The implications are that, for the 160 years where the BTs survive, there are two copies of all register events and between 1740-1796 there are three, with four copies of marriages between 1754-1796. To further confuse the situation, there were two BTs sent in 1637 and 1661 which differ both from each other and the register. As the archdeacon had simply ordered the old register be 'copied' and the BTs are certified 'true copies' by two church-wardens, then minimal variation might be assumed. The investigation shows such an assumption to be unwarranted and raises significant questions regarding both the original source of each version and the effects of variants on nominal linkage for family reconstitution. Variations in the BTs are perhaps not surprising, however, when it is noted that on five occasions they were signed as 'a true copy of the register' by illiterate churchwardens signing by a mark!

The organisers of the Cheshire Project found 'only a small proportion' of their BTs were variants; this would appear not to be the case in Worsbrough though, in the absence of comparative quantitative data, it cannot be said positively which is atypical. However, the Worsbrough study reinforces their conclusion that the PR/BT relationship is 'complex, inconsistent and often puzzling'.
### Table 1  Differences between Bishops Transcripts and equivalent parish register entries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1600-1650</th>
<th>1651-1700</th>
<th>1701-1750</th>
<th>1751-1800</th>
<th>1801-1812</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BAPTISMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surname – spelling</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surname – different</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forename – spelling</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forename – different</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forename – additional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation change</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation additional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional data</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date change – year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date change – month</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date change – day</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total differences</strong></td>
<td>169</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total events</strong></td>
<td>348</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>1061</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>3102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BURIALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surname – spelling</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surname – different</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forename – spelling</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forename different</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forename – additional</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation change</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation additional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional data</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date change – year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date change – month</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date change – day</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total differences</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total events</strong></td>
<td>216</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARRIAGES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surname – spelling</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surname – different</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forename – spelling</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forename – different</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forename – additional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation change</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation additional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional data</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date change – year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date change – month</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date change – day</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total differences</strong></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total events</strong></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand totals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Differences</th>
<th>Events</th>
<th>No. of BT years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Differences</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. of BT years</strong></td>
<td>181</td>
<td>1661</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Events total includes only those occurring in both PR and BT for years where BT survives.
Analysis: Parish Registers compared with Bishops Transcripts

Table 1 summarises all the differences between the Parish Registers and the BTs but it should be noted that only 22 BTs survive between 1600-1650 and 27 between 1651-1700. The period 1701-1750 lacks only 1717 so may be compared directly with the period 1751-1800, which includes the years when the register had to be re-written, and greater attention to accuracy is seen in the nineteenth century. In the full register total of 7,638 entries between 1600-1812 there are 5,719 recorded in both PR and the equivalent surviving BT of which 1,000 (17.5 per cent) show variations of some kind.

In reviewing the changes in spelling it must be conceded that differences are often minor and of little consequence to family historian or demographer, merely demonstrating the well-known lack of conformity and an element of laxity in the copying process. Variations of surname and forename are found in 10 per cent of the 5,719 entries recorded in both the register and BTs. Perhaps this is not surprising when dealing with illiterate villagers, strange accents and an often semi-literate parson trying to cope with the complexities of a ‘Micklethwaite’. However, 44 per cent of the variations are simple alternations of single/double consonants such as Milner/Millner or the extra ‘e’ found in Ward/Warde for example. It would be tempting to dismiss these as mere irritations but the decrease in variations by the early nineteenth century shows surnames becoming standardised, perhaps through increasing literacy, where, for instance, the Ward family had dropped the final ‘e’ in the mid-century census enumerators’ books. On the other hand, Clark/Clarke evolved into two distinct families by the later nineteenth century with no apparent connection unless traced back to the eighteenth century spelling variations.

The majority of the remaining 56 per cent could be resolved by family reconstitution, even for wide variations where the register and BT authors differed over Roddes/Rooydes/Rhodes or Stanzer/Stansill/Stancel/Stancey and a thorough mixing of Leech/Leach for example. However, a small group remains which cannot be resolved such as Cliffe/Clough and Perkin/Parkin/Parker which the nineteenth century census returns clearly show have become different family surnames. The two nineteenth century families of Brammah and Bramhall cannot be resolved from the eighteenth century permutations of Brammah/Brammer/Bramhall/Bramheld/Braham/Bramham, a problem not helped by Joshua Brammah marrying Elizabeth Bramheld in 1760.

Examples where the BT gives a completely different surname (0.4 per cent) are difficult to explain as this excludes those with known aliases. Perhaps, for females, a previous marriage could explain some differences as when William Carr married Dorthie Ellisonne in the register, but shown as Dorthie Heatone in the BT or a burial in 1601 where Ane Hawwaye of the register becomes Anne Dennis in the BT, as does her infant son in the same year. No similar explanation can be offered for changes in male surnames, as when the register states Richard Parkin is buried in 1607, but is Richard Couper in the BT. On 18 April 1607, the register records Jennet the daughter of Laurence Ellis was baptised, where the BT gives Jennet daughter of Laurence Sylverwood.
Different forenames in the BT (0.6 per cent) present particular problems for family reconstitution where, for example, in a family such as Rhodes, resident in Worsbrough over 300 years, William in the register, son of William, baptized in 1760, becomes John in the BT. Similarly, the baptism of Henry Beevors’ son is registered as Joseph on 24 August but Thomas on 19 September in the BT. As such forenames are common in these families, reconstitution borders on the impossible and it is even more difficult to know what to make of entries such as the following baptism entries in 1760:

Jan. 17  (PR) Thomas son of John Cliffe  
(BT) Anne daughter of John Cliffe

March 1  (PR) William & Betty son & dau of John Cawthorne  
(BT) Samuel & Mary son & dau of John Cawthorne.

We can usually be grateful for the items of additional information provided by the BTs, particularly occupations, sadly lacking in the earlier Worsbrough registers, which are often vital in distinguishing families of the same name. However, even here there are occasional terminology disagreements as when Thomas Rogerson is a husbandman in the 1788 burial register, but the BT demotes him to labourer.

Date changes between register and BTs are particularly common (3.5 per cent), defying reasonable explanation. Tests on whether they represent birth/baptism and death/burial dates found no correlation. A few are simple mis-readings where the BT scribe has copied register dates in the same order but opposite the wrong entry. Differences are usually so diverse, such as Anthony Farrer schoolmaster buried in 1705 on 7 November in the register but 16 August in the BT, as to suggest that the different authors were working independently. Changes range from a few days to months, and even years, with no means of knowing the ‘correct’ date.

Perhaps the most serious discrepancies are events recorded in either the registers or BTs, but not both, as summarised in Table 2. The problem persists throughout the register period, being particularly acute in the late eighteenth-century and, although the BTs do not survive for Worsbrough earlier than 1600, a study of the sixteenth century Long Melford records suggests the earlier period would have been no better, perhaps worse.13

If Worsbrough is not atypical, it is clear that the BTs cannot be discounted in any demographic work based on parish registers but, until more evidence is available, accounting for the discrepancy is open to debate. Ignoring the periods noted above when it is known that the register was copied from an existing record, the setting and handwriting show events were generally entered in year blocks at Worsbrough. In years when the hand can be compared with other sources, the register author was an assistant curate, excepting two periods which were compiled by the curate, one of whom appears to have made the entries on, or close, to the actual day. However, identification of the BT author is confounded by a peculiarity of the recording process. Particularly following the adoption of an ‘early modern’ style writing in the 1630s, the register entries are in a large scrawling script, well spaced, occupying the full 25cm page width
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1600-1650</th>
<th>1651-1700</th>
<th>1701-1750</th>
<th>1751-1800</th>
<th>1801-1812</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>BT</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>BT</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>BT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptisms</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burials</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriages</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total variants</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. baptisms</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>1141</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. burials</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. marriages</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no. events</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. BT years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% in PR only</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% in BT only</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Events total includes PR entries for years where BT survives plus any additional entries in BT.

whereas the BTs are on smaller pieces of parchment, often strips down to 10cm, and written in a neat, small (frequently tiny) hand. After due allowance for the scribe’s being affected by enforced neatness and constricted space, half the BTs appear not to have been written by the compiler of the register. These BT copies accounted for 63.5 per cent of the variations summarised in the Tables.

Excepting the incumbency of Revd Jeremiah Dixon (1748-1774), the periods where both register and BT can be considered to have a common author contain only 14.7 per cent of the differences. The Revd Dixon submitted 20 of the 26 BTs during his curacy and he alone accounts for 21.8 per cent of the differences found throughout the whole period reviewed.

Taking all the variations into account, in addition to the frequent tendency for events to be recorded in a different order in the BT, a simple copying process to produce a BT from the register is suspect. Examples where the register and BT authors were different might suggest they were working from separate diaries of events and, although the BT was supposed to be compiled by the churchwardens, the handwriting suggests not; they merely signed it. Even when the register and the BT can be ascribed to the same person, the variation is such as not to rule out compilation from separate diary records in many cases. In 1637, when two differing BTs were sent, one can be identified as the curate’s hand, the register by the assistant curate, but the other BT is by neither. This would imply a communication failure, the two records not being compared before submission of the BT, and nullifies the signed assertion by the curate that it is a ‘true copy’ of the register. The 1758 baptisms present a prime example where, of the 22 entries, 7 are only in the BT, 4 in the register but not the BT and 7 of the remaining register entries are given a different date in the BT. Over the whole period it is seen that 3.4 per cent of entries are not in both the register and the BT, whilst 1.1 per cent occur only in the BT.
It is generally accepted that registers are subject to a degree of under-recording which, by its nature, cannot be quantified and any attempt to estimate the extent enters the realm of conjecture. In this instance, however, if the BTs are excluded in any aggregating procedure, there will be a known 1.1 per cent under-recording overall in the Worsbrough register for 160 years covered by the BTs, the loss in each event being 1.0 per cent baptisms, 1.3 per cent burials and 0.5 per cent marriages. Such a loss from aggregated totals could be significant in itself but it is not known at this stage if Worsbrough is typical: if exceptionally high then, as a ‘rogue’ register, it could be discounted: if it were found abnormally low then doubts must arise on the validity of any aggregation of events taken solely from registers. However, aggregations in earlier studies based solely on the BTs could be even more unreliable, the overall deficiency at Worsbrough being 2.4 per cent, derived from baptisms 2.5 per cent, burials 2.0 per cent and marriages 2.8 per cent.

**Analysis: Comparison with the ‘extra’ register**

The variations found between the original register (book 4) and the copied sections of the main register (book 3) are summarised in Table 3 which shows 22.5 per cent of the 2,140 entries differ in some way. Two copyists were employed, neither of whom has been identified: one copied the baptisms, making numerous errors and changes in the process, the other copied the burials and marriages with few changes. The then curate, Revd William Porter, signed them as being true copies, despite the differences, though he occasionally scribbled corrections on the baptism copy.

The scribes appeared concerned to arrange one entry per line, even at the expense of omitting detail which would have been lost had the original not been preserved. However, detail is occasionally added which showed an intimate knowledge of the minor locations in the township area and of the families. As with the BTs, there are numerous changes in the spelling of surnames, the majority being of the simple Windore/Winder type. However, the baptism copyist often introduces a new element by deciding to ‘standardize’ a name, as with ‘Gelder’, for example, which he changes to ‘Geldar’ throughout, yet, when the register continues with new entries after 1796, it reverts to ‘Gelder’.

Current research into the origin and distribution of surnames in the region shows that even such simple blanket changes can be misleading. More seriously for Worsbrough family reconstitution, he changed the Caward entries into Coward, where these are known to be two distinct families, long resident in Worsbrough, then compounds it by changing a Caward into Cawood, which is another different family. The original register permits reconstitution of these families of the period, but the copy does not.

The scribes show a similar irritating disposition regarding forenames where, for instance, every Joshua in the baptisms becomes Joshuah, but remains Joshua in the burials. When the copy has a totally different forename, however, the copyist may be indicating the name by which the person has become known later as, for example, the carpenter ‘Matthew’ Fletcher whom he records as
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>1741-60</th>
<th>1761-80</th>
<th>1781-96</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BAPTISMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surname – spelling</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surname – different</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forename – spelling</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forename – different</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forename additional</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation change</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation additional</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional data</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date change – Day</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total differences</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total entries</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>1231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences %</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BURIALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surname – spelling</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surname – different</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forename – spelling</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forename – different</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date change – Month</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total differences</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total entries</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences %</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARRIAGES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surname – spelling</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total differences</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total entries</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences %</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand totals**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total differences</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total entries</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>2140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences %</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'John' Fletcher. To confuse matters further, the curate appears periodically to have checked the progress of the baptism copy and, where it differs, has added the original statement above the copy entry as, in this case, he changes 'John' back to 'Mathew'. The copyists are occasionally helpful in supplying a forename lacking in the original, as with the baptism of John, son of Joseph Tasker in 1768, though it is still unclear which child of George Charlesworth is baptised in 1752 when the original is blank. The copyist says it is John and the BT gives George.
Checking of the copy as it progressed is particularly evident regarding occupational entries where the copyist has altered 75, but the curate, Revd Porter, has written above the entry, in his distinctive scrawl, the occupation of 71 of these as given in the original. Of particular interest are the references to ‘husbandman’ in 104 entries in the original register, representing 57 different men. The copyist altered 47 entries, the most noticeable being 25 demoted to ‘labourer’ and 5 promoted to farmer. The curate amended 41 of these back to the original, but neither he nor the copyist was consistent and it cannot be said with certainty what occupational description was intended, nor whether there were clearly understood definitions of husbandman, labourer and farmer. The element of doubt almost certainly reflects eighteenth-century changes in Worsbrough, when the major landowners were enclosing and amalgamating smallholdings into their farms; the copyist of 1796 was clearly influenced by the changing status of many families since the middle of the century, whereas the curate was more concerned to retain the original text. However, the latter appears to tire of checking and makes no amendments to the burial and marriage registers, which retain the copyist’s interpretations. Despite the variety found in the copy it is noticeable that, unlike the BTs, there are no changes in any of the dates excepting year groups where, after sorting the entries into month order, the copyists attempted to comply with the calendar change in 1752, thereby occasionally clouding the issue as to the ‘correct’ year. It should be noted that, compared to the original register, all the variations in the copy and the BTs are different, excepting nine minor spellings and two occupational changes.

Finally, the copyist records the baptism of: John, son of Michael Harper, labourer, 2 April, 1770. As this entry does not occur in either the original register of the period or the BTs, it would be interesting to know the source of his information for an event occurring 26 years before he wrote the copy.

Analysis: Hardwicke marriage register, 1754-1812

The particular bonus obtained from what may be termed the Hardwicke marriage registers, printed forms introduced following the Hardwicke Act, is the record of marriages in 1811-12, missing from the register book 3. There are, however, twenty four further spelling variations, six additional occupations and eight general items of additional information. More importantly perhaps, there are two day changes and one different forename.

Conclusion

The value of Bishops Transcripts is not in dispute where they augment and amplify parish register entries, even to supplying a significant number of additional entries, as at Worsbrough. It is clear that any edition of a parish register cannot be considered complete without inclusion of the transcript material, though this may, at times, appear to confuse rather than clarify. As virtually all registers are copies made by compilation from some form of diary, perhaps even two diaries if the indications of independently compiled Bishops Transcripts are correct, then the degree of accuracy applied in the copying process becomes vital.
Changes in procedure, introduced in the early years of registration, mean that records prior to 1603 will have been copied at least twice and, if the standard of accuracy displayed in the enforced eighteenth-century copy register at Worsbrough is at all typical, grave doubts on reliability are inevitable. Demographers and family historians alike look to parish registers in anticipation of precision in names, dates and places: this analysis, perhaps, has brought little comfort to either.

NOTES

2. The composite register is an intended publication by St Mary’s Church, Worsbrough, with copies deposited in Sheffield Archives and the Borthwick Institute.
4. Registers deposited on loan at Sheffield Archives, uncatalogued but, if available, can be accessed under reference PR3 as books 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, having been given arbitrary numbers reflecting the order of deposition, not necessarily chronological sequence.
5. Wapentakes were Anglo-Danish administrative areas equivalent to Anglo-Saxon Hundreds.
7. It is not uncommon for entries to be ‘lost’ from a chapelry where the senior church retains a strong influence; see Introduction in M. Drake, Population studies from parish registers, (Matlock, 1982).
10. I am grateful to Mr W. Morton, local historian, for drawing my attention to the existence of these forms.
12. Percentages are based on the total number of register entries only for the years where BTs survive.
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EDITORIAL COMMENT

Readers of this article and those who have studied other parish registers should gain some help from the following extracts taken from D J Steel, National Index of Parish Registers, Volume I (London: Society of Genealogists, 1968):

Later transcripts (p.26)

Many registers were recopied for one reason or another at various times in the 17th and 18th centuries. One of the earliest of these post-1598 transcripts was at Stepney [in 1613].

The keeping of the registers (pp.27-32)

All sixteenth century registers and many of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries are secondary texts. It is not generally appreciated that seventeenth and eighteenth century parish registers are very frequently copies of a primary text, probably a memorandum book kept for the purpose. The writing up was done monthly and sometimes quarterly [or even annually]. Such book-keeping could only be done from notes or memoranda made at about the time of the ceremonies themselves.

This custom of copying entries into the register from a rough note book seems to have been widespread in the 18th century over most of the country and probably occurred to some extent throughout the entire period from 1538 to 1837. Where a rough register was kept, the entries were usually copied up much less frequently than weekly and it is clear that such a system made omissions due to carelessness and forgetfulness more likely. In the parish of Mitcham [Surrey] the clerk kept a rough note-book and this has survived. A comparison with the parish register shows: 'In many cases, as might be expected, entries made by the formed are omitted by the latter, and vice versa. But where entries are found in both, they often disagree in the matter of dates, and sometimes even in the christian names, the surnames, or the relationship of the parties concerned.' Sometimes discrepancies between two surviving lists of entries defy explanation. Sometimes a new and more efficient incumbent copied up into the register entries he found in a paper register. Sometimes the Vicar himself appears to have kept the rough note-book. Thus in 1766, the vicar of Chatham, Kent, observes in a letter that 'the entries are chiefly brought from the Minute Book, carefully kept in the Vestry room, and it cannot be supposed that there should be any material variation in the case'. A similar book was kept at St Margaret's Rochester, but a great many entries were omitted in the copying into the register.

Some clerks did not even use rough registers but wrote the entries on odd slips of paper with the idea of writing them in at some later date. As with a rough notebook, the entries might be abbreviated when entered up. Sometimes the parish register contains even more defective data. In the register of Rochdale, Lancs. the name of the wife is frequently not given in a marriage entry or the Christian name in a burial. [Sometimes the clerk's] notes might never be entered in the register in any form. Thus in the register of St Peter's Dorchester:
'1645. In twelve months there died 52 persons whose names are not inserted, the old clerk being dead who had the notes'. This practice explains why entries are often found in the Bishop's Transcripts but not in the register. In these cases it would appear that when the Bishop's transcripts came to be written at the end of the year the loose slips were transcribed in their proper order on the parchment.

Although vast numbers of clerical errors in parish register must have remained uncorrected to baffle the future genealogist, occasionally one finds a note of correction. In Barnstaple Parish Registers is recorded the baptism on 23rd Nov. 1794 of William son of John and Elizabeth Ley. A note has been added: 'The William was an error for John and was corrected 29th June 1843 by the Vicar in the presence of the father'.

Information given in the Transcripts (pp.174-5)

For the most part the Bishop's Transcripts are copies of the Parish Register although some details may be omitted as is shown by the following example: Truro, Cornwall, Parish Register: '9 June 1756 Richard Surgent, mariner, and Mary Williams, widow, married by licence. Witnesses, William Startridge, Edw. Terrill'. Bishop's Transcript: '9 June 1756 Richard Surgent and Mary Williams married by licence'.

Sometimes entire entries may be omitted, such as those of illegitimate children, perhaps on the principle that the less said, the better. Nevertheless, at other times these transcripts betray unmistakable signs that they, and the register are both copies of some earlier text, probably the clerk's rough notebook. Thus, the transcript may have entries not in the register, and what are actually telescoped entries in the register are given correctly. Sometimes extraordinary discrepancies occur between the two texts, such as the interchange of bride and bridegroom's surnames in a marriage entry or the interchange of the bride's surnames in two separate entries.

There is also evidence to suggest that in some cases the Bishop's Transcripts were copied from neither the register nor the rough notebook. Not infrequently one finds that a considerable number of entries are in the Bishop's Transcripts which are not in the register at all. Thus the register of St. Nicholas, Gloucester has no marriages at all for 1687 and yet the transcript shows 18 entries. These were probably copied from loose slips that were never written up in the register.

This also leads to the interesting possibility that however neglected the transcripts were in most parishes, in the eyes of some vicars or clerks they were more important than the registers.

The Value of Bishop's Transcripts (pp.181-2)

Emphasis has already been placed on the value of Bishop's Transcripts in 'filling in' entries missing in the parish register or in clarifying doubtful readings. As well as the genealogist and the historian, lawyers have had
frequent recourse to Bishop's Transcripts to check suspected forgeries in parish registers. Copies of Bishop's Transcripts are extremely useful if used with caution. Only too often the unwary searcher assumes that in searching a copy of the Bishop's Transcripts he avoids the necessity of examining the original registers. Unfortunately, this is seldom the case, as most dioceses have at least the odd year here and there missing in a series. Thus, although copies of Bishop's Transcripts are invaluable for checking register entries and filling in gaps, except in the case of a few dioceses they are only of limited value on their own.
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RESEARCH IN PROGRESS

STUDYING URBAN MOBILITY: THE POSSIBILITIES FOR FAMILY RECONSTITUTION

Contributed by F. Lewis

Investigation into the incidence and nature of population movement in a historical context has produced a wide range of studies.¹ In particular, rural to urban movement has tended to attract much attention, often to the neglect of movement within urban areas themselves. Much of what is known about intra-urban mobility is drawn from the study of nineteenth century towns and cities with only a few notable exceptions for earlier periods.² One possible reason behind this relatively limited view lies in the availability and suitability of sources that contain information on place of residence and change of residence over a known time period. For the nineteenth century, researchers have tended to follow the well-trodden path of the census enumerators, linking census to census and occasionally adding further enrichment through directories and similar nominal lists.³ Although utilising such standard sources allows comparison across communities, a major flaw is encountered due to the cross-sectional nature and frequency of the census data. As an alternative, biographical accounts, such as diaries and family histories, have been employed to reconstruct the residential history of individuals.⁴ Whilst these provide valuable longitudinal portraits of personal movement and extend beyond the confines of the census their survival is erratic and their interpretation problematic.⁵

However, it may be possible to explore issues of mobility and persistence within urban areas by adapting material otherwise intended for a different research purpose. Employing a family reconstitution study for a large urban centre and using the place of residence information recorded in the parish registers it has proved possible to track the location and re-location of families. As such, the technique can be seen as a variant of that used by Souden to examine comparative migration flows across a variety of settlement types.⁶

The town examined in this article is the port of Liverpool between the years 1660 to 1750. During this period, Liverpool experienced rapid and substantial population increase, in part a result of the port’s prosperity in the Anglo-American sugar and tobacco trades. From a hearth tax estimate of approximately 1,400 in the 1660s, population total was to rise to almost 6,000 by the late seventeenth century, to double in the first twenty years of the eighteenth century, and then nearly double again to reach almost 20-22,000 by the 1750s.⁷ In the hierarchy of English provincial towns, from almost total obscurity in the 1670s, Liverpool ranked within the top twenty by 1700 and was placed sixth by the middle of the eighteenth century.⁸ Aggregate analysis
suggests that excess of baptisms over burials was small in most years and almost negligible between the mid 1720s and 1740s, accounting for barely 20 per cent of Liverpool’s population growth. Consequently, the vast majority of growth must have been fuelled by in-migration. Although the origin and character of these migrants has been well-researched, considerably less is known of the movements of individuals and families within the town of Liverpool. What follows is an example of how family reconstitution might be used to study such intra-urban migration.

As readers of this journal will be aware, family reconstitution involves the linking of parish register baptism, burial and marriage records into family units according to formalised rules. Availability of information on place of residence can vary considerably between parish registers. In the case of Liverpool such information is relatively forthcoming for the late seventeenth century onwards. As a result it theoretically becomes possible to trace residential moves from one vital event to another. To illustrate, consider the stylized family reconstitution history produced as Figure 1. Marriage was celebrated in 1660, with place of residence given as Dale Street. The first birth was also registered with place of residence given as Dale Street, indicating persistence in that location for at least a year. With the birth of the second child, residence is given as Water Street, thus indicating a change of address. Continuing to chart place of residence in this manner, over the five year period that the family was in observation, three distinct places of residence can be identified, indicating three separate moves, although the reconstitution history began and ended in Dale Street.
Table 1  Number of residential moves by length of observation: Liverpool family reconstitution, 1660-1750

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n. of moves</th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>21+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>n.</td>
<td>n. %</td>
<td>n. %</td>
<td>n. %</td>
<td>n. %</td>
<td>n. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By adopting this means of analysis, from a selection of reconstituted families with marriage record and at least two further events recorded, frequency of movement was assessed. Allowing for the probability that with increasing time, it would become more likely for a family to contemplate a move, comparisons in family mobility habits can be compared by considering the number of families completing a particular number of moves against years in observation.

Eighty families were selected as a sub-sample of the complete reconstitution. Of these, 50 per cent recorded no movement, while nearly a third of families moved once. Movement two or more times was limited: only eight families moved twice, and just six families three or more times. Of course, in interpreting these figures it must be realised that propensity to move is influenced by the period over which a family is in observation within the reconstitution. Table 1 clearly shows that families in observation for less than five years recorded little or no movement: although just over a fifth experienced one change of address; no families completed two or more moves. As the period in which families are in observation is extended, the likelihood of residential change increases. For those families in observation for more than twenty years, just under a fifth moved three or more times. Indeed, the relationship between number of residential moves and period in observation closely resembles the positive correlations shown for persistence at the same address over time witnessed in the case of nineteenth-century Liverpool using census material.10

Though difficult to quantify, it is also possible to make some general comments upon the nature and direction of this movement. Throughout the 90 year period, distance moved by households was generally small, often only between neighbouring streets and mostly within the same area of the town, either the north or south end. It is only by the very late 1740s that a handful of families contemplated re-location to the periphery of the town, the areas centred around Derby Square and beyond St George’s church. Such movement was intimately bound up with the changing work practices of certain economic sectors, and the beginnings of home and workplace separation, in this case, by the relatively wealthier merchant classes.
Although useful, this alternative use of family reconstitution data has certain limitations. First, the analysis of movement is necessarily based upon only those families with large numbers of associated parish register records, and thus, by implication, the more stable members of the community. Therefore, in common with Souden's approach, and family reconstitution itself, it does not accommodate those that did not marry and produce children, single adults, many of whom formed the bulk of the migrant population, and transients. Second, the success of such an exercise is heavily reliant upon the availability of an uninterrupted parish register series of high quality. The influence of under-registration and poor administration will not only cast doubt upon the reliability of the reconstitution study itself, but any analysis of movement characteristics stemming from it. Irrespective of these methodological shortcomings, in the absence of other source material this method may provide a useful tool for the analysis of comparative intra-urban movement.

NOTES


3. A table summarising mobility rates within nineteenth-century towns is provided in Dennis, English industrial cities, 256-7. For comparisons between urban and rural mobility rates see K. Schürer, The role of the family in the process of migration, in Pooley and Whyte, Migrants, Emigrants and Immigrants, fn 2, 134-5.


11. For the influence of migration on family reconstructions see S. Ruggles, 'Migration, Marriage and Mortality: Correcting Sources of Bias in English Family Reconstitutions', Population Studies, 46 (1992), 507-522.
TIME AND WAGES OF WEST COUNTRY WORKFOLKS IN THE
SEVENTEENTH AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES

Contributed by Pamela Sharpe

While working on a research project about the parish of Colyton in Devon, I
discovered some interesting estate accounts relating to types of work and wages
on two estates in Devon and Cornwall in the seventeenth and eighteenth
centuries. The first set of documents related to Antony estate on the Torpoint
peninsula near Plymouth, and consisted of workfolk’s wages books for the
period 1673 through to 1691, and a hired labour agreement book for 1692 to
1714.1 These gave both wages by the week and day and agreements made for
yearly hiring. Comparison can be made with a century later for another estate
owned by the Pole family, Shute Barton, situated in East Devon. The records
for Shute Barton consist of a day labourer’s book for the 1790s.2 Shute was a
small parish neighbouring on the larger town of Colyton and some of the
workforce of Shute Barton were drawn from Colyton. We still have little
information about wage rates and labour force participation for ordinary people
in the past,3 and even though these records only provide details from two
estates, and large ones at that, they do help us to shade in the picture to a
small extent.

Roughly equal numbers of males and females were employed on the Antony
estate in the seventeenth century. Day workers were often related to each other.
For example, one entry reads ‘pd Martha Trewharse, daughter and
granddaughter’. Females were only employed in the summer months; in the
winter work volume was greatly reduced and the estate just employed men. In
summer, women participated in ‘weeding in ye garden’, ‘beating’, ‘winnowing
collecting’, ‘threshing and drying oats’, ‘fishing’, ‘collecting eggs’, as well as
haymaking and harvest work. There was also a large pastoral sector.

Wages differed between men and women who worked in the fields. Men
received between 6d. and 8d. per day and women received either 3d. or 4d. per
day. These wages are higher than those found by Shammas for seventeenth
century Swarthnoor Hall in Lancashire but not as high as agricultural wages in
Essex at a similar period.4 Where husbands and wives both worked on the
Antony farm, married women normally worked about a third of their
husband’s time. Women would work a total of two days on average (which, in
some cases, consisted of four half days), but men would work a full six days in
a summer week. On average children worked half the time of adult males. At
haymaking a large number of extra women (notably no men) were recruited.
Since certain people appeared together to work, an informal word of mouth
and family recruitment system seems to have been in operation.
Sometimes women did particularly physically strenuous jobs and were paid more than other women. Jane Garland was paid 6d. per day at Antony in 1687 for shearing ewes which was on a par with men in other tasks. The same amount was paid to two other women who each did five days of shearing for 2s. 6d. Similarly, a woman was paid 4d. per day for four days of attending a thatcher. Henry Best described women in a similar sort of work in 1641;

Wee usually provide two women for helpes in this kinde viz. one to draw thacke and the other to serve the thatcher, shee that draweth thacke hath 3d. a day and she that serveth the thatcher 4d. a day because shee is also to temper the mortar, and to carry it to the toppe of the house.5

Comparison can be made with the Shute Barton Estate for which records exist from 1791 to 1794, although this record contains details of regular agricultural labourers rather than casual workers. At Shute at this time, which covers the start of the Napoleonic Wars, arable was more important than it had been in Antony. Oats and wheat were the main crops, but timber management, fishing and attending the hounds also feature as significant jobs. Women here earned 6d. per day for field work and men generally received a shilling a day or slightly more.

The female agricultural labourers were employed in weeding, haymaking, harvesting in the fields and gathering of fruit. One woman ran the dairy which was probably just for household consumption. This was all year round work. The season, within which women worked, now lasted most of the year possibly because some of the women were doing men’s jobs while they were away in the militia. Weeding started in March, cultivation of the potatoes and plantations took the work into November. Turnips were singled in mid-winter and this was always female work. For example, in January 1794, Martha Strowbridge was ‘6 days cleaning the Brickyard, putting, washing and cutting of Turnips 3s.’.

The women who did work on the Shute Barton Estate could be linked to the reconstitution of Shute.6 The women were all single and mainly aged in their early twenties. They were daughters or siblings of the male workers on the estate. Interestingly, there is no record of any of them ever marrying and most of them had had illegitimate children, or went on to have them in the future. It seems likely that these women became agricultural labourers because they had difficulty in getting, or keeping, a job as a domestic servant. There were no married women who were agricultural workers although we could expect them to have been contributing to the estate as casual workers at the busiest times of the year.

It is unfortunate that few similar series of wages or work agreements survive for smaller properties since records from large estates are not necessarily representative. However, some conclusions can be drawn from the west country data even though the estates were very different. In both sets of records it is clear that women agricultural workers were paid less than the rates of pay for
men, even when they appear to have done directly comparable work. For example, in May 1683, Jone Clements and her husband were both paid for a day’s threshing. She was paid 4d. and he was paid 5d. This differential appears to have become wider over time, as by the late eighteenth century female labourers were certainly earning less than half of men’s wages for a week’s work despite the fact that they may have been substitutes for male labourers who were in the militia. Historically, wages were extremely regionally specific. They were much higher in the south-east of England in the seventeenth century, but much lower in the north-west of the country. By the late eighteenth century however, Shute Barton had male wages which do not differ widely from those in Essex at the same period, or in any of the English parishes for which David Davies collected budgets.\(^7\) Whereas Antony provided diverse employments for local women who probably worked on their family gardens or small farms for part of the week and year, by the 1790s there had been a transformation in both agricultural techniques and regional market integration. The resulting capitalist farms relied on landless labour. As a result Shute Barton used the sort of workforce which was described in the texts of the agricultural improvers.\(^8\) Nevertheless, it is striking that on both estates at both times the labour force was drawn from certain families.

NOTES

1. Cornwall Record Office CA/H/115-116; CA/H/117.
2. Cornwall Record Office PA/32/27-29.
6. The reconstitution of Shute was carried out by Roger Sellman and presented to the Cambridge Group.
8. For example, A. Young ed., Annals of agriculture, in 44 volumes from 1784 to 1806.
MISCELLANY

MISSING PERSONS IN THE 1911 CENSUS

Contributed by Geoffrey Stevenson

A note of some importance to historical demographers has recently been attached to the crypt in the Palace of Westminster: not however connected to the tradition whereby ‘many christenings have taken place over the years for the offspring of the privileged and aristocratic’ but to the census-taking of 1911. Nor is it strictly a tale of the crypt: more specifically of the broom cupboard of the same, which Mr Tony Benn has highlighted with more than one plaque dedicated, ‘with much respect and gratitude and affection’, to the campaigners for popular representation to Parliament.

It is claimed that in this place, Emily Wilding Davison, the militant suffragette later killed at Epsom at the 1913 Derby, hid on the night of the 1911 census to claim equal rights with men as a resident of the House of Commons. One could, of course, speculate how many male members of that House spent a Sunday night in the Palace at any census-taking, though of course some may have been enumerated ‘away from home, on trains’ or in some other theatre serving their constituency interests, though that may be beside the point.

Emily Davison’s entry in the Suffrage Annual and Women’s Who’s Who of 1913 lists three occasions when she hid in the House of Commons, in April 1910 in a hot-air shaft, in April 1911 in the crypt, and also in June 1911. However, in the tribute to her by Gertrude Colmore her motive is described as seeking to avoid enumeration:

Nineteen-hundred-and eleven was the year of the Census, and large numbers of suffragettes made it the occasion of a protest against their absence of political status by refusing to fill in the papers; so large indeed were the numbers that the threatened prosecutions were of necessity abandoned. Emily’s census paper contained these characteristic words: "As I am a woman and women do not count in the State, I refuse to be counted". Then followed her chosen motto: "Rebellion against tyrants is obedience to God".²

Her method of avoiding the census was to spend the night in the House of Commons, in Guy Fawkes’ cupboard. There she narrowly escaped the notice of an MP with two visitors, but being unable to get out of the crypt as its doors were locked, she was finally discovered by a cleaner. She was taken to Cannon Row Police Station, but, after being detained a few hours in the matron’s room, was dismissed.
Whether the stand over the Census was one of commission or omission is perhaps of secondary importance to the fact that census-taking, a crucial activity to local population historians of St Stephens, Westminster or any other parish, is a sufficient part of the story of ‘the advancement of freedom, civil liberties, social justice and democracy’ to deserve commemoration.

NOTES

3. A phrase from Mr Tony Benn’s latest plaque which joins the one to Emily Davison in the broom cupboard or closet concerned.
CORRESPONDENCE

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

Eighteenth-century Militia Lists

Dear Sir,

I note that in the Spring 1994 issue of LPS (no 52), in his note on occupations, Bernard Nurse does not mention the series of eighteenth-century Militia Lists from which ballots were made. These lists start from 1758 and continue until varying dates toward the end of the century. The Hertfordshire Family and Population History Society is progressively publishing the series in booklet form, and we are up to No 52 at present with others in the pipeline. Further details are available from the address below.

Yours faithfully
F. J. Parker
(Projects co-ordinator)

36 Elm Gardens, Welwyn Garden City, Hertfordshire, AL8 6RY.

(A sample page from one of the recent publications is reproduced over – Eds)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Forename</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Other Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1773</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>CAMP</td>
<td>Hertingfordbury</td>
<td>Servant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1775</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>CAMP</td>
<td>Hertingfordbury</td>
<td>Servant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>CAMP</td>
<td>Hertingfordbury</td>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1783</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>CAMP</td>
<td>Hertingfordbury</td>
<td>Servant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1785</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>CAMP</td>
<td>Hertingfordbury</td>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>3 Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1786</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>CAMPIN</td>
<td>Hertingfordbury</td>
<td>Servant</td>
<td>3 Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>CAMPIN</td>
<td>Hertingfordbury</td>
<td>Servant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1775</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>CAMPIN</td>
<td>Hertingfordbury</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>3 Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>CAMPIN</td>
<td>Hertingfordbury</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1783</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>CAMPIN</td>
<td>Hertingfordbury</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1784</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>CAMPIN</td>
<td>Hertingfordbury</td>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>Served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1786</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>CAMPIN</td>
<td>Hertingfordbury</td>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>Served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>CAMPIN</td>
<td>Hertingfordbury</td>
<td>Servant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>CAJOIN</td>
<td>Hertingfordbury</td>
<td>Servant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1792</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>CAJOIN</td>
<td>Hertingfordbury</td>
<td>Servant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1794</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>CAJOIN</td>
<td>Hertingfordbury</td>
<td>Servant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1792</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>CARTER</td>
<td>Hertingfordbury</td>
<td>Servant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1794</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>CARTER</td>
<td>Hertingfordbury</td>
<td>Servant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1798</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>CARTER</td>
<td>Hertingfordbury</td>
<td>Servant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780</td>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>CASTLE</td>
<td>Hertingfordbury</td>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>CASTLE</td>
<td>Hertingfordbury</td>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1783</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>CASTLE</td>
<td>Hertingfordbury</td>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1786</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>CATLEN</td>
<td>Hertingfordbury</td>
<td>Printer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>CATLEN</td>
<td>Hertingfordbury</td>
<td>Servant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1772</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>CAYLOR</td>
<td>Hertingfordbury</td>
<td>4 Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also spelt Chalke, Chalkeley, Chockley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Forename</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Other Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1786</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>CHALKEY</td>
<td>Hertingfordbury</td>
<td>Servant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1786</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>CHALKEY</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1786</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>CHALKEY</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1786</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>CHALKEY</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1785</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>CHALKEY</td>
<td>Hertingfordbury</td>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1768</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>CHALKEY</td>
<td>Hertingfordbury</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1766</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>CHALKEY</td>
<td>Hertingfordbury</td>
<td>Farmer's Son</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>CHALKEY 3R</td>
<td>Hertingfordbury</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>CHALKEY 3R</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>CHALKEY 3R</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MILITIA LISTS: Hertingfordbury, Herts.
Brewer’s four-wheeled truck with two horses