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EDITORIAL

A Golden Age?

Many readers will already be aware that this year's New Year honours list included a knighthood for Professor E. A. Wrigley, Master of Corpus Christi College, Fellow of the British Academy, Professor of Economic History at the University of Cambridge and now a Knight of the Realm, it is as Tony Wrigley that he is known to most local population historians. As co-founder of the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Structure and the pioneer of family reconstitution in this country, Tony has always been an active supporter of the journal. Indeed, although never a formal member of the editorial board, Tony was instrumental in the establishment of the journal in 1968 and was particularly keen to see the publication as a 'practical' journal accessible to 'amateurs' and 'professionals' alike. Nearly thirty years on it is perhaps sometimes too easy to overlook the fact that as well as generally encouraging the practise of local historical demography, one of the key reasons for establishing LPS was to support and unify the growing body of local researchers up and down the country who were providing information to the members of the Cambridge Group on the aggregate analysis of parish registers and the analysis of local listings of inhabitants. It was on this collaborative venture that the successes of such pioneering works as Family and Household in Past Time and the hugely influential Population History of England were built. In recognition of this, the latter book was, of course, dedicated 'To the local population historians of England'. In the same way that the publication of these two volumes can be seen as marking a triumph for local population studies, the honouring of Tony Wrigley for 'services to historical demography' (the first time such a citation has been made) can be seen as the crowning glory!

We should not overlook either the fact that the New Year's List also honoured Margaret Spufford, jointly for her contribution to 'social history' and for her work in support of education for the disabled. We mention this because just as Tony has done so much for local population studies, in similar ways Margaret has championed the historical research and study of local communities. Her highly popular Contrasting Communities is probably the most visual and well-known illustration of this. Taking these two honours together, although neither citation specifically referred to 'local' studies (is W. G. Hoskins' 1971 CBE citation for services to local history the only time such reference has been made?), one may be tempted to view this as signifying a 'coming of age' for what M. M. Postan once termed 'microcosmic' history – that is to say, research that is locally-based in terms of area and sources, but the impact and scope of which is far-reaching. It is certainly true that over the last twenty to thirty years micro-based studies have had a major impact on many branches of economic and social history, expanding and enriching our understanding of past societies.
through the often detailed reconstruction of historic populations and the events that shaped people's lives. Not all of this is demographically orientated, of course, but the reconstitution of past populations is fundamental to, indeed underpins, much micro-history research.

Yet does a coming of age also represent a Golden Age? The two need not, and very often do not, coincide. The study of local history, whether from a demographic, family or community perspective, is without doubt very popular as both an academic activity within the university and higher education sectors and as a leisure pursuit without. Indeed, the Open University's highly successful course in Family and Community History in part points to the interchange of these two forces, with many individuals wishing to develop what started as an interest in their own family or local surroundings into a broader academic study. The principals and objectives in this example are little different from those behind the founding of LPS some thirty years ago. The subject area may have developed, broadened in scope and become ever-more popular, but is it undertaken with the same passion and enthusiasm as in the days when Wrigley and Laslett were putting the Cambridge Group on the map and Spufford was researching at the Leicester School with the likes of Finburg, Skipp, Hoskins and Thirsk? Of course it is impossible to answer such a speculative question, if only because of the difficulty of measuring subjective notions like 'enthusiasm'. One item that might be used as a benchmark, however, is the volume of correspondence, notes and queries contributed by readers of this journal over the years. The graph above plots the frequency of letters and similar items published in LPS from issue one to the present. Since LPS started the overall trend has been a steady decline in the number of letters, notes and queries received from readers, the key exception being a burst of activity in the late 1970s and very early 1980s just prior to the publication of
Wrigley and Schofield's *Population History of England*. The over-riding conclusion of this simple exercise is that in the first ten years of publication LPS interacted much more with its readership than it has done in the last ten years. Not only has the quantity of correspondence changed but so also has the nature. If one looks back at many of the early issues of the journal it can be seen that letters presented research findings, sought advice and questioned the conclusions and interpretations of others. Debates were conducted through the pages of the correspondence section and editorial comment was given on general approach and method. Most of this dialogue has long since gone. It is true that, in part, this aspect of the journal has been transferred to the LPSS Newsletter, but we do not think that this should preclude debate and commentary being included within the pages of this journal once more. If this is something that you feel strongly about then, go on, send us a letter!

Letters intended for publication should be sent to LPS, Department of History, University of Essex, Colchester, CO4 3SQ. Readers are reminded that the editorial board is always prepared to offer advice on subjects within the scope of the journal.

The LPS Research Fund

We would like to remind readers of the possibility of gaining financial aid for their research via the LPS Research Fund. This fund was established as a result of a donation under covenant in 1987 in order to enable the journal to promote research in local population history. In maintaining the Fund it has always been the Board’s policy to encourage and support a wide range of activities and topics. Any research involving a component of local population history can qualify: applicants could range from the reimbursement of necessary research expenses, such as travelling and copying charges, to scholarships to provide subsistence for several weeks or months to enable theses, or other research projects, to be completed.

Applications should contain an account of the aims and methods of the research project and details of the costs for which support is sought. To help reduce the administrative load, no applications will be considered for sums under £50. In the case of applications for a subsistence scholarship, the names to two referees should be provided. Applications may be made by individuals or groups, and should be addressed to: Dr Roger Schofield, The Cambridge Group, 27 Trumpington Street, Cambridge, CB2 1QA.
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NEWS FROM THE CAMBRIDGE GROUP FOR THE
HISTORY OF POPULATION AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE

Honours and Celebrations

The New Year Honours’ List for 1996 brought forth marvellous news when it was revealed that Tony Wrigley, one of the two co-founders of the Cambridge Group, was to be awarded a knighthood for his services to historical demography. This is an extremely well-deserved recognition of Tony’s fundamental and highly original contributions to the foundation and development of this historical social science both nationally and internationally. It may also be regarded as recognition of the work of so many readers of this journal who have both directly and indirectly served as providers of much of the data sets upon which Tony’s research findings have been based.

On 18 December 1995 Peter Laslett, the other co-founder of the Cambridge Group, celebrated his 80th birthday. On the following day Tony Wrigley hosted a dinner to celebrate this event in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. A large gathering of Peter’s current and former colleagues and students attended and listened to speeches from Quentin Skinner (Regius Professor-elect of History at Cambridge), Richard Smith, Michael Drake and Lord (Michael) Young. These speeches ranged broadly over Peter’s remarkable contributions to the fields of political theory, family history, his work as educational innovator through his role as early planner and founder of such institutions as the Open University and the University of the Third Age and his current role as one of the foremost international authorities on ageing. Peter replied in characteristic fashion and left all those who attended this celebration with a clear sense that he had a programme of activities that would keep him (and us) fully engaged for the coming decade.

Post-graduate research at the Cambridge Group

The work of post-graduate students based at the Cambridge Group has been reported previously in LPS (see numbers 30, 31). However, it has been some time since any information was provided on this subject. What follows is the first of what is hoped will be regular reports on doctoral research being undertaken within the Cambridge Group. At present, staff of the Cambridge Group supervise nine postgraduates working on doctoral dissertations. The following are brief reports of the topics being pursued by four of these graduates which may be of particular interest to readers of this journal.

*Sharon Lauricella* is working on *Economic and Social Influences on Marriage in Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth-Century Banbury*. This research engages with issues that have preoccupied both Thomas Malthus in his *Essay on the Principle of Population* and modern demographic historians who have puzzled over the growth of population in town and country in England after 1750.
Malthus blamed this population increase on 'the passion between the sexes' and modern research has indicated that this rise in population was indeed fertility-driven, although focussing on the role of marriage. Women in the late eighteenth century, as compared with their mothers and grandmothers, were having more children throughout their lifetimes. They married earlier as the century progressed, with average ages falling from 27 to 23 years. Why were women accepting the practice of having larger families and beginning their reproductive careers at an early age? It is the objective of this doctoral dissertation to determine the economic and social motivations behind an increasingly younger age at marriage by undertaking a micro-study of Banbury, in Oxfordshire, in order to compare local statistics on age at marriage with national figures found by the Cambridge Group. This study is based primarily upon the demographic statistics gleaned from the parish register and family reconstitution for Banbury. The parish register data are particularly rich, as husbands' occupations at marriage were recorded in the marriage register, and the occupation of brides' fathers is available through the family reconstitution. With such occupational information, this study has the advantage of linking economy and demography. Preliminary research has shown that the decline in women's age at first marriage in Banbury was widespread amongst all occupational groups, rather than having been exclusive to manufacturing or proto-industrial occupations, as has often been hypothesized. Wives of men in all occupations in Banbury, from weaver to rat-catcher, all married on average at age 24 from 1770-1790. This widespread trend, on both the national and local level, will be examined with reference to research on related topics, such as remarriage and the influence of prenuptial pregnancy. This community-focused occupational analysis will be innovative since very little local-level history has to date been systematically exploited in understanding the determinants of age at marriage.

Alice Reid is working on Child Health and Mortality in Derbyshire 1917-1922. The course of the demographic transition in England and Wales has been extensively studied, yet understanding is by no means complete. One of the most puzzling issues is why, when fertility and adult mortality began to fall in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, did infant mortality remain at high levels until the dawn of the twentieth. Recent work at the Cambridge Group has suggested that, contrary to previous beliefs, the environment a child was born into was a more important influence on its survival than the social class of its father.1 The overlapping roles of environment and class need to be investigated further. What aspects of environment were important with respect to child health? What roles were played by housing and infant feeding, and how were these influenced by measures of status such as social class, occupation and legitimacy? Is the importance of environment primarily physical or social? In this PhD advantage is being taken of access that has been granted to a rare set of records made by Derbyshire health visitors to investigate the influences on infant and child health and survival. The records cover all births in particular districts (including most of the county) for the years 1917 to 1922. Information varies for each birth, but at their best the records can provide detailed information on all the births a woman had in the six-year period. For each birth it will be possible to establish the date and place of birth (nursing home or elsewhere, if not at home) and name of doctor or midwife attending;
whether it was a boy or girl; and whether it was illegitimate or a twin. The
dates of frequent visits up until the age of five or starting school are known
(some children were visited up to 40 times); how the infant was fed at each
visit during its first year (breast, artificially fed or both), when it was weaned
and what its weaning food was (such as cow’s milk and water, or various
patent foods); at what age it was vaccinated; how many teeth it had at various
ages and whether it was walking and talking; what illnesses and accidents it
had and when; whether it was still-born or died and date and cause of death.
The social circumstances of the family at the time of birth of each child is
known: the occupation of both parents, and how long the mother worked
during her pregnancy; the number of living and bed rooms in the house; and
the number of previous births, child deaths, still-births and miscarriages (it is
this information which enables the linking of births to the same mother, and
hence the calculation of birth intervals). Changes of address are noted and,
together with possible changes in occupation between different births, enable
monitoring of geographical and social mobility. Other facts considered pertinent
by health visitors include baby-show prizes, prosecutions for cruelty, maternal
death and incest.

Research is still at a very early stage, time at present being taken up with the
computerisation of the data, but it is intended to provide a detailed
investigation of the relationship between environment and social class in
relation to infant and child mortality, and to assess in particular the roles
played by feeding methods, housing, birth intervals and morbidity. The wealth
of data recorded by the health visitors makes it possible to set each child in its
immediate social and physical context, and local sources also enable a picture of
its wider environment to be built around it.

Leigh Shaw-Taylor is working on The Household Economy of the Labouring
Poor in Rural England 1700-1850. Recent work by Jane Humphries, Peter King
and Jeanette Neeson has suggested that the level of non-wage and non-poor
law resources available to the labouring poor were more significant than has
been assumed and were of particular importance to women within these
households. The aim of this PhD is to explore this hypothesis principally
through a number of case studies. It is intended to investigate a range of
resources, the most important of which are: common pasture rights (mainly for
milk cows), common fuel rights, pig-keeping, the produce of cottage gardens
and also allotments, and the ownership of house property and squatting.
Cottage ownership, squatting, gardens and pig keeping are resources which
have been widely ignored in accounts of the labouring poor in this period.

The main questions to be addressed are as follows. How widespread was access
to these resources and how much were they worth relative to family money
income from wages and the poor law? How far did these resources therefore
confer independence of wage labour? On what terms were those resources
accessed (for example, the social meaning of common rights would be very
different between a labouring family who exercised them by virtue of owning a
common right cottage and one which exercised them by occupying a tied
cottage belonging to the husband’s employer)? How far did the availability of
these resources decline over the period and what was the role of parliamentary
enclosure in any such decline? Whilst the research is primarily intended as a contribution to the ongoing debate on the proletarianising effects of parliamentary enclosure it will also have implications for the standard of living debate which has been almost entirely focussed on money incomes. Preliminary research has been undertaken on the fen-edge village of Willingham which is already well-known for an earlier period as one of Margaret Spufford’s ‘contrasted’ communities. Other case studies are currently being selected.

Samantha Williams is working on Poor Relief, Welfare and Medical Provision in Bedfordshire: The Social, Economic and Demographic Context, c. 1750-1850. The late eighteenth and early nineteenth century was a period of rapidly increasing expenditure on the poor throughout south-east England, and the effect of the rise in the cost of poor relief on poor law policy will be the main focus of the study. Through the methodology of nominal record linkage between parish overseers’ accounts and the family reconstitution for Campton-with-Shefford and Southill, this study will consider the health and well-being of the poor in these three parishes circa 1750-1850. It will assess whether this period witnessed an increase in occasional relief, and in particular cash payments to unemployed men, at the expense of regular weekly pensions to widowed women. It is also possible that as ‘the burden of the rates’ grew heavier, overseers sought to cut back on some forms of poor relief expenditure leading one to speculate that spending on medical provision was reduced. Medical provision for the sick poor included payments to parish doctors, midwives, inoculators, bone-setters, and the village carers and nurses. The parish also paid for certain forms of poor relief which could be considered welfare grants, including paying paupers’ rent, and providing fuel, clothing, food and alcoholic stimulants. The adoption of medical contracts between parishes and local surgeon-apothecaries which became widespread throughout East Bedfordshire in the late eighteenth century could be regarded as a cost-cutting measure. Linkage between overseers’ accounts and the reconstitution produces a wealth of information about individuals’ and families’ lives that would not otherwise have been known. Many women, for instance, came on to poor relief at the time of their husbands’ deaths, while other people received money and care in their final illnesses, and the parish also paid for their funerals, including beer, bread and cheese. On a more personal level, for instance, we find that Lucy Townsend, who was pregnant with an illegitimate child, was paid by the parish authorities to care for William Newman, who had been widowed for a year and had three small children. This story appears to have a happy ending, because three months after Lucy had had her son, she married William.

NOTES

NEWS FROM THE LOCAL POPULATION STUDIES SOCIETY

Conference reports

LPSS/British Society for Population Studies Conference – Sheffield, 4 November 1995

This jointly-organised day conference was held at the Division of Continuing Education, University of Sheffield. The theme was ‘Family Reconstitution and Community Reconstruction’.

Tony Wrigley spoke of the role, rewards and difficulties of family reconstitution, taking the opportunity to reflect on the 30 years since he first started working on the Colyton parish registers. The role of reconstitution was in linking rather than counting, devising rates from stocks and flows. Among the rewards had been the study of pre-marital conceptions and the long term trends in birth intervals. Among the difficulties had been defective registers, although the best were capable of sustaining sophisticated analysis. Another difficulty was that reconstitution was weighted towards ‘stayers’ rather than ‘movers’, who might be uncharacteristic, but might also move out and return. Reconstitution is now less time consuming than it used to be. Computers have reduced the time required for data input and linkage and lead to more searching statistical questions.

Steve King spoke on individual and family life-cycles and the process of community reconstruction. Taking as an example the different levels at which members of a community know each other, as evidenced by their mode of address, i.e. title or first name, he spoke of the enrichment of family life-cycles using sources which span community boundaries, of the ways in which life cycles interact and of the operation of the community with reference to demography. These processes raised substantive questions, such as the life-cycles of poverty and kinship networks, as revealed by credits and bequests. They also raised complementary questions about motivation, change, stability and dynamics. In the discussion which followed several members of the audience raised issues relating to the comparability of sources.

During the generous lunch break the book stall did a brisk trade and the Sheffield super trams were much admired.

The first of the three afternoon speakers was Jean Robin who spoke on her study of the 633 cohort of 0-9 year-olds listed in the 1851 census for Colyton through 40 years to 1891. This has been published as a Working Paper by the Cambridge Group entitled From Childhood to Middle Age.

Roger Bellingham spoke on Dade registers, explaining not merely what they are, with examples of the amount of information included in each entry, but
also how they can be used to study marriage horizons, migration, and inter-generational mobility.

The final speaker was Andrew Blaikie on Scottish illegitimacy. In the north-east of Scotland, pre-marital intercourse seems to have been the norm, even among Elders of the Kirk. There was however, no evidence of co-habitation or single parent households. Children lived with their grandparents while their mothers continued working, often engaged in farm service at a distance from the parental home. This fascinating study of household dynamics was based on the Registers of the Poor (1845-1920) and is a rare case of men being ‘hidden from history’.

Annual Symposium of the Centre for South-Western Historical Studies, held in conjunction with LPSS in the Moot Room of the Amory Building at the University of Exeter – 18 November 1995

The theme of the day was ‘Population and Community in the South-West’, which was defined as the four historic counties of Cornwall, Devon, Dorset and Somerset.

Richard Adair spoke on illegitimacy, pre-nuptial pregnancy and community, showing the regional variations in the early modern period. He set the experience of the South West in the context of the country as a whole, claiming that national statistics were unmeaningful until the mid-seventeenth century as Britain was not homogeneous. The South-West pattern is hard to explain as it could not be attributed to agrarian, textile, inheritance or Roman Catholic influences. It was possibly due to the in-migration of landless labourers and delayed marriage. There was evidence of locality persistence despite changes in economic and social structure. The most plausible explanation was local custom and attitude to marriage as a process rather than a special event. Laity defined marriage differently from clergy. In the eyes of the former, spousal probably sanctioned sexual relations. Although religious authorities opposed espousal and southern lawyers and moralists either ignored spousals or claimed they were dying out, spousals were common in the diocese of Exeter until 1600 and beyond.

David Cullum spoke on production and reproduction in early modern West Penwith, examining the relationship between household and economy in an area characterised by its rural mining industry. His analysis of the parish registers, Easter books and inventories for the period 1600-1740 showed a population growth with little in-migration. There was no decrease in the age at marriage but high marital fertility, probably due to a reduced period of lactation, which in turn was due to large joint extended households and the availability of women’s work. The infant mortality rate was high, as was the adult mortality rate from mining and fishing. He posed the unanswered questions – what are the imperatives of family formation in extended households, and why did the age at marriage not fall?

Tom Arkell spoke on homes and hearths in the South-West. Starting from the Hearth Tax returns for Exeter and other towns he had drawn up tables of the
proportion of houses with different numbers of hearths in the various parts of the city. He led us to consider the number of rooms per house this would represent and the kind of household in terms both of people and of social structure, which inhabited such houses. Linking with inventories produced a richer picture.

After lunch and the AGM for members of the Centre for South Western Historical Studies, Richard Smith spoke on epidemiological transition in England c1400-1600, especially the implications of the Devon evidence.

Pam Sharpe spoke on Colyton's historical demography 1538-1837, relating her experiences of exploring some of Colyton’s 7000 acres in an open top car. Her studies focussed on the rates of celibacy, marital separation, pre-marital pregnancy, illegitimacy, age-specific marital fertility, and male infant mortality; and on the relationship between lace-making and religious denomination.

After a short tea break, the final speaker was Bernard Deacon of Redruth on internal migration and Cornish identity in the nineteenth century. His diagrams of gross and net migration flows revealed a pattern of sub-regions between parish and county and the hinterlands of the various urban centres.

Four of the day’s speakers formed a panel for a closing discussion session. The organisers are to be congratulated on compiling such a coherent and integrated programme.

Forthcoming conferences and day schools

**Saturday June 22, 1996** LONDON day school, at the Institute of Historical Research, University of London, aimed especially at Open University DA301 students, though anyone is welcome. Last year’s day school was very popular so early application is urged. Further details and application forms are available from Christine Jones, 54 Hardinge Road, Kensal Rise, London NW10 3PJ.

**September 13-15, 1996** AMBLESIDE residential weekend conference, Charlotte Mason College, Ambleside, Cumbria. Theme: Women as Wives and Workers – an historical perspective from North and South. Speakers will include Professor Michael Anderson of the University of Edinburgh, Dr Marguerite Dupréé of the University of Glasgow and Dr Elizabeth Roberts of the University of Lancaster. There will be an evening lecture on the Lake District and there will be time for some exploration in this beautiful part of the country. The LPSS annual general meeting will be held during the conference. Details and application forms from Christine Jones, 54 Hardinge Road, Kensal Rise, London NW10 3PJ.

**Local Population History Book Club**

Dr Peter Franklin, who runs the Book Club, will be present – with the books – at our conference and day schools. The Book Club supplies books to members of LPSS at reduced prices; a list is available and Peter will send books by post. Contact him at 46 Fountain Street, Accrington, Lancashire, BB5 0OQ.
Getting into Community History

This LPSS publication, which contains the lectures given at the 1994 DA301 day school in London, has proved to be very popular. Copies are still available, price £1.95, or by post £2.50 from Dr David Gatley, 114, Thornton Road, Stoke-on-Trent, ST4 2BD. Cheques should be payable to LPSS.

Membership and Subscriptions

Members of LPSS receive LPS Journal and a Newsletter, as well as membership of the Book Club and advance details of forthcoming conferences. Subscriptions are, per annum, £10.00 for students, £12.00 for ordinary membership and £15.00 for members living outside the European Community. Our membership secretary is Sir David Cooke, Bt, 78 Harlow Terrace, Harrogate, HG2 8AW. Existing members sometimes forget to update Bankers Orders to the current subscription – please check!

Newsletters

LPSS newsletters contain correspondence from members. A member has written to tell us that she has found an early example of the defrauding of social security by a woman living in Newington, Kent in 1785. The parish register on her death records ‘This woman received Alms of the Parish about 16 years; and at her Death was currently reported as generally believed that she was in Possession of about £500 but afterwards known to be about £700. (A sad Instance of hypocritical Duplicity).’
Surveying the People
The interpretation and use of document sources for the study of population in the later seventeenth century

Edited by KEVIN SCHURER
and TOM ARKELL

A LOCAL POPULATION STUDIES SUPPLEMENT

This volume examines four key sources for the study of population in the later seventeenth century: the assessments and/or returns for the Hearth tax, Compton census, Poll taxes and Marriage Duty Act. It provides details of the legislative background and administrative framework for these important sources, discusses some of the main problems involved in their use and interpretation, and provides illustrations of how the surviving documents can be utilized to shed light on key research issues in demographic, social, economic and local history.

Given the importance of these sources to various fields of historical enquiry, this publication will be of interest to a broad readership, including teachers and students of demographic, social, economic and local history, family historians and genealogists.

The book includes contributions from the following authors:

Peter Laslett reflects on the work of Gregory King and John Graunt and examines the development of ‘political arithmetic’.

Anne Whiteman supplies a comprehensive introduction to the use of the Compton census.

Tom Arkell charts the instructions for collecting the Hearth tax and the legislative framework for the Poll taxes and Marriage Duty Act and their impact on the work of Gregory King. He also demonstrates a method for estimating population totals from Compton census returns.

Chris Husbands examines distributions of wealth between occupations via Hearth tax returns.

Peter Jackson explores the incidence of nonconformity in east Devon.

Jeremy Boulton investigates the comprehensiveness of parochial registration in London.

Sheila Cooper provides an analysis of household structure in King’s Lynn using the Poll tax returns.

James Alexander compares the Poll tax and 4s. Aid material for London in order to provide detailed information on social and occupational distributions within the City.

Kevin Schürer uses the Marriage Duty Act assessments to examine regional variations in household structure.

Thanks to the assistance of the Marc Fitch Fund, this volume is available at the special price of £10 (+£1 p&p) per copy. To order, please complete the form below.

£-

Name: ..........................................................................................................................

Address: ......................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................

Please send me ...... copy(ies) of Surveying the People. I enclose a cheque for .............. made payable to “Local Population Studies”.

* This form should be returned to LPS, Dept. of History, University of Essex, Colchester, CO4 35Q
THE PROTESTATION RETURNS, 1641-1642:  
PART II, PARTIAL CENSUS OR SNAPSHOT? SOME EVIDENCE FROM  
PENWITH HUNDRED, CORNWALL  

Anne Whiteman and Vivian Russell  

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.  

Foreword  

The late Vivien Russell, FSA, is best known as an archaeologist who pioneered  
the identification and comprehensive listing of antiquities by an intensive field  
study of a defined area: her 'West Penwith Survey', Cornwall Archaeological  
Society (Truro, 1971) and 'Isles of Scilly Survey', Isles of Scilly Museum and  
Institute of Cornish Studies (1980) are landmarks. At the same time she was a  
learned student of Cornish local history. Throughout the 1970s she worked  
intensively on the Penwith hundred Protestation returns and local parish  
registers. After her death in 1992, Anne Whiteman continued to work on the  
Protestation returns papers left to her by Vivien Russell, preparing them for  
publishation. It is Anne Whiteman's intention to leave her papers on the  
Protestation returns to a suitable repository in West Cornwall for the use of  
other scholars.  

Introduction  

As the Protestation returns were intended to record a full list of all the male  
inhabitants, aged eighteen and over, living in a parish, they should in effect  
constitute a partial census, from which demographic evidence may be drawn;  
the fact that temporary absentees are often noted strengthens the presumption  
that the lists were intended to be comprehensive. But they may have elements  
of a snapshot too; strangers are sometimes included with an explanation why  
they were present in the parish on the day when the Protestation was taken,  
like the crews of two ships in St Ives harbour, one from London and the other  
from Farlam (in Cumberland, although the return reported it from Scotland),  
and 72 'Frenchmen' in Belton parish, in Lincolnshire, who were assisting  
Vermuyden with his draining activities.  

To investigate, in the case of any return, 'who was an inhabitant of a parish,  
and who was a 'visitor' or 'stranger', is difficult and perhaps in the last resort  
only partly feasible. Nevertheless the late Vivien Russell of Sennen Cove, West  
Cornwall, set herself the task. She chose for detailed study the six West  
Penwith parishes of Gulval, St Just, Ludgvan, Madron, with its chapelry of  
Penzance, Paul and Sancreed, which form a contiguous block in the Land's End  
peninsula (see the shaded area on the map). Deficiencies in the evidence  
available from the parish registers made it impossible to include a similar study  
of the large parish of St Buryn with its chapelries of Sennen and St Levan. But her work on the area, and on the other parishes in Penwith hundred, was
extensive. This involved the carding and numbering of each man listed in the Protestation returns of 26 parishes and chapelries in all, and a consolidated index of the names, with a note of the parish in which they took the Protestation oath.\(^5\) Details of men with the same names were added from the home registers of baptisms, marriages and burials, and also from a considerable number of other surviving Penwith parish registers.\(^6\) Her aim was, in the main, to establish as residents those names in the returns for each parish, and to identify the remainder who do not appear in the registers of the six parishes, or elsewhere in the district, and might be considered ‘strangers’. She was also concerned with examining in detail the way in which the Protestation was organised in the area, how the returns were made, and what were their special characteristics.
Taking the Protestation Oath

The Protestation returns for the hundred of Penwith are remarkable in that, of the 26 parishes and chapelries, only three (those for St Erth, Sennen and Perranuthnoe) are ‘fair copies’, with the names all written in one hand; that for Gwinear, probably in two or three hands, is also without signatures and marks. The remaining 22, accordingly, offer first-hand evidence of how the returns were organised at local level. All were made on 4 or 5 March, the very days after the ministers and parish officers had themselves taken the oath at Helston, a small town in the Lizard peninsula, the designated centre for Kerrier and Penwith hundreds; this was done in the presence of two magistrates, Ezekiell Grosse of St Buryan (Penwith hundred) and John Trefusis of Mylor (Kerrier hundred). Also present were Hugh Thomas of St Buryan, High Constable, and Simon Prust, of Lelant, the Hundred Constable. How well planned this meeting was is shown by the attendance at it of one minister or curate from each parish in Penwith hundred and all but perhaps one in Kerrier (with one away sick). Every parish in both hundreds also sent, for the most part, two constables, two churchwardens and two overseers of the poor, and some of them more of each. The boroughs of Marazion and Penzance, both of them chapelries, did not have separate ministers; at Helston, the vicar of St Hilary signed for the former, and the vicar of Madron for the latter.

The meeting at Helston must have been a considerable assembly, with its business presumably taking a good deal of time, since something like 47 ministers and about 316 officers, from the parishes in both hundreds, had to take the Protestation. Daylight hours at the beginning of March are not very long; it is tempting to conjecture that time may have been saved by tendering the oath to representatives of each parish together, rather than individually, but of this there is no evidence. But whatever methods were adopted, it must have been a lengthy process to collect the signatures or marks of about 360 persons. What is more, a busy programme was scheduled for the ministers and officers of the Penwith parishes on one of the two next days, when they had to supervise those required to take the Protestation oath in their respective parishes.

Men over eighteen in the parishes nearer to Helston met their officers on 4 March, a Friday. These were Camborne, Crowan, St Hilary and its chapelry of Marazion, Phillack, Lelant and its chapelry of Towednack. It seems likely that the same day was appointed for Gwithian and perhaps St Ives, though the returns for these parishes are not dated. Those living further away took the Protestation on Saturday, 5 March. The parishes are known to have been St Buryan with its chapelries of Sennen and St Levan, St Erth, St Just, Paul, Sancreed and Zennor; although the returns are undated, this was almost certainly also the day for Gulval, Ludgvan, and Madron with Penzance and Morvah chapelries. The returns for Illogan, Perranuthnoe and Redruth, though all in East Penwith, are dated 5 March. From Helston to Penzance is approximately 13 miles; St Just, St Buryan, Sennen and St Levan are at least seven to ten miles further to the west. Most of the parishes for which 4 March must have been arranged for the oath-taking lay no more than ten miles or so from Helston, so perhaps it was not unreasonable to expect the ministers and
officers to supervise the proceedings in their parishes the day following the hundred meeting, although a good deal of travelling was involved. Officers living west of Penzance had at least an extra day before they met their parishioners.

It must be presumed that warning of the proceedings, with the day and time of assembly, had already been given to those liable to take the oath, but unfortunately how far ahead this was announced, and by what means, is not known. The place of meeting was probably the church, and is so specified in the return for Zennor. The vicar of St Just, however, refers to ‘our usual place of meeting’, which Vivien Russell suggested might be an indication that it was not the church but the Plain-an-Gwary, the area in the middle of St Just where once miracle plays had been performed. The extent of the West Penwith parishes, and the siting of the ‘church town’, meant that the distance even from the most remote settlements or farms seldom entailed a journey of more than two or three miles, and often less; it is reasonable to suppose that there were convenient church paths, even where the terrain was rough, as much of it must have been. Accordingly there would not appear to have been any particular difficulties in assembling the men of the parish, providing they were fit enough and young enough to come. What the weather was like on 3, 4 and 5 March is not recorded, but as the ink on some returns is blotted, sometimes showing the imprint in reverse of another sheet (eg some sheets for Camborne, St Ives, St Just and Ludgvan) showers or longer periods of rain may have occurred.

All the Protestation returns for parishes in Penwith hundred are written on paper, either on double or single foolscap sheets. They do not follow exactly the same form. Three, for St Just, Gwithian and Sancreed, begin with the wording of the Protestation itself, in a scribe’s hand. Several have an initial statement, often with the date, and sometimes with a list of officers; a certification by the minister and officers that the above-named have taken the oath, and none has refused it, is often at the end. That for St Just is more informative. The minister and officers state that all the men in the parish of eighteen years and over have complied, except for certain old and sick men willing but not able to come, and also some tinners and others who were ‘at the blowing-houses and elsewhere’ out of the parish ‘before we had order given to us to warne them, and are not yet returned’. The order to give this warning must have come from outside the parish, and presumably pre-dated the Helston meeting of 3 March. Most of the returns do not record that the list of names is in fact of men of eighteen and over, but this is specified in the case of Crowan, St Just, St Levan, Sancreed and Redruth, and it is a reasonable presumption that this was the intention everywhere. Of course some under eighteen may have been included; not everyone necessarily knew his own age. At least one person listed in the St Just returns appears to have been too young to sign.

The appearance of the returns varies widely. Some are tidy lists, the names written neatly in one, two or three columns, bearing witness to an orderly procedure and careful supervision; among these are the returns for Madron and Gulval. Others are very untidy, with names all over the place, like the return for Lelant and part of that for Illogan; wavy lines, trying to shape the names into columns, run down the sheets for Crowan. The return for Sancreed is
unique in consisting of three ruled columns, each with its narrow space on the left for the mark, if needed, with a larger space for the name on the right; this was carefully marked out with horizontal lines, giving each name one space. Unfortunately there turned out to be more persons to give assent to the Protestation than there were spaces, so that the second sheet ends with a number of names, somewhat squashed into four columns at the foot, but nevertheless neatly written. It was obviously difficult to supervise the proceedings in some of the more populous parishes, like Paul, where a great deal of paper was wasted; perhaps more than one sheet was being completed simultaneously to save time. The return for Perranuthnoe, in East Penwith, suggests by the bunching of surnames that the Protestation oath may have been taken by the inhabitants of each farm in turn or even, as Vivien Russell wondered, by the officers going round to each settlement. Unfortunately it is a fair copy, probably in the curate’s hand, so that the order of the surnames may have been rearranged later, and how the names were taken at this time cannot be established.

Assessing literacy

It is not by any means easy to decide which in the lists of names are signatures. Respect for the more honourable persons in a parish is often shown by the grouping of what are undeniably signatures at the top of a column or columns, generally on the first page. Thus the return for St Buryan begins with eight signatures, four of them members of the prominent Noy family; the second column has eight, with four members of the Levelis family; Francis Godolphin heads the list for St Hilary, two members of the Arundel family at Camborne, and the stylish signature of Thomas Tresilian begins the return for St Levan. Signatures are scattered throughout the lists in a number of parishes; sometimes two consecutive names are apparently in the same hand, so perhaps a man signed for his less literate brother or neighbour. Respect is also paid to borough officials; the mayors of Penzance, Marazion and St Ives are all prominent at the beginning of the respective returns, with others of the corporation. The body of every return is in the hand of one or more scribes not, in general, easy to identify, though not, except in the cases of the returns for Sennen and Perranuthnoe and perhaps St Erth, clearly professional ones. Sometimes it is the incumbent or curate who wrote part or most of the return; the distinctive hand of John Kete, the vicar, is at the beginning and the end of the return for Madron, and also as scribe for most of the names in that for Morvah, a chapelry of Madron. John Smyth, vicar of Sancreed, wrote out some of the names, as did Samuel Sweete, vicar of Zennor. Sometimes others in the parish shared the burden; at Ludgvan, for example, as well as the rector, one of the churchwardens and an overseer of the poor probably did their part. In many cases, however, it is difficult to identify the hand of the scribe with certainty.

A man unable to write his own name was required, in theory at least, to put a mark beside it on the return. Some lists preface the name with the words ‘the signe of’ or ‘the sine of’, with the mark between the Christian name and the surname; sometimes the mark preceded the name; sometimes the mark is placed to the right of the name. There is little uniformity, and indeed none
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>% definite signatures</th>
<th>% doubtful signatures</th>
<th>% marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Ives</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penzance</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camborne</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowan</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lelant</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Hilary</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwithian</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morvah</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madron</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marazion</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulval</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sancred</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illogan</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Levan</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Just</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zennor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redruth</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towednack</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillack</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (3127 names) | 19 | 5 | 76 |

Notes: Parishes omitted in the above lists are St. Buryan, St. Erth, Gwinear, Ludgvan, Perranuthnoe and Sennen, totalling 775 names.

could be expected. The marks themselves vary from lines at various angles, crosses, a variety of abstract patterns, and attempts, more or less successful, to write one or both of the initials of the man's name. These last are often at a peculiar angle, and appear sometimes upside down, as if the scribe wrote the name sat on one side of a table, and the man making his mark on the other side: thus we find a capital M by the name of Wedge, on the return for Towednack. The return for St Just has CE for Charles Ellis, O for Lawry Ottes, IV for John Ustick, B for Bennet Sacerly and what appears to be a P on its head for Francis Peares. A flicker of independence is shown by a firm H by the scribe's rendering of the name written as Omfrie Martin, of Gulval. These letters may have been made by men who had a smattering of the ability to write, but used it seldom except on solemn occasions. How desirable it seemed to be able to write one's own name is perhaps uncertain; John Gelbart, an overseer at Zennor, signed himself in the parish but made his mark at Helston, though it is possible someone else did it for him.

It is clear that a number of those who should have made their mark did not do so. Some returns have a number of signatures, a number of names with marks beside them, and a number of names which are not signatures but are without marks, often written in the hand of one of the scribes for the parish. The extreme case is the return for Ludgvan, which out of 187 names includes four signatures, eighteen names with marks beside them and 165 without any marks.
at all; that for St Buryan also has a number of names in a scribe’s hand without marks, and examples may be found elsewhere. The cynical might assume that these are the names of men known to live in the parish but not actually present on the appointed day at the church or other place of assembly: this can be neither confirmed nor contradicted. In Table 1, the percentage of names which cannot be established as either signatures or having marks by them are classified as ‘doubtful’; these have been added together to suggest an overall percentage of the illiterate, but is likely to be an overestimate. It is however worth noting that the percentage of those able to write their own names is markedly higher in the two boroughs of St Ives (33 per cent) and Penzance (31 per cent) than in the rural parishes. The re-examination of the returns has not in all cases confirmed Cressy’s percentages of illiterates in the Penwith parishes, but there are few significant differences when the difficulties of interpretation are taken into account.9 If the parishes of St Buryan, St Erth, Gwinear, Ludgvan, Perranuthnoe and Sennen are left out of the calculation as providing little or no reliable evidence of literacy, the mean percentages for the remaining parishes and chapelries work out to 19 per cent signatures, 76 per cent with marks against them, and 5 per cent difficult or impossible to classify.

**Identifying the oath takers**

What evidence is there to establish that those named in a parish return lived in that parish and which men over eighteen who might be expected to be listed are not included? These are two questions Vivien Russell had in mind when she began her detailed investigation of the six parishes. Taking each Protestation return as her base, she extracted the names on the list which also occurred in the baptismal registers of each parish; those of eighteen years of age in 1642 should have been baptised no later than 1624. She also noted from the marriage and burial registers any reference to men with the same name; these might, or might not, refer to the same person.10 Also incorporated on the card for each man named are any references to the same name from the surviving registers for other Penwith parishes she was able to consult, and any other contemporary records, especially the lists, mostly by parish, of those who served in Slanning’s regiment in 1643.11 Correct identification is of course a crucial problem.

There is, first of all, the question of names. Some surnames in Penwith hundred are distinctive, like Noy, Jacka and Madderne, but it is by no means the case that they were largely confined to a specific parish or district, though some may have been, such as Bosince in Sancreed and Vellenoweth in Ludgvan. Moreover, Vivien Russell noted that the Protestation returns show that not all surnames were hereditary by 1642. In Zennor a churchwarden was called Andrew Bodinned in the list of those who were present at Helston, and Andrew Noye alias Bodinner in the parish one, and an overseer was Francis White at Helston and Francis Madderne in the parish. In Gwinear a churchwarden was similarly George Browne and George Eedes. She also drew attention to the point made by Canon Taylor in his commentary on the St Just Easter Book of 1588 to 1596,12 that in some instances the father’s Christian name becomes the son’s surname, and though admitting that the Protestation returns do not give actual proof of the continuance of this custom, pointed out that
there are frequent occurrences of pairs of names entered consecutively which would bear this out if father and son came to sign or make their mark together: e.g., in St Buryan, Jenken Dennis and Arthur Jenkin; in St Just, Wearen Richard and Edmond Wearen. In addition, the mishearing or misinterpretation of a name may complicate identification still further; she instanced in the St Buryan list, Nicholas Parrye and David Harrye and Thomas Carne and Robert Barne, juxtapositions which may be co-incidental, but probably are not. Baptismal names might be unusual; St Just, for example, boasted of exotics like Arcules (Hercules) and Ogustin (Augustine), whereas at St Buryan were to be found Hanibal, Peroclis (Pericles) and Diogenes. But most men had common or relatively common names.

Secondly, the limitations of parish registers in supplying names of local inhabitants are generally accepted. A man who lived all his life in the same parish and died unmarried might leave at most two entries, those of his baptism and burial, and even these might go unrecorded. The care with which each incumbent or curate kept his registers must have varied widely. The quality of recording during the lifetime of men born before about 1624, and still active in the 1640s, defies generalisation, but coverage in the registers of Gulval, Ludgyan, Madron with Penzance chapelry, Paul and perhaps Sancreed (though perhaps less so after the Restoration), seems good, as is that for St Just except for the baptismal registers. But for St Buryan and St Ives, two large parishes with chapelries, registers only survive from the 1650s; those for Zennor are patchy, and a number begin only in the late seventeenth, and early eighteenth century (see endnote 4). Entries in the baptismal, marriage and burial registers may all help to identify a man, but do not give any information whether he was in a parish in or around 1642.

Vivien Russell's indexing of the names in each Protestation return for the six parishes and in Penzance chapelry makes it possible to say how many of these can be found in the registers of the home parish, though when more than one man with the same Christian and surname occurs in the Protestation returns, the entries in the registers do not always make it clear whether the references apply to one or more persons. Baptism and burial dates are sometimes helpful in such cases. Vivien Russell's own research led her to the conclusion, which she would almost certainly have regarded as tentative, that about 88 per cent of all the names in these Protestation returns are to be traced in their home registers. As Table 2 shows, a reworking of the evidence suggests that it is maybe a little higher: 89.5 per cent. In Sancreed and Gulval it is probably 93 per cent: in Madron and Penzance chapelry (they share the same register), 85 per cent. It cannot of course be assumed that all those whose names occur in both sources refer to the same person, but it is reasonable to presume that the majority do. A detailed examination suggests that, overall, identification is probable in 56 per cent, and possible in 33.5 per cent, of the men listed; but many of the judgements which go to make up the classification set out in Table 2 are necessarily subjective.

Perhaps the most reliable evidence of the presence of a man in a parish just before and just after 1642 is a record in the home register of the baptism of his
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Gulval</th>
<th>St Just</th>
<th>Ludgvan</th>
<th>Madron Penzance*</th>
<th>Paul</th>
<th>Sancreed</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of names in Protestation Returns (PR)</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probable identification of same person in PR and home registers (%)</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible identification of same person in PR and home registers (%)</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same names occurring in home parish registers (%)</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Names in PR not found in home parish registers but possibly associated with one or more persons in PR, or connected with parish (%)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Names in PR not in home registers but in other West Penwith registers (%)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Names not traced in West Penwith registers (%)</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Names found in home parishes but not in PR, although apparently of suitable age (18 years)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44*</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** * = Penzance was a chapelry of Madron and as such entries for Penzance are included in the Madron parish registers.

children. At least 22 out of the first 60 entries in the Protestation return for St Just share the same name as men in the parish who had children baptised in the crucial period; it is probable that they can be identified as the same people. A similar sample for Gulval, a smaller parish, discloses that about 23 names of a sample of 60 men listed in the Protestation return are also to be found in the home register as having had children baptised in or near 1642, and these men seem likely to have been resident in Gulval at the time. Such evidence is useful in showing that a number of identifications are probable, as are a miscellany of references in the registers of marriages, although it is not clear whether there was any current convention that the ceremony should take place in the bride’s or bridegroom’s parish. Dates of burial may also be useful, sometimes suggesting that two men of the same name may have been in the parish, rather than the one perhaps indicated. That about 44 per cent of names in the
Protestation returns are also to be found in one or more of the surviving parish registers of Penwith hundred presents a problem, but many of these references do not appear relevant as an indication of where a man was living in 1642, and in general evidence from the home registers has been preferred in making the classification in Table 2, though of course not necessarily correctly in all cases. Other instances in which the evidence is conflicting or incomplete have been classified as tending to possible rather than probable identification.

Each of the Protestation returns for the six parishes and Penzance chapelry includes some names which are not found in the registers of the home parish. A few of these are possibly associated with one or more persons in the same Protestation return, or connected with the parish in a special way. Another group of names, again not found in the home parish, occurs in the registers of other Penwith parishes, but identifications are often very doubtful. A third group consists of names not traced in any surviving Penwith registers at all. The number in all the groups is very small, totalling only about 10.5 per cent of the total number of those named in the returns.

The first of these groups is directly related to the completeness of the registers as a guide to the inhabitants of a parish. There are a number of names in each Protestation return which seems to be closely associated with men whose identification with names in the registers seems probable or possible: they share a surname, and signed or made their mark in the return next to that name, suggesting some relationship and perhaps habitation in the same parish. Thus in Paul parish, Noall Thomas’s name appears next to that of Will Thomas, Sampson Pender’s name next to that of Robert Pender, Edward Nicholas’s next to that of John Nicholas. Seven men in the return for St Just are recorded next to someone with the same surname, whose position may of course merely indicate a welcome extended to a relation outside the parish, but it may equally point to a fellow inhabitant whose name has somehow escaped inclusion in the registers. There may also be some argument with a surname found, according to the Protestation returns and parish registers, solely in that parish. Single persons with the name of Chelew, Vellenoweth and Cadwedres seem likely to be inhabitants of Ludgvan, the Protestation return for which records four with the name Chelew, five with that of Vellenoweth, and one other with that of Cadwedres. Also candidates for inclusion are William Isaak and George Wheare, both overseers of the poor in Paul parish, since it seems unlikely that this office would be held by someone who was not an inhabitant of the parish, although their names do not appear in the registers. A total of 25 is a conservative estimate of those who should be placed in this group; the number might easily be extended by a rather more liberal interpretation of ‘association’ in the returns. But the fact that none of the names in question is found in the registers of neighbouring parishes is some indication that the men lived in the parish whose Protestation they signed or to which they put their mark, and seems to justify their separate grouping.

A second group, about 3.5 per cent of the total returns, consists of those which are not found in the home registers, but may be traced in the registers of neighbouring Penwith parishes, some with assurance, some very tentatively. Whether these point to men who had migrated, or to temporary visitors who
found it more convenient to take the oath in the parish in which they found themselves – as must have done James Incledon, of St Keverne parish in Kerrier hundred, noted in the return for Camborne – is unknown. But what they do indicate is that those recorded were predominantly men of West Penwith, as their surnames overwhelmingly suggest.

The third group, just over 5 per cent of the 1418 persons named in the Protestation returns of the six parishes, consists of names found neither in the home parish registers nor in those of neighbouring parishes. Of these 77 persons, 31, perhaps 33, have a surname found in the home Protestation return, and 29 in the Protestation returns of other Penwith parishes. Only 15, less than a quarter of the group, have surnames not found in any Protestation return or registers (so far examined) of any parish in Penwith hundred. Among these 15 are some surnames which may be found as those of men who made their Protestation in other parts of Cornwall; this seems to be the case in 11 out of the 15 names, some of them common or relatively so in the centre and east of the county. Only four of the 15 names do not otherwise figure in the Index to the printed edition of the Cornwall Protestation returns, and even of these, three have a Cornish ring about them (Polpeare, Chelenros and Treffulack). These Cornish names may be compared, significantly, with those of the crews of two ships, previously mentioned, as in St Ives harbour, names unmistakably those of men from areas far from Cornwall. Unfortunately there is no indication why these strangers were in West Penwith in March 1642, but it is noticeable that the highest number of these names are to found in Penzance, an urban centre likely to have attracted men from other parts of the county.

Vivien Russell also set herself the task of scanning the registers of the six parishes in the hope of identifying men over eighteen in 1642 who might have been expected to appear in the Protestation returns, either in the parish where some event of their life had been recorded, or in a neighbouring parish. She compiled a list of these ‘missing persons’, totalling them to 171; inclusion or exclusion in some cases inevitably becomes a matter of subjective judgement. There is, of course, a possibility that some of these were already dead but their burial had not been registered, or that they had moved away from the area. Thus the total 171 is a potential maximum, although of course under-registration must also be taken into account; but if it or some similar figure is accepted, the proportion of males aged eighteen and over in each parish might have to be inflated by something like 10 to 15 per cent (see Table 2). But unless a full list of those who were not present was given on the return, and this is often not included, there is no direct evidence about who could have been present and was not. We have to make do with the imperfect statement about absentees at St Just, reports from St Buryan, Gulval and Sancreed that there were no ‘refusers’ or ‘neglecters’, and declarations from Crowan, Gwinear, St Hilary, St Levan, St Just, Ludgvan and Sancreed that those who had taken the Protestation were all the men over eighteen in the parish or, alternatively, that all the names in the return were of those over eighteen in the parish: the interpretation of the wording – whether they mean the same thing – is an open question. In none of the parishes in the hundred was a single Catholic recusant reported, and not a single dissenter.
Table 3  Estimated population in certain West Penwith parishes, 1642 and 1676

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Protestation return, 1642</th>
<th>Compton Census, 1676</th>
<th>Ratio, CC/PR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n.</td>
<td>x 3.0</td>
<td>x 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Just</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludgvan</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madron with Penzance</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>1272</td>
<td>1484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sancreed</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  
\( ^a \) = 1676 figures from A. Whiteman (ed.), with the assistance of Mary Clapinson, *The Compton Census of 1676: a critical edition*, (British Academy, Records of Social and Economic History, NS 10, London, 1986), 285-6. There was no return in 1676 for Gulval, the other parish specially investigated.

\( ^b \) = For the use of 1.4 and 1.7 for the multipliers of the 1676 figures see T. Arkell, 'A Method for estimating population totals from the Compton Census returns', in K. Schürer and T. Arkell, (eds), *Surveying the People*, (Oxford, 1992) 97-116, esp. 114.

\( ^c \) = See *Compton Census*, 286, fn. 143.

Population estimates

Each Protestation return must, of course, be assessed on its merits in trying to decide how far it is a partial census and how far a snapshot. There can be little doubt that, on the remarkable foundations which Vivien Russell laid her study of these six parishes of West Penwith, it is reasonable to conclude that identification of a considerable number of men listed on the returns with men found in the home registers is either probable or, a lesser number, possible, and that the returns may accordingly be taken as evidence for the population in the parishes in 1642. Such a calculation needs the help of suitable multipliers. What these should be remains a matter of conjecture, but it is suggested that, as the number of men of eighteen and over in a parish is likely to have constituted about 30 per cent of the population, a multiplier between 3 and 3.5 is probably appropriate. It is certainly misleading to suggest that a more precise figure would be any more likely to provide accurate results, since the margins of error are considerable. Table 3 suggests that a comparison of the number of men over eighteen who assented to the Protestation in five out of the six parishes in West Penwith for which a return is also available in the Compton Census of 1676 points to considerable agreement about the size of the populations in 1642 and 1676 in all except Sancreed, where a marked discrepancy is found which cannot at present be explained. In making such comparisons, changes in population cannot of course be ruled out, but it is more likely that some returns are misleading, as one of those for Sancreed may be. Nevertheless, the care with which the Protestation returns were compiled in 1642, as demonstrated in both parts of this article, points clearly to the view that they constitute a partial census. Further work on them, as pioneered by Vivien Russell, will bring about greater clarification and enable demographers to use them with greater confidence.
NOTES

1. The original Protestation returns, in the custody of the Clerk of Records, House of Lords Record Office (hereafter HLRO), are filed by county and hundred or division, etc. For further details see the first part of this article published in the previous issue of this journal; A. Whiteman, 'The Protestation Returns of 1641-1642: Part I, The General Organisation', LPS (1995), note 1, 25. I am grateful to the Clerk and his staff for allowing me access to the returns over the years, making me various photocopies which I was permitted to lend to the late Vivien Russell, and giving me help of various kinds. The returns for Cornwall are printed: see T.L. Stoate, (ed.), Cornwall Protestation Returns, 1641 (Bristol, 1974). See also Jeremy Gibson and A.J. Dell, (ed.), The Protestation Returns of 1641-2 and Contemporary Lists (Federation of Family History Societies, 1995) for a recent survey of existing returns.

2. Stoate, Cornwall Protestation Returns, 65 (the heading, 'A note for the names of strangers', is misleadingly placed, implying that it refers to all three columns and not only to the first one); W.F. Webster, (ed.), Protestation Returns 1641-2, Lincolnshire (Nottingham, 1984), 73.

3. HLRO, Cornwall, Penwith Hundred, has returns for all the parishes and chapelries. Those generally regarded as in West Penwith are St Buryan, with St Levan and Sennen chapelries, Gulval, St Just, Lelant with St Ives and Towendack chapelries, Ludgvan, Madron with Penzance and Morvah chapelries, Paul, Sancreed and Zennor; in East Penwith, Camborne, Crownan, St Erth, Gwinear, St Hilary with Marazion chapelry, Illogan, Perranuthnoe, Phillack with Gwihian chapelry, and Redruth.

4. For a survey of the dates covered by the registers of the parishes in the Deanery of Penwith (co-terminous with the hundred) and their location, see Hugh Peskett, (ed.), The Guide to the Parish and Non-Parochial Registers of Devon and Cornwall 1538-1837, Devon and Cornwall Record Society, Extra Series, 2 (1979). It should be noted that Vivien Russell only recorded the names of men in her search of the registers.

5. It is probably impossible to arrive at a satisfactory total of those who assented to the Protestation in Penwith hundred, partly because of obscurities in the returns, and partly because some names may be duplicated. Vivien Russell thought that the number was about 3,800, but suggested that it might be higher, by up to 27, because of the problem of deciding whether a man who signed a list was, or was not, the man of the same name who acted as a parish officer. A count of all entries in the returns, ignoring probable or possible duplications, comes to 3,899; 3,921 names are recorded in her consolidated index for the hundred, but this almost certainly includes a number of duplications. Her analysis of Christian names totals some 3,891, but of course entries which are illegible are omitted, and there may again be some duplication.

6. It should be noted that entries for the chapelry of Penzance are included in the Madron registers, but Morvah, another chapelry of Madron, kept its own registers. Morvah is not included in the detailed study below.

7. HLRO, Cornwall, Penwith and Kerrier hundreds: list of those who took the Protestation at Helston, 3 March 1642.

8. For example, Thomas Robert and John Robert, at St Levan; Bennet Tremellion and John Ballamy, at Redruth, is less certain.


11. Royal Institution of Cornwall, Truro, Courtney Library, PET/1/1.


13. Other examples are: at Camborne, Humphrey Town and Richard Humphrey, Olliver Wade and John Oliver; at Crowan, James Breay and Thomas James, Walter Hugh and John Walters; at Gwihian, Richard Michell and Percie Richard; at Ludgvan, Nicholas Davie and Richard Nicholas; at Paul, Nicholas Cock and Thomas Nicholas; at Zennor, Thomas Phillip and John Thomas, David Udy and Richard Davye, Thomas Nennis and Mathew Thomas.

14. Vivien Russell's further research on the returns and on the parish registers for Redruth, Gwihian and Perranuthnoe, though not on the same scale and through the same scrutiny of the registers of neighbouring parishes, revealed much the same tentative results; 93 per cent of the names in the Protestation returns for Redruth and Perranuthnoe and 90 per cent of the names for Gwihian, occur in the parish registers.


16. See above, endnote 2.
ALLOWING FOR MIGRATION IN ESTIMATING EARLY POPULATION LEVELS
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Introduction

Parish surveys giving exact populations in the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries are rare. Normal the local historian of this period has to make rough estimates of populations, based on such sources as the numbers of communicants at ecclesiastical visitations, the numbers of adult males taking the Oath of Protestation in 1642 and the numbers of householders subject to, or exempt from hearth taxes. More recently, aggregative analysis combined with back projection technique has made it possible to estimate populations from the average numbers of baptisms or burials per year as recorded in the parish registers. However, the average factors for converting numbers gleaned from these sources into real populations are only roughly known, and may not necessarily apply in a particular case. If estimates at different dates can be related to each other by reasonably reliable calculations of population changes, they can then be adjusted to obtain the best fit. These adjusted estimates are likely to be more accurate than those obtained from the separate sources.

The two components that need to be taken into account in calculating population changes are natural increase (births minus deaths, usually approximated by baptisms minus burials), and migration both into and out from the community. Subject to the possibility of incompleteness of the registration of vital events, parish registers usually allow reasonably accurate calculations of natural increase to be made. Only rarely, however, is there direct evidence of the level of migration before the recording of places of birth in the nineteenth century census enumerations.

A discussion of the main sources of information on mobility can be found in Hollingsworth. One pre-census source which provides information on both the amount and distance of migration is a group of Yorkshire parish registers, in which baptismal records from 1777 to 1812 note the places of residence of the grand parents. Another source of earlier mobility information, though of a sample of the population that may not be entirely representative, is provided by some diocesan court records that include biographies of witnesses. A further source of information for migration is household listings. Those such as for Cardington, Bedfordshire, 1782, which give information on the de jure as well as the de facto population are extremely rare. Consequently, migration is more often studied by combining lists of inhabitants for the same place at different times. A pioneering example of the use of this sort of information is Laslett’s study of the 1676 and 1688 listings for Clayworth, Nottinghamshire, and the 1618 and 1628 listings for Cogenhoe, Northamptonshire. Such listings
allow the extent of migration to be calculated but not the distances that people have moved. Other sources mentioned by Hollingsworth, such as those marriage records that give the parish of origin of spouses, apprenticeship records that give the place of origin, freeman records that provide places of birth, and settlement papers that give the parish of origin, allow such distances to be studied, albeit for restricted samples of the population. Population changes without details of individuals can, of course, be used to estimate net migration. This was done, for example, for mid-Wharfedale in the period 1721-1812\(^8\) and for Worcestershire between 1660 and 1850.\(^9\)

If studies of population change are undertaken for places that lack sources of mobility information, there is a temptation to assume that in and out migration roughly compensate each other so that they can be ignored. But differences in local economies between neighbouring communities must often have caused unequal migrations, and one of the purposes of this article is to point out that serious errors may arise if the migration components are ignored. A method is suggested by which these components may be roughly estimated. This is first tested, using the Clayworth data, and then applied to the case of Beeston, Nottinghamshire.\(^10\) The method involves noting the appearance and disappearance of surnames in the parish register, together with the numbers of continuing names, from which a further estimate of the population may be obtained.

**Degree of mobility**

Laslett’s study of Clayworth over a limited twelve year period and Cogenhoe over ten years is one that does allow the calculation of rates of migration. In Clayworth, with 401 inhabitants in 1676 and 412 in 1688, 244 people disappeared between these two dates. Of these, 92 had died, 6 had married, and 53 were servants who must have moved away. At least 45 were household members who had moved away – there may have been more among the 48 names not accounted for.\(^11\) Thus, an average of at least 8.2 people per year had moved away. On the other hand, 255 of the names in the 1688 list had appeared since 1676. These included 58 household members and 60 servants migrating in, corresponding to an average of 9.8 people per year.

Of the 185 named people in Cogenhoe in 1618 and the 180 in 1628, only 86 survived throughout the period. Of the 99 (53.5 per cent) who disappeared, about 40 household members and 18 servants moved away – an average of 5.8 people per year - and about 4 and 25, respectively, in these two categories moved in (totalling 2.9 people per year). About 21 of those disappearing and 23 of those appearing were not accounted for.

Re-assessment of these mobility figures in terms of numbers of households provides a more relevant comparison with the estimates that are to follow. In Clayworth, there were 98 households in 1676 and 91 in 1688,\(^12\) of which 60 had persisted from the earlier listing. Of the 38 households that disappeared over the 12 year period, 10 were identified as moving out, and 19 of the 31 new households in 1688 had moved in from elsewhere. This represents an average rate of movement of about 0.8 households per year moving out and 1.6 per
year moving in. The numbers of individuals associated with these migrating households averaged 4.5 per household for those moving out and 3.1 per household for those moving in. Presumably the latter were generally younger families with fewer children.

In Cogenhoe, there were 33 households in each of the two years but only 25 of them had persisted from 1618 to 1628. All 8 of the disappearing households had moved out (averaging 0.8 per year) with an average household size of about 5.0. Of the new households, 4 had moved in (averaging 0.4 per year) having an average size probably more than the minimum 1.0, since there were 23 people not accounted for. Laslett notes that, in addition to these household members, there was a considerable movement of servants, many of whom changed their employment once a year, frequently involving movement to a different parish. This applied not only to the male servants, who were mainly employed in agricultural work, but also to the female domestic servants.

Much of the migration that took place is likely to have been over small distances, some only to adjacent parishes. The study by Levine of eighteenth century settlement certificates and removal orders for immigrants to Shepshed (Leicestershire) and Bottesford (Nottinghamshire) showed that only in 5.5 or 5.8 per cent of the cases, respectively, was migration over a distance of more than 15 miles. On the other hand, only 17.5 or 12.5 per cent, respectively, were from adjoining villages. Similar evidence comes from the Cardington studies mentioned above.

Migration distances were analysed by occupational category proposed by Lamb and Maltby in a study of West Riding parishes and were compared with Holderness' figures for the Plain of York. In both studies, about 55 per cent of the farmers appeared not to have moved from the parish of residence of their parents, about 31 per cent had moved under 10 miles, and 11-15 per cent had come from further afield. For tradesmen and textile workers, about 48 per cent had remained in the same parish, 26-30 per cent had moved under 10 miles and 18-26 per cent further. The labourers, however, had been more mobile though, again, only over short distances. Only 32-38 per cent remained in the same parish, 38-43 per cent moved less than 10 miles, and 18-24 per cent moved further.

Studies have also been made of the ages at which migrants moved, for example, by Schofield, based on the 1782 Cardington listing, and by Clark, derived from court witnesses in the period 1660 to 1730. In the latter study, over 60 per cent of urban males and nearly 70 per cent of rural males had moved at least once, again usually within 10 miles. It is clear from these that there was much movement before the age of thirty, especially by men prior to marrying or, if after marriage, before having many children.

Effects of the neglect of mobility in estimating population changes

Between the dates of the two parish surveys in Clayworth, the numbers of burials exceeded the numbers of baptisms by 6, and the population increased by 11. In this case, then, neglect of migration in calculating the change in
population would have caused only a small error. The situation is different in places where there is more imbalance between in and out migration, especially if longer periods are studied, as is illustrated by the case of Laxton, Nottinghamshire. Here, estimates of population change between the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries, based on natural increase only, showed a steady increase that was contrary to the rough indications from the various sources mentioned in the introduction. This could be corrected empirically by assuming a small excess of four people per year migrating out compared with those moving in. Even such a small imbalance caused a large cumulative effect on the population estimates in the long term.

A new method of estimating the amount of migration

The empirical method adopted for dealing in an approximate way with net migration away from Laxton, though better than making no allowance at all, is unsatisfactory since it is not based on any real evidence concerning the true extent of migration. The main sources of direct evidence have been outlined above but, in general, the local historian must rely on indirect evidence. This can be provided by parish registers, especially if the latter permit family reconstitutions. However, registers need to have been accurately compiled for at least two or three generations to allow reconstitution of a reasonable proportion of the families of any community. As Hollingsworth points out, omissions are indistinguishable from migrants.

Most registers suffer from some degree of under-registration, due either to neglect, particularly during the Civil War and Commonwealth period, or as a result of baptisms and marriages carried out on nonconformist premises and not recorded in the parish register. This is sometimes allowed for in a rather arbitrary way by multiplying by either a constant or a variable factor.

I have used parish registers in a way which is less exacting than family reconstitution, and which is relatively insensitive to under-registration, to obtain a rough estimate of the extent of both inward and outward migration. It is based on the appearance and disappearance of surnames, rather than of individuals.

It is true, of course, that not all surnames in the community would appear in the parish register. Omissions would be mainly servants – mostly young people who from parish register evidence would be considered as still residing in some other parish in which they were baptised. Laslett has found, however, in a study of 21 English communities, that about half of the servants shared surnames with other members of the community. Although some of these may have come from other parishes, many of them can be regarded as having been accounted for in population estimates based on parish register names, as though they were still living with their families. For the rest of the servants, one can normally do no better than assume that the numbers who have moved in from elsewhere are roughly compensated by the family members from the parish who have moved away to become servants elsewhere. Alternatively, if the contribution to the total population from nuclear families can be estimated,
servants and others can be allowed for roughly by using Laslett’s average number of 0.63 servants per household, or the average total of 0.93 persons per household (20 per cent of the population) who were not members of the family.

It is also true that registers contain surnames of people who do not belong to the parish. These are most likely to be marriage partners from outside who did not remain in the parish. The partners of these people from within the parish who also moved away one can only assume to be roughly compensated by those who married elsewhere and moved in.

The most significant names, then, for estimating both the population levels and the extent of migration are those of the members of families resident for some years in the parish. As a rough rule, these surnames can be taken to be those for which there is more than one parish register entry within, say, a 20 year period. Most resident family names should have occurred within this time, even if there were a slight under-registration of demographic events. For example, in a study of the Clayworth register for the years following the second of the rector’s surveys in 1688, I found that 52 of the 77 family surnames in that survey had occurred in the register within 5 years, 63 within 10 years and 67 within 15 years. Families with the remaining ten surnames had probably moved away from the parish or died out by then.

The method adopted for obtaining a rough estimate of the extent of migration involves, as a first step, the construction of a table of the type illustrated in part by Figure 1, in which there is a horizontal row for each surname mentioned more than once in the parish register within the period under study (preferably not less than 25 years). The columns are the individual years of that period. Each demographic event recorded in the parish register for these names is then entered in the table with a C for each christening, an M for each marriage, and a B for each burial. (Each marriage is entered twice, once for the groom’s surname and once for the bride’s.) A line is then drawn across the table for each surname, spanning the years for which there are recorded events for that name. Where there is a long gap of, say, more than twenty years between events, a broken line is used to indicate doubt about the continuation of the name over this period. A similar broken line is used anywhere else in the table where there is doubt about a name’s continuation (e.g., especially near the beginning and the end of the period). Brackets or short vertical lines are then drawn at the beginnings and ends of the lines to emphasise the commencement or termination of each name.

Near the beginning and end of the period under study, it is not possible, without further evidence, to distinguish between a gap in the occurrence of a name and its start or termination. Any opportunities of clarifying this situation should be taken but it must still be recognised that there must be uncertainties near the edges of the table. These are conveniently referred to as ‘end effects’.

The next step in the procedure is to count, for each page of the table, the numbers of names starting, ending, continuing, and possibly continuing each year. These numbers are then added for all the pages. The year in which any
Figure 1  An illustration of the table used in conjunction with the proposed method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>1577</th>
<th>78</th>
<th>79</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>81</th>
<th>82</th>
<th>83</th>
<th>84</th>
<th>85</th>
<th>86</th>
<th>87</th>
<th>88</th>
<th>89</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(selected)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbot</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacheler</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beardsley</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennet</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booth</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynes</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayles</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jellibrand</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkby</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacie</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leep</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mee</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owhthram</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowson</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampson</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharwen</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smalley</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widhouse</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?Continuing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
name makes its first or last appearance in the register would not normally correspond, of course, to the date of movement of a family of that name into or out of the parish. Moreover, single individuals, or a whole family bearing that name may have left the parish, still leaving relations to continue the name in the register. However, the first of these considerations merely introduces a timing error and the second causes a small underestimate of the number of people migrating. If rates of migration change only slowly, the timing error will be insignificant. With regard to the second point, some allowance can be made for the number of families associated with each surname, as explained later.

Because of the ‘end effects’ referred to above, only the central part of the period of years studied is likely to yield reliable statistics. This more reliable period is usually obvious in the trend of the totals obtained, and overall averages should be taken only over this central range. If there are clear trends in the totals, moving averages over the central period are helpful, but the timing error referred to above should be borne in mind.

The final stage in this analysis is to convert the numbers of surnames starting, ending, continuing and possibly continuing, into numbers of individuals. This can be the least certain part of the process but the local historian may have an indication from other work of the most appropriate factors to use. If not, for continuing households, Laslett’s ‘English standard’ household of 4.75 persons, is a possible factor, bearing in mind that this would include servants and other inmates.27 However, Arkell has pointed out that this figure is an average over the wide period 1574 to 1812 and that it falls to 4.5 if the period is restricted to 1650 to 1749.28 He recommends a factor 4.3 to apply to hearth tax household numbers, in order to exclude lodgers, and he suggests that two-thirds of rural communities should have populations within 10 per cent of the estimate obtained by using this factor and three-quarters should be within 15 per cent. Laslett’s figure becomes 3.82 if all non-kin are excluded but, again, for the period 1650 to 1745, Wall concludes that the average household size was 4.44 persons, of whom 3.56 were members of the family of the head of the household.29

If populations are calculated from continuing household numbers, lodgers and other inmates should be included, so I propose to use the factor range 4.3-4.5. For migrating households, however, a range of 3.4-3.7 (spanning Wall’s 3.56) is probably more appropriate, since a substantial proportion are likely to have had a young household head with few, if any, children and non-kin members.

When a surname disappears from, or first appears in a parish register, it almost certainly represents only one household. Continuing surnames, however, will on average represent more than one. For Clayworth, Laslett quotes the approximate figures 30 per cent more households than surnames in 1676 and 20 per cent more in 1688.30 For any community, abnormally high numbers of parish register events for particular names in the period studied (e.g. Lacie, in the Table) may provide a rough figure for the number of extra families or households for these names. For Beeston 1580-89, there were about 13 names with abnormally high numbers of parish register records, suggesting the need for about an 18 per cent inflation from names to families. A partial family reconstitution, however, suggests that the 76 surnames in 1593 might represent
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about 100 family groupings, corresponding to an inflation of 32 per cent. In the absence of specific evidence, it would be safest to employ for rural communities an inflation factor in the range 1.2-1.3.

Test of the method using Clayworth data

With the aid of the two surveys for Clayworth, it is possible to check both the method of estimating the degree of mobility and the use of the number of continuing family surnames to estimate the total population. I have studied the parish registers for the period 1672-1701 (actually as bishop’s transcripts from 1672 to 1680), and supplemented my findings from the list of names in the 1674 hearth tax assessment. On the basis of these sources, the average number of continuing surnames that were likely to belong to families (as distinct from servants and other single persons) over the ten year period 1678-87 inclusive was found to be 67.4. The average number of names possibly continuing was 1.7 and the numbers starting and ending were 1.1 and 1.2 per year, respectively. Even though errors produced by the ‘end effects’, referred to above, had been reduced by examining data relating to 6 years before the start of the 10 year period and to 13 years after it, it was realised that some names may have been missed or wrongly categorised. The extent of the remaining error was therefore ascertained by using the surveys to correct the parish register and hearth tax data, but only to the point of simulating the effect of studying the parish registers for a whole generation on either side of the 10 year period. In fact, only 14 family names were affected, and in most cases the error was only a change of a small number of years in the first or last mention of a name. As a result, the rate of termination of names remained unchanged at 1.2 per annum and the rate of commencement was slightly reduced to 0.9 per annum. Only eight of the corrected list of family names had received no mention in the parish register over the period between the two surveys in 1676 and 1688, and the majority of these names were represented by only one or two individuals in one or both surveys, and so were possibly not really family names. However, the corrections from the surveys increased the average number of names continuing to 71.1 and those possibly continuing to 3.6.

In order to test the methods outlined above for estimating the levels of mobility and population, both the uncorrected and corrected figures will be used, to give an indication of the magnitude of error that might be expected from an incomplete parish register analysis. Applying the range of factors of 3.4-3.7 persons per surname to the numbers of starting and terminating names (centred on Wall’s factor 3.56), we obtain estimates 3.7-4.1 individuals migrating in per year (or, using the corrected figure, 3.1-3.3 per year) and 4.1-4.4 per year moving away. Laslett reports 10 households or 45 household members (other than servants) moving out and 19 households or 58 household members migrating in, over the 12 years between the surveys. The actual annual averages were therefore 1.6 households or 4.8 individuals moving in and 0.8 households or 3.8 individuals migrating out. In view of the approximate nature of my method (which cannot take account of the migration of only some of the members of any one family) and the uncertainty in Laslett’s figures (since he could not account for 48 people missing in the 1688 list), the agreement is quite satisfactory.
To test the reliability of population estimates obtained by applying average factors to the numbers of continuing names, both uncorrected and corrected figures will again be used. Thus, both the uncorrected 67.4 continuing family surnames and the corrected 71.1 surnames have, first, to be inflated by the average range of factors 1.2-1.3, to estimate the number of families or households. The result is 81-88 or 85-92, compared with an actual number of households ninety-eight in 1676 and ninety-one or ninety-six in 1688. This is reasonable agreement but it is improved if the numbers of possibly continuing surnames is added, after similar inflation by 20-30 per cent. This adds 2 or 4-5 estimated further households, giving totals in the range 83-90 (uncorrected), or 89-97 (corrected). It must be recognised that there is some circularity of argument in using figures corrected with the aid of the surveys to compare with the survey figures. However, even if the uncorrected figures are compared, the agreement is quite acceptable. Also, it must be recognised that the factor range 1.2-1.3 for converting numbers of names into numbers of households, was derived partly from Clayworth and partly from Beeston data. As suggested above, local knowledge may indicate the best factors to use for other communities.

If only the estimated numbers of households were known, to obtain estimates of the numbers of family members or the total population these would now require multiplying by the range 3.4-3.7 to obtain the former, or by 4.3-4.5 for the latter. These result in estimates 282-332 (uncorrected) or 305-359 (corrected) family members, and 356-404 or 385-437 for the total population. The last range spans both the 1676 and the 1688 populations, 401 and 412, and the top end of the uncorrected range is near to both. The method can be said to have given estimated levels of migration and continuing population that agree reasonably well with the actual levels.

Application of the method to Beeston, Nottinghamshire, in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries

In a previous article I attempted to estimate the population of Beeston in 1593 (when the village suffered a visitation of the plague) and the changes in population over the subsequent few years. This was done by attempting a family reconstitution from a rather limited set of data. The parish register starts in 1558 but is rather sparse for the first few years, and there is only a small proportion of individuals who can be followed from christening to burial. The plague in 1593 resulted in 141 burials up to the end of the old-style year but, in estimating the population at that time, migration was only partly allowed for. It is now realised that several families, previously counted as having moved away from Beeston at the time of the plague, probably left the parish before that crisis.

The technique described above has now been applied to the parish register data, initially for the period 1580-89, by which time the register was better kept, yet the 'end effect' errors resulting from the disruption of the plague and a gap in the register in 1610 would be reduced.
A count of surnames over this period showed averages of 2.6 starting per year, 1.0 terminating, 68.0 continuing and 5.2 possibly continuing. Apart from the first, these figures are similar to those quoted above for Clayworth, indicating communities of similar size. The reversal of magnitudes of numbers of names starting and ending, compared with Clayworth in 1678-87 (0.9 and 1.2, respectively) suggests that Beeston was a growing community in contrast with the almost static population of Clayworth. This view is supported by a comparison of the average numbers of christenings and burials over the ten year periods – Beeston 10.4 and 8.5 (i.e. more christenings than burials); Clayworth 16.0 and 17.4 (burials more than christenings).

Bearing in mind the rates of appearance and disappearance of surnames in Beeston mentioned above, the previous family reconstitution records have been reassessed. These now suggest about 100 as a more likely figure for the number of families or households just before the plague, sharing 76 surnames and comprising about 386 individuals. This last number includes children who may have left home to become servants or apprentices elsewhere, but it is assumed that they are compensated by a similar number moving into Beeston but remaining unrecorded.

It is instructive to compare this reassessment with the estimate of population derived from the numbers of continuing surnames. Adding a nominal 20-30 per cent to the 68.0 surnames to obtain an estimate of the number of households yields the range 82-8. However, adding the number of possibly continuing names, similarly inflated, gives 88-95, in better agreement with the 100 obtained from the family reconstitution. When the range 88-95 households is multiplied by the range of factors 4.3-4.5 individuals per household, a population 378-428 is obtained. Although this is derived from a slightly low range of household numbers it spans the 386 estimated from the family reconstitution. Both these estimates, of the order of 400, are almost certainly an improvement on the estimate of 560 previously reported, bearing in mind the expected similarity to the population of Clayworth, mentioned above.

A reassessment of the distribution of the 141 plague burials now suggests that 125 of these shared forty-four family surnames and that they probably came from about 63 households. (For the remaining 16 people, the plague burial was the only record of that surname in the register.) Only in the case of four surnames were all those likely to have been alive just before the plague (totalling six people) wiped out in the crisis. However, for a further 16 surnames, representing about 42 survivors from 20 households, there were no further parish register entries after the plague. These survivors probably moved away from the parish, possibly to join relatives in nearby parishes. If so, this would leave a population of about 220 in Beeston. The family reconstitution suggests that, by the time of the Archdeacon’s visitation in 1603, the number with family surnames had risen to about 320, of whom about 220 would be aged 16 or over. This agrees well with the number of communicants, 241, recorded at the visitation, since it does not include people for whom there was only a single parish register entry or no entry at all. Wood used an average factor 1.6 in converting this number of communicants into an estimated population of 386, but the 320 quoted above is only 1.45 times the 220 thought
to be of an age to take communion. The plague may have so affected the age distribution that this lower factor is appropriate for Beeston at that time. If it is applied to the reported number of communicants, a population of 350 is obtained, which is 30 more than the estimate of those with family names – a reasonable increase.

These figures may be compared with estimates based on the numbers of continuing surnames in 1603. There were 63, with a further 6 possibly continuing. The corresponding numbers of households, obtained by multiplying by the range 1.2-1.3, would be 76-82 or, including those possibly continuing, 83-90. Then, assuming 4.3-4.5 people per household, the total population would be 327-363, or 357-405 if the number of possibly continuing names is included. The first of these ranges agrees well with the lower estimate obtained by applying the factor 1.45 to the number of communicants in 1603, whereas the second range agrees with Wood’s estimate. Bearing in mind the suggestion made above, that the family size may have been lower than average in Beeston at this time as a consequence of the plague, it is to be expected that an estimate based on average household sizes would be rather high.

Conclusion

The use of family reconstitution and ‘natural increase’ methods in estimating pre-census populations and population changes can only give acceptable results if account is taken of migration into and out of the community under study. Although definite information concerning such movements is usually not available, rough approximations may be obtained by studying the rates of appearance and disappearance of surnames recorded in the parish register. Moreover, the numbers of surnames continuing from year to year can provide a rough estimate of the resident population.

In making such analyses, it is best to discount surnames with only one parish register entry in the period of one generation (about 25 years), since it is unlikely that they represent resident families. Conversion of numbers of surnames into numbers of individuals may be carried out using average factors derived by Laslett in a study of 100 English communities within the period 1574 and 1821, as modified by Arkell and Wall if the earlier part of this period is studied. These suggest an average household size of 4.3-4.5 persons, of whom 3.4-3.7 were closely related to the head of the household, the rest being servants, lodgers, etc. Since migrating households were likely to be below average size, it is proposed that the range 3.4-3.7 is more appropriate when estimating the numbers of migrating individuals. Also, at the point of migration, it is probably safe to assume that there is only one household per surname. For estimating continuing populations, however, an average range of 1.2-1.3 households per surname is proposed for rural communities, and the factors 4.3-4.5 should then be applied to obtain an estimated range for the total population. (The 3.4-3.7 range would give an idea of the number of individuals sharing family surnames.)

It has been shown that application of these factors gives a good approximation to the population of Clayworth in the period 1676-88, and to the average rates
of migration between these dates. However, the agreement is slightly artificial since the 1.2-1.3 factor is partly based on Clayworth data. Further tests of the method are needed to confirm its validity. Applying the same factors to Beeston, just before the onset of a plague in 1593, suggests a revised total population of about 400-25. The 141 burials during and shortly after the plague, and migration away from Beeston at this time, may have reduced the population to about 220. Between then and an Archdeacon’s visitation in 1603 when 241 communicants were recorded, the population according to family reconstitution may have risen to about 320 sharing family surnames, plus perhaps 30 others. Of these 320, it is estimated that about 220 would be of an age to take communion if this is taken to be 16 or over. A further estimate, based on the 63 continuing surnames and 6 possibly continuing at that time, gives 327-405 as the population. A compromise number 360 is therefore suggested, with a likely error in each direction of about 40.

Comparing these estimates for Beeston with those reported earlier it may be seen that the greatest difference occurs in the reduction of the suggested population just before the plague from about 560 to 400. The continuing population, after the ravages of the plague and associated movement away from Beeston, is not much changed, from about 240 to 220. Similarly, the previously expressed view, that the population had probably reached 400 again by the end of 1602, is now only slightly modified, to about 360. In fact, the main differences arise from the timing of the estimated outward migration, from being a substantial exodus during or just after the plague, to being a continuous movement, merely intensified during the plague period.

NOTES

11. Households are generally taken to include both the family members and the servants and lodgers (including journeymen and apprentices) living with the family. Such households would occasionally move from one place to another as a complete unit. In addition, servants would
move more frequently as individuals. However, with reference to the turnover of persons in Clayworth and Cogenhoe, Laslett states, ‘Servants can all be treated as individuals in Clayworth, but in Cogenhoe some servants have to be treated as members of migrating households’. Laslett, ‘Clayworth and Cogenhoe’, 98.

12. The figure 91 excludes 5 small ‘inmate’ households that contained 9 people in ‘comon-Houses on Aims’. For comparison with total population numbers, the figure should therefore be 96.


15. Holderness, ‘Personal mobility’.


22. Occurrences of surnames in parish registers have already been used in connection with migration studies, for example, see D. Souden and G. Lasker, ‘Biological inter-relationships between parishes in East Kent: An analysis of Marriage Duty Act returns for 1705’, Local Population Studies 21 (1978), 30-9, where the degree of linkage between parishes is calculated from the number of occurrences of the same surnames in pairs of parishes; also E.F. Buckatzsch, ‘The consistency of local populations and migration in England before 1800’, Population Studies 5 (1951-2), 62-9, in which the numbers of surviving names are used to calculate proportions migrating away from parishes at different periods; and R. Watson ‘A study of surname distribution in a group of Cambridgeshire parishes, 1538-1840’, Local Population Studies 15 (1975), 23-32, who studies both these aspects for the commonest surnames in eight Cambridgeshire parishes, for three periods of 100 years.


24. Since servants usually totalled less than 20 per cent of the community, any error involved in making this assumption can only cause a small error in the estimate of the total population.

25. Laslett, ‘Mean household size’, 83.

26. The occasional registration of baptisms in more than one parish would cause slight over-estimates of the numbers of migrating and continuing names.

27. Laslett, ‘Mean household size’, 83.


30. P. Laslett, ‘Clayworth and Cogenhoe’.

31. This was expedited by Mrs Elizabeth Perkins’ provision of transcriptions for some of the years. This assistance is gratefully acknowledged.


33. Wallwork, ‘The role of the computer’.

34. The figure 100 is an estimate of the number of people of the right age and family status likely to be heads of family groupings. It is not known, of course, whether all of these did, in fact, head separate households.

35. S.J. Wright, in her article ‘Confirmation, catechism, and communion: the role of the young in the post-Reformation Church’ (in S.J. Wright (ed.), Parish, Church and people, local studies in lay religion 1350-1750, (London, 1988), 203-27) points out that, although the age sixteen is generally adopted by historians when converting numbers of communicants into estimates of population, the age could well have been as low as fourteen, especially in earlier periods. However, because of the effects of the 1593 plague on the calculated demographic structure of Beeston in 1603, the estimated number of communicable age only rises to 225 if fourteen is taken as the minimum age.


37. The family reconstitution showed an abnormally small proportion of children aged 10 to 14 in 1603.
THE BISHOPS’ CENSUS OF 1563:
A RE-EXAMINATION OF ITS RELIABILITY

Nigel Goose

Dr Goose gained his PhD from Cambridge, undertaking a comparative study of the economic and social development of Cambridge, Colchester and Reading. He currently lectures in history at the University of Hertfordshire.

Introduction

The ecclesiastical census of 1563, the Bishops’ Census, has long been known to local historians as a potentially valuable source of information on population size for particular communities, has been used as a basis for estimates of urban populations and, more recently, to suggest a national population figure for this date.¹ Like all early modern sources used for this purpose, which invariably require manipulation to allow for categories of the population excluded either intentionally or accidentally, it is far from ideal, and certainly was not prepared with the interests of the twentieth century demographer in mind. That said, it appears to be more straightforward than most. Unlike the Exchequer lay subsidies of 1524-5 or the Compton Census of 1676, there is no disagreement or confusion over the categories of persons included: they clearly relate to the number of families within each parish and dependent chapelry.² If these lists were accurately compiled, therefore, one has simply to employ an appropriate multiplier which reflects mean family (or household) size in 1563 to produce an approximate population estimate. To derive regional or national estimates, the data available for 12 dioceses must be further adjusted to allow for missing parishes and the remaining 14 dioceses in England and Wales. Just such a procedure was used by Palliser and Jones to produce national population estimates of 2.6 millions for England and 0.2 millions for Wales.³

The data for Cambridge

In 1985 I published a brief note in LPS indicating that urban evidence, from Cambridge, throws some doubt on the accuracy of these lists.⁴ Although the Cambridge return claims to be ‘The true certificate made by the Reverend father in god Richard Bishop of Ely of all and singular the households and the whole number thereof...’,⁵ there is evidence that the numbers given represent an undercount. Doubt was initially shed by the existence of an estimate of the town’s population published in 1587 by the Vice-Chancellor of the University giving a total of 4,990. Application of a mean household size of 4.5 to the number of households included in the 1563 returns for the town’s 14 parishes produced a total of just 2,400, and it was judged to be unlikely that the town’s population would have doubled in size in just 24 years.

The validity of the 1563 returns for Cambridge was tested by comparison with the extant parish registers available for Little St Mary, Great St Mary, St
Benedict and St Edward. The decadal average of baptisms for these parishes, unadjusted for any possible distortion caused by delay between birth and baptism, was compared with the population totals derived from the census. This allowed the calculation of baptism rates, which were treated as if they were crude birth rates, and these were then examined for their plausibility. Birth rates lying within the range 28-40 per 1,000 are generally regarded as plausible in the pre-industrial context, and it was felt that as decadal averages of baptisms had been taken, as there was no internal evidence from the registers that there were any special conditions to be considered and as baptismal figures are likely to understate the number of births rather than to exaggerate them, one might expect the Cambridge figures to fall within, or very near to, this range. They did not, or more precisely they did not for two of the four parishes. The crude baptism rate stood at 39 per thousand for St Benedict and 40 for Little St Mary, but for Great St Mary it stood at 47 per thousand and for St Edward at 65. These figures are implausibly high, indicating that in these instances the Bishops' Census understates the number of households.

Some researchers, perhaps prematurely, appear to have accepted that the Cambridge results might be applicable more generally. But the scepticism beginning to surround the Bishops' Census has not been universally accepted, and a concerted attempt to refute the Cambridge evidence was recently made in LPS by Alan Dyer. Dyer's piece is typically inventive and searching, containing a particularly valuable analysis of the frequency of numbers of households listed in parishes of different sizes and in the various dioceses covered by the census. His detailed treatment of my Cambridge evidence, however, invites response.

In order to render the Cambridge figures, and hence the census generally, more credible, Dyer adopts a number of strategies. The first of these is to recalculate the Cambridge figures on the assumption that the mean household size in 1563 was 5.1. There is little hard evidence produced to support the adoption of this figure, a good deal of speculative discussion about the hypothetical impact of the demographic crisis of 1556-61 on household size, and an even larger wedge of indirect evidence produced by comparing communicant returns from 1548, 1551 and 1557 with the 1563 census, which requires, inter alia, estimates to be made of population trends between these dates in the three counties concerned. Readers will no doubt want to judge for themselves how compelling they find this evidence, based as it is on a further raft of assumptions, and one must in particular look forward to the completion of Dr Dyer's own detailed analysis of the 1557-60 mortality crisis. But whether or not one reserves judgement on the argument in general, there is nothing here that relates specifically to an urban community in 1563. Whatever the mean household size may have been in 1563 or at any other point in the pre-industrial period, there is no doubting the fact that it varied considerably between different communities, and even varied considerably within communities, a point that Dyer himself rehearses towards the end of his article.

The household multiplier of 4.5 applied to the Cambridge returns was neither chosen arbitrarily nor to mirror a figure conventionally employed: it was chosen.
as a figure markedly higher than the 4.13 discovered for a different sample of five Cambridge parishes in the 1620s when in-migration, poverty and plague had served to reduce the mean size of households. Of course it is an estimate, but it is an informed one. Furthermore, the possibility that mean household size in the relatively central parishes of Great St Mary and St Edward was higher still was allowed in my earlier note, where it was calculated that a MHS of 5.0 produced baptism rates of 43 and 59 respectively, both still outside of the likely range.

Further evidence to support any choice of an appropriate MHS should surely be sought from a town of a similar size and status. Canterbury is just such a town, and an enumeration for the very year 1563 indicates a MHS of just 3.4. This is, of course, based upon four suburban parishes, which tended generally to exhibit lower mean household sizes. But occupational analysis of 109 male householders in Canterbury reveals that the great majority of trades represented lived in small households, and that the mean figure was not simply the product of over-representation in this sample of poor labourers. The Coventry enumeration of 1523, biased in favour of the wealthier areas of the town, reveals a MHS of 3.8, whilst after adjusting the figures to allow for the economic problems the town was experiencing the figure rises to just 4.1. There is little here to support the adoption of a high urban MHS, and a figure of 4.5 for Cambridge remains more plausible than 5.1.

The second strategy adopted by Dyer to invalidate the Cambridge evidence is remarkable for its simplicity: he adjusts upward the number of families in Great St Mary from 80 to 89. This procedure, alongside the adoption of a higher MHS of 5.1, reduces the crude baptism rate from an unlikely 47 to an acceptable 37. In entering 80 families for Great St Mary, we are told, the incumbent probably meant ‘closer to eighty than sixty or one hundred’. He may well have done, although we have no way of knowing this, and might prefer to assume that he meant either 80 itself or approximately 80. The choice of 89 appears entirely arbitrary, even if the round four score is somewhat suspect. One might just as well adopt the figure of 71, which would render the data even more problematical. Perhaps more reasonably, if adjustments must be made to remove the offending round number, 79 is most likely, for as Dyer later argues, in the more accurately assessed dioceses (including Ely) ‘many of the suspect even numbers, even some of those over fifty, have probably only been rounded up by one numeral, which is too small a distortion to bother with’.

All such hypothetical arguments are anyway rather academic, for in ‘saving’ the accuracy of the census in this way Dyer has effected the most remarkable sleight of hand. Faced with independent evidence that questions the accuracy of the census, he has taken one of the offending figures, adjusted it upwards by 11.25%, to conclude ‘there is no good reason to suppose that the 1563 returns under-record population levels in any way’. What he has in fact done is to accept that, for Cambridge at least, the census clearly does under-enumerate households, for if it did not there would be absolutely no need for upward adjustment of the Great St Mary total to produce credible crude baptism rates.
Faced with the intractable problem of the parish of St Edward, where the figure of 34 households is not at all suspect, Dyer suggests that the inflated crude baptism rate may be the product of incomplete baptismal records. But this is to misunderstand the problem: an even higher decadal average number of baptisms would produce an even higher and still less credible baptism rate. Dyer’s other solution is to assume that in this parish the incumbent was mistaken, or the figure has been subject to scribal error. This is, of course, entirely possible, just as it is for all other figures given in the census, but we have absolutely no way of knowing without recourse to independent evidence. Again it is clear that we need to test the accuracy of the census on a wider basis.

Dyer’s final strategy is to suggest that the required growth rate between 1563 and 1587, reduced to approximately 92 per annum if a higher MHS is used, may not be so unlikely, for ‘perhaps a town of this sort was capable of such a spurt at this date’. But if my research, or Mary Sirault’s detailed work on Elizabethan Cambridge, had indicated that a rate of growth of this magnitude was plausible, then no suspicion would have been cast on the figures in the first instance. The evidence of parish registers, topography and contemporary comment and concern all point to the later sixteenth and earlier seventeenth centuries as the key period of growth, and hence such rapid growth between 1563 and 1587 is highly unlikely.

The Cambridge data indicate clearly that for this small sample of urban parishes the figures given in the Bishops’ Census represent an undercount of the number of households and will thus produce an underestimate of population unless allowance is made for this shortfall. Whether this was a peculiarly urban phenomenon, one that was more widespread or merely a localised quirk remains to be seen. Dyer’s ingenious work on the frequency distribution of parochial totals is an important first step towards answering this question, and is particularly valuable for drawing our attention to those dioceses that are more likely than others to give unreliable returns.

**The Hertfordshire parish register evidence**

The main purpose of my note in *LPS* was not necessarily to cast doubt upon the reliability of the census but to encourage local historians to test it against other evidence, particularly parish registers. As a further, more substantial, contribution to that process, the returns for Hertfordshire in 1563 have been compared with all extant parish registers. The census covers 73 parishes, and registers survive for a comparable date for 40 of these. All 40 were examined, and 9 rejected because of incomplete coverage or unreliability. Baptisms were counted for the remaining 31 and an annual average figure established. Generally this pertained to the years 1560-1569, although, as an attempt was made to ensure that the average was based upon at least seven years, it was occasionally necessary to stray into the early 1570s. A minimum of five years was used as the basis for annual average baptisms, though it proved necessary to drop below seven years only twice. Alternative procedures for calculating the average were tried for all parishes, such as the employment of a centred average upon the year 1563 where possible. In the vast majority of cases only a
Table 1  Shortfall of odd numbers in Hertfordshire census returns 1563

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>No. Even</th>
<th>No. Odd</th>
<th>% Odd Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-49</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-69</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-99</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

marginal difference, if any, resulted, and there was no discernible tendency for
different procedures to bias the results in any particular direction.

Further preliminary analysis drew upon Dyer's methodology to test for
excessive rounding of the returns and for any apparent shortfall in odd
numbers. Although his analysis revealed that Huntingdonshire and
Hertfordshire parishes in Lincoln Diocese combined produce relatively low
levels of 'suspect' figures at only 12.3 per cent, the Hertfordshire data were
tested independently to ensure that they were not peculiarly flawed. An
identical methodology was employed, analysing all numerals between 17 and
105 for the 53 parishes that fell within this range, and calculating the disparity
between the expected number of tens, dozens and scores if numerals had been
evenly distributed and the actual number found. For Hertfordshire six tens
were found where 2.4 would be expected, eight dozens instead of 3.7 and four
scores rather than the expected 3.0. The general tendency to round to the score
was not evident in Hertfordshire, but both tens and dozens were over-
represented, producing a proportion 'suspect' of 16.8 per cent. This figure lies
within a range that would classify the county as reasonably reliable rather than
particularly suspicious.

The results of testing for a shortfall of odd numbers for the 57 parishes which
lie within the range 10-99 are shown in Table 1. Again Dyer's procedure is
employed, the figure for percentage of odd numbers missing representing the
shortfall assuming an even distribution of odd and even. For the census in
general Dyer found a greater shortfall of odd numbers than would have been
produced by the tendency to favour ten, twelve or twenty. This was not
evident in Hertfordshire, which gives a relatively low overall excess of odd
numerals in comparison to the degree by which figures subject to rounding are
over-represented. There was some tendency for the shortfall of odd numbers to
be more marked for larger parishes, though perhaps surprisingly this was not
apparent for the largest parishes in the sample. Most importantly, there is no
indication of an excessive tendency to favour even over odd numbers, the
overall figure of a 14.9 per cent deficit of odd numerals standing towards the
bottom of the identified range. The Hertfordshire returns should be expected
to be amongst the more reliable of those extant, and can certainly not be
characterised as unduly suspect.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>No. of Families 1563</th>
<th>Pop. MHS 1563</th>
<th>Pop. MHS 1563</th>
<th>Pop. MHS 5.1</th>
<th>Annual Average Baps. (MHS 4.5)</th>
<th>CBR (MHS 4.5)</th>
<th>CBR (MHS 4.75)</th>
<th>CBR (MHS 5.1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aldbury</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldenhall</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardeley</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspenden</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aston</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldock*</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengeo</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benington</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkhamsted St Peter*</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bramfield</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottered</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flamstead</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graveley &amp; Chesfield</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Gaddesden</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Wymondley</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harpenden</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemel Hempstead*</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertford All Saints*</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertford St Andrew*</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hitchin*</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>1103</td>
<td>1164</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelshall</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Langley</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Walden</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevenage*</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tewin</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thérfield</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tring*</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkern</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watton at Stone</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weston</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willian</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2098</td>
<td>9441</td>
<td>9966</td>
<td>10700</td>
<td>483.6</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Market Towns           | 1067                 | 4802          | 5068          | 5442         | 232.1                         | 48            | 46            | 43            |
| Small Parishes         | 458                  | 2061          | 2176          | 2336         | 118.6                         | 58            | 55            | 51            |
| Medium Parishes        | 636                  | 2862          | 3021          | 3244         | 138.8                         | 48            | 46            | 43            |
| Large Parishes         | 1004                 | 4518          | 4769          | 5120         | 226.2                         | 50            | 47            | 44            |
| Rounded Numbers        | 418                  | 1881          | 1986          | 2132         | 109.2                         | 58            | 55            | 51            |
| Unrounded Numbers      | 1680                 | 7560          | 7980          | 8568         | 374.4                         | 50            | 47            | 44            |

Notes:  
Market Towns = those marked with an asterisk (*)  
Small Parishes = those with less than 50 families (n=14)  
Medium Parishes = those with from 50 to 99 families (n=10)  
Large Parishes = those with 100 or more families (n=7)  
Rounded Numbers = those for which the number of families ends in 0 or 5 (n=9)  
Unrounded Numbers = the converse of Rounded Numbers, above (n=22)
Having established the relative credibility of the Hertfordshire returns, it remains to test them against the parish register data. The procedure employed is the same as in my original LPS note: a population total is calculated from the census by adopting a mean household size as a multiplier, and a crude baptism rate established by comparing this figure with the annual average number of baptisms established from the parish registers. Three different calculations were made, assuming mean household sizes of 4.5, 4.75 and 5.1, and separate breakdowns provided for market towns, by size of parish, and according to whether the figure given was a rounded number (a multiple of ten, twelve or twenty) or not. The results are presented in Table 2.

Wrigley and Schofield's national crude birth rate for the relevant quinquennium, 1561-5, stood at 34.7 per thousand, whilst Dyer's recalculation of a rate for the decade as a whole gives a figure of 36.7. Whichever figure is regarded as appropriate for the purpose of comparison, the overall estimated crude baptism rate for these 31 parishes, using the census as a guide to total population, is high. Even if the generous household multiplier of 5.1 is used the resultant crude rate is 45 per thousand, 8-10 points or 23-30 per cent above the national figure produced by back projection. Adoption of a compromise MHS of 4.75, the most commonly employed average derived from Laslett's seminal work, gives a figure of 49 per thousand, 12-16 points or 34-41 per cent above the national rate. It is most unlikely that such a high baptism rate prevailed across an entire English county, and equally unlikely that Hertfordshire should exhibit a rate so discrepant from the national average. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that for Hertfordshire the Bishops' Census is of little value as a basis for the calculation of a regional population total.

Little comfort is given by the various breakdowns of the data in Table 2. There is no indication that the returns for towns are particularly unreliable and therefore distorting the overall total. Hertfordshire was not a particularly urbanised county, containing no substantial towns at all, but the crude baptism rates derived from market towns are slightly more acceptable than the county average rather than less, if still implausibly high. Both large and medium sized parishes, somewhat surprisingly, exhibit lower figures than the small parishes, 46 and 47 per thousand respectively for medium and large parishes if a multiplier of 4.75 is used, compared to 55 per thousand for the 14 small parishes. This contradicts Dyer's general conclusion that the greatest inaccuracy lies in the middle range, whilst small parishes produce better results. A clear difference is apparent between parishes with rounded numbers in 1563 and those that are not rounded, a multiplier of 4.75 producing crude baptism rates of 55 per thousand and 47 respectively. But whilst this supports the common sense proposition that rounded figures are generally more likely to be in error than ones that are not, even parishes with unrounded numbers produce implausibly high baptism rates. Nor can we 'assume that all odd numbers are very likely to be correct'. Aldbury, Ardeley, Aston, Baldock, Hertford All Saints and Therfield, all exhibiting unrounded, odd numbers, produce crude baptism rates above the average for the sample as a whole, in Aldbury and Aston above 60 per thousand even on the most optimistic assumptions about mean household size.
Table 3  Number of Hertfordshire Parishes in each Crude Baptism Range in 1563

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt;40</th>
<th>40-4</th>
<th>45-9</th>
<th>50-9</th>
<th>60+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MHS 4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MHS 4.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MHS 5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 presents the data in a different way, indicating more clearly exactly how many parishes provide credible data on the basis of different assumptions about mean household size. Whichever MHS is employed, the results are not encouraging. Using the compromise figure of 4.75, only four parishes out of 31 (13 per cent) exhibit a crude baptism rate that falls within the plausible range of 28-40 per thousand, and of these the parish of Flamstead only just qualifies at the bottom end of the range, possibly reflecting the need to rely upon an unrepresentative run of years for this parish. Extending the realms of plausibility to below 45 per thousand, still only seven (23 per cent) fall into this category. As many as 24 parishes (77 per cent) produce crude baptism rates of 45 per thousand or above when annual average baptisms are compared with population totals derived from the census, and as many as 15 (48 per cent) give a figure of 50 per thousand or over. Using the generous household multiplier of 5.1 the results are a little more encouraging, but not much. Still only six parishes (19 per cent) produce baptism rates that are quite clearly plausible, whilst as many as 18 (58 per cent) produce rates of 45 per thousand or above, a level which must cast serious doubt upon the reliability of the census data.

The fact that there is no reason to believe that the Hertfordshire returns are particularly defective must be re-emphasised. The parish registers employed are of good quality, and all clearly suspect ones were rejected, though as noted above there is room for doubt in the case of Flamstead. But if this register, or indeed any others, were defective, then this would only serve to produce unrealistically low crude baptism rates, and give spurious credibility to the population totals that can be calculated from the 1563 returns. Given that baptism rates below 40 per thousand can be derived from so few, and given that there is no reason to suppose that over-registration might have occurred, the possibility of under-registration only serves to reinforce the argument offered here. Furthermore, no allowance has been made for a well attested
cause of under-registration, the delay between birth and baptism in the light of prevailing rates of infant mortality, which has led to the suggestion that the number of baptisms registered for the half century 1550-99 should be increased by 2 per cent. 31 Had the raw data used here been adjusted in this way, the crude rates produced by employment of the Bishops' Census would have moved even further in the direction of general implausibility. Any residual under-registration would have the same effect.

Conclusions

There are clearly many observations in Alan Dyer's valuable article with which one can only agree. The Bishops' Census remains a potentially useful source of demographic information for a period that deserves far closer attention than it has hitherto received. Analysis of the numerical distributions contained in the returns for the various dioceses and counties can provide an approximate insight into their relative accuracy. It is most important that such sources are tested for internal coherence at the local level, as well as against external evidence wherever possible. Even then, the conversion of these returns to accurate population totals will never be easy due to the fact that MHS can vary considerably between communities and across time, even if the likely range is more narrow than was once believed. The Bishops' Census is indeed a curate's egg, and it is difficult to discover which parts are good and which are bad.

In all of these respects there is agreement over the census, but there is discord too. First, the Cambridge evidence which cast doubt upon the accuracy of the returns for this town cannot be dismissed through arbitrary adjustment of the figures, circular reasoning, the assumption of scribal error or the introduction of an unlikely household multiplier without reference to particularity of place and established demographic history.

Second, it is more difficult to establish the accuracy (as opposed to the probable relative accuracy) of the census for various localities than Dyer suggests. The Hertfordshire figures, like those for Cambridge, indicate that rounding was probably not generally confined to an increase of one numeral, even in the more accurately assessed dioceses, and neither is it possible to assume that odd numbers are generally correct. 32 Nor do small parishes necessarily produce more acceptable figures than large ones. This serves to underline the crucial importance of external testing of the census against other sources.

Third, if the Bishops' Census is indeed 'good in parts', then we need to explain carefully what we mean by 'good', as well as to quantify the likely proportion of the 'parts' to which this judgement applies. If we mean by 'good' a generally reliable basis for the calculation of population size, then the Hertfordshire evidence suggests that the proportion of parishes for which this holds true is low, probably as low as one-fifth or one-sixth. If we mean that it provides the basis for a very rough and ready approximation of population size, and the likely relative differences between parishes, then it could perhaps be applied to one-half of the parishes included within a county or diocese for which the returns appear to have been generally conscientiously prepared. It is very difficult to defend the census against the accusation of quite general
unreliability, and a recent attempt to rescue it for the Diocese of Canterbury looks rather unconvincing in view of Dyer's discovery that Canterbury produced the highest level of suspect figures in the entire country at 65 per cent, and the highest shortfall of odd numbers at 76 per cent.\textsuperscript{33}

Finally there are some wider implications. First, the 1563 census is most unlikely to provide a solid foundation for the calculation of national population figures. Palliser and Jones' calculation, employing a generous household multiplier of 5.05, gives a total for England of just 2.6 millions, well below the Wrigley and Schofield figure of almost 3 million for 1561.\textsuperscript{34} Furthermore, recent reworkings of the Cambridge Group data appear to indicate the need for a slight upward revision of the figures initially suggested to perhaps 3.2 millions.\textsuperscript{35} Despite the generous household multiplier, the census still produces a shortfall of 19 per cent, a figure that would increase to over 23 per cent if the more generally accepted multiplier of 4.75 were used. These percentages are remarkably close to those that can be derived for Hertfordshire. In order to achieve the baptism rate of \textit{circa} 36 per thousand that back projection suggests, a MHS of 5.1 would imply a shortfall of 20 per cent in the totals calculated from the 1563 returns for the 31 Hertfordshire parishes, whilst a mean of 4.75 would indicate a shortfall of 26 per cent.

Second, the census is clearly not a firm basis for the calculation of population trends between the Exchequer lay subsidies of 1524-5 and 1563. Side-stepping the fact that the categories of person included in these two sets of documentation differ, both urban and rural evidence indicates a substantial undercount in 1563, besides the need for extreme scepticism where figures are clearly rounded. In particular, the employment of these data as evidence for general urban demographic decline across the second and third quarters of the sixteenth century cannot be endorsed.\textsuperscript{36}

Third, and finally, the evidence suggests the need for general scepticism with regard to early modern ecclesiastical censuses, whether they be those of 1563, 1603 or the Compton Census of 1676. Although it is clearly necessary to await the results of further independent tests before reaching a definitive conclusion, the burden of proof with regard to the 1563 returns must now rest with those who would wish to revive its credibility.
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AN ORSETT CENSUS ENUMERATOR

Barbara Woollings

Barbara Woollings is a retired nurse who has recently completed the Open University Course DA301 Family and Community and the Certificate Course in Local History Studies at the University of Essex.

Introduction

Given the wide use of Victorian census enumerators’ books (CEBs), it is surprising that so little is known about the background and ability of the enumerators who compiled them. For the most part they are anonymous persons with difficult handwriting and strange spelling. One such enumerator was the current author’s grandfather, William Woollings of Orsett, Essex, who compiled the censuses of 1851, 1861 and 1871 for one of the enumeration districts in the parish in which he lived. This article examines his qualifications for the task of census enumerator and attempts to find if his knowledge of and social standing in the local community affected the way in which he completed the census returns. Secondly, by comparing the three censuses that he compiled an overall assessment is made of the accuracy of his returns in the light of the difficulties that he experienced, and the improvements that were made over time.

William Woollings’s Personal Background

William was born in Orsett in 1819 and was baptised in the parish church of St Giles and All Saints, where he would later become churchwarden. His parents, James and Jane Woollings, lived in the mill house by the smock mill which James owned. James also owned some farmland and rented a further portion from the Baker family, the major landowners of the parish.¹ As the eldest living son, William was later to inherit all this from his father.²

In his adult life William’s business and farming career appear to have prospered. By 1861 he was, according to the census, employing seven men, two millers, two boys and three women. As well as being a farmer and miller, he also acted as agent for The British Empire Mutual Life Assurance.³ In politics he voted in 1857 and 1859 for Richard Baker, the liberal candidate who also happened to be principal landowner of Orsett, to whom he was also tenant. He carried out a full and active life, being a Trustee for two local charities, a Manager of the National School, a Guardian of the Orsett Union for thirty years and a churchwarden for twenty five.⁴ In the last years of his life he was an ardent campaigner for the provision of a fever hospital, following an outbreak of smallpox. On this occasion his enthusiasm must have got the better of good judgement, as a large tent was ordered from Denmark which, not surprisingly, proved useless as a preventative measure. His obituary in The Essex Times described him as an ‘affectionate husband and father, an upright, shrewd, intelligent and well-read man. A good master to all his servants and labourers’.⁵
William Woollings as enumerator

William appears to have had all the requirements listed for the selection of a census enumerator. In 1851 the instruction given to Registrars stated that enumerators should be ‘persons of intelligence and activity, who could read and write well, with some knowledge of arithmetic, be between 18 and 65 years, temperate, orderly and respectable, likely to conduct themselves with strict propriety and deserve the good will of his district’. It is impossible to tell if William volunteered his services as enumerator or if he was asked, but it seems possible that he knew both the Registrar for Orsett Registration District in 1851, Dr Corbet, and the Superintendent Registrar, in 1861 and 1871, George Biddell, as he lived close to the former while the latter was the agent for the Orsett Estate. In many respects William appears to have been typical of the
picture of the rural enumerator painted by Arkell: in the 91 enumeration districts examined for Cornwall in 1851, 42 per cent were like William, farmers or sons of farmers, and two thirds, also like William, lived in the districts for which they were responsible. Likewise, three quarters were married and heads of their own households, and 53 per cent aged between 30 and 39.\textsuperscript{7}

Orsett was described in 1848 as a 'large and pleasant village comprising 1390 population and 4136 acres of land'.\textsuperscript{8} It was the largest of a group of agricultural parishes located in central south Essex, some five miles north of Tilbury on the River Thames. It was the administrative centre for the area with the Union House for eighteen parishes being sited there. William Woollings’s enumeration district was described as that part of the parish lying to the south of the main road, running east west from Horndon on the Hill to Stifford.

When first appointed in 1851 William was no doubt supplied with a set of household schedules, an enumeration book, a memorandum book and a list of instructions by the Registrar, as required.\textsuperscript{9} Enumerators were also required to spend time familiarising themselves with their enumeration district.\textsuperscript{10} This would not have bothered William as he already knew the area first hand. However, he probably did share the same experience noted by an enumerator for the 1891 census in persuading each householder to accept and fill in a schedule. In a previous issue of LPS it was reported that one census enumerator in 1891 found that deaths had occurred in his enumeration district between handing out the schedules and collecting them again.\textsuperscript{11} There is no evidence that this occurred in Orsett as there were no burials over the census periods, but in 1851 schedule number 53 was given by William to a traveller in 'a portable house' which had moved on before the collection date of 31 March.

His local standing would also have placed William in good stead in relation to another problem encountered by enumerators: that of suspicion of officialdom.\textsuperscript{12} Most of the population of Orsett would have known their enumerator both by sight and by reputation. Since he was a parish official they may have needed considerable reassurance that the completion of the forms would not result in increased payments or extra duties, but clearly one visit must have been easier for him than others; as a Guardian of the Union House in the district, there at least he should have had prompt attention from the master. In some respects William’s detailed knowledge of the enumeration district may have proved critical given that in terms of size, increasing from 976 in 1851 to 1083 in 1871 (Table 1), his enumeration districts were larger than the average.\textsuperscript{13}

The accuracy of Woollings’s returns

Despite his work as agent for the British Empire Mutual Life Assurance, arithmetic seemed to prove difficult for William. There are numerous crossings out in the schedule accumulation page, apparently by his own pen, and he failed to add up the number of houses correctly. It is difficult to check the accuracy of items of information pertaining to individuals, such as rank and profession, but he does seem to have used the official terminology yet does not always distinguish, for example, between baker and master baker. Not surprisingly the 1851 census appears to have proved the most difficult for
Table 1 Numbers of schedules and size of population in Orsett (southside enumeration district), 1851-1871.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schedules</td>
<td>166+2</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhabited houses</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninhabited houses</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>1083</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

William. He forgot to give a schedule number to his own household and that of the Registrar, although they are included. He also re-wrote four schedules at the top of one page and then crossed them out when he found that he had included them several pages earlier. There was a definite improvement in later censuses, and he appears to have used a better pen as his writing is easier to read, although still blotchy. Despite this improvement, he failed in 1871 to record the number of schedules that were completed on behalf of the householders unable to do so, the first time enumerators were asked to provide this information.¹⁴

Matching information across censuses it is possible to determine a number of other enumeration errors due to discrepancies in the recording over time. For example, James Wade apparently aged only three years between two censuses. Equally, both Samuel Sanders a shopkeeper and John Dalliday an agricultural labourer recorded their ages as 42 in 1861 and 62 years in 1871.¹⁵ As Drake states ‘the inability to recall one’s precise age was common throughout the nineteenth century’.¹⁶ The same could also be argued about the consistency of recalling their place of birth. In one census Eliza Sanders was born in London and in the next in Orsett, while Eliza Dalladay thought she was born in Orsett for the 1861 census and in Grays for the following. Yet certain errors must have been those of the enumerator. Take, for example, schedule 25 in 1871. Sarah Major was recorded as the head of the household and married in the condition column, but as widow under rank and profession. As her husband Thomas was buried on 19 October 1867, she clearly was a widow. Another example of enumerator error can be seen in 1861. It seems unlikely that Jonathan Ward an agricultural labourer and his wife Eliza would have two daughters aged fifteen and three both called Susan. The younger one was certainly baptised Louisa on 30 August 1857.

Spelling in the last century was for many very flexible, and as such it is hard to state clearly that the enumerator was at fault over what today are seen as mispellings. As an Essex man himself, he should perhaps have known that Leer Britton should have been Layer Breton in Essex. Yet, although a local man, he probably can not have been expected to have known the precise spelling of all the surnames in the district, especially given the mobility of the rural populations in the nineteenth century. Mispronunciation and poor literacy were
both common. As a result we can see that a certain brickmaker was recorded as Henry Hayward in 1861 and Haywood ten years later. Another example is Knott an agricultural labourer in 1861, who appeared as Robert Knopp in the 1871 census and was registered as Robert Knock at the time of his death in 1874. Examples can also be found where information was clearly withheld. Take the case of Samuel Newcome who in the Post Office Directory for Essex in 1866 is recorded as a farmer and landowner. The 1851 census shows him at Croft Hall with 500 acres, employing 25 men. His wife and sons, however, have no forenames given, only their initials. The 1861 schedule has all the information, but after Samuel's death, the 1871 records his widow as head of household with initials only, and the birthplace 'Not Known' even though it was recorded as Rainham (Essex) in previous censuses. Both William and for that matter the Registrar, must have known the full details of this family but omitted the information. A similar problem arises with schedule 70 in the 1871 census. Richard Fine aged 71 and his wife Caroline 65 years, a hawkers family, are recorded with their daughter Caroline, unmarried aged 20 years. Also in the household are James aged four and Ann two years old, said to be son and daughter of the head of household. Given the ages of these individuals, this seems impossible. Could these have been the illegitimate children of the daughter Caroline? If so did William know this and try, for whatever reason to conceal the true set of relationships, or did he just fail to notice the improbable age difference?

Conclusion

From the scanty information available about other enumerators in the nineteenth century William Woollings would appear to have been an average rural census recorder. He seems to have delivered his books to the Registrar with the minimum of delay and although he had problems with totalling the numbers of houses and population figures, he followed quite closely instructions given for the presentation of the census enumerators' books. He was said to be an educated man but his spelling was certainly inconsistent with regard to place names, leaving more to the imagination than accuracy. Surname changes also plagued William, as much as they do the family historian today. After his initial exposure to census-taking in 1851 the next two were much better presented and it seems that he must have learnt from experience. Although there are number of errors in the three census records, it is perhaps too easy for the present day recorder to see them in the light of the current age of regular information gathering and recording, as well as the ability to contrast, retrospectively, one census with the details of another. Finally, in evaluating the census process and its accuracy we must not forget the need to take account not only the enumerator himself, but also remember that in many respects the information collected is only as good as that given to him by the householders that he was enumerating.
NOTES

1. Tithe Award, 1836, Essex Record Office, D/CT 264.4.
5. The Essex Times, 1889.
15. The former age seems more likely to be correct as Samuel was baptised on October 1, 1818 and John on April 27 of the following year. Both listed in the Baptismal Register of Orsett Parish Church.
17. General Registry Office, St Catherine’s House, Register of Deaths. Henry Hayward died aged 87 (Sept. quarter, 1887, Orsett 4a 181); Robert Knock died aged 51 (Dec. quarter, 1874, Orsett 4a 121).
RESEARCH IN PROGRESS

TUDOR SEAMEN - AN APPEAL

Contributed by P.E.H. Hair

A collection of some eighty wills of English seamen who died during voyages to Guinea in the 1550s and 1560s was published in 1992.¹ This is the earliest traced set of wills relating to English overseas voyages and tells us much about Tudor seamen. The wills name several hundred other persons, mates of the dying seamen, relatives, and ‘hostesses’, the keepers of lodging houses in which unmarried seamen lived between voyages. The seamen who left wills were generally resident in London, Bristol or other seaports of southern England, but the stated locations of relatives show that the seamen originated from many parts of England, even from as far afield as Yorkshire, Liverpool and the Scottish Border. While the wills illuminate aspects of life shipboard, it would be useful to learn more about the seamen’s background on land, including their earlier life and, for those who survived, their later life.

In the book published by J.D. Alsop and myself we listed the names of all the seamen and all the other individuals, and we attempted to trace these persons in other records. We did, for instance, trace one individual in the town records of Liverpool.² However, our attempts to trace the burials of the few seamen who died after their ships reached port failed, because the parish registers of the ports concerned are missing for the relevant period. Again, many seamen who died in the 1550s or 1560s will have been born at a date before parish registers were instituted. Nevertheless, we believe that a proportion of the names could be traced in respect of events recorded in local parish registers or other local documents of the period. Some of the individuals named must have been married, had children baptised, or been buried at dates up to perhaps the end of the century; and some must have appeared in other later local records.

The difficulty for us was that these events could have occurred almost anywhere in England, for instance, could been recorded in almost any extant parish register. We gave up. I now address those local historians who have access to local material of the Tudor period, both published and unpublished. This includes local probate material, since, as we explain at length in the book, some Guinea seamen’s wills may have escaped our attention because probate was obtained in regional probate jurisdictions. For some of our seamen their original home location is recorded, although for many it is not. We would be much indebted if dedicated local historians could search the relevant material for traces of any of our seamen, perhaps particularly the parish registers, and report all successes. Our book is expensive but should be available in libraries, and I will be happy to send any prospective researcher a photocopy of our lists of the names of the Tudor seamen and associated individuals. We think that
the more is known about the lives of Tudor seamen the sounder the understanding of the initial stages of an important historical relationship, that between British internal and overseas history.

NOTES
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SOME RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Compiled by Terry Gwynne and Kevin Schürer

Since a number of journals appear very frequently in this section we thought it might be helpful to many readers to ask the editors of such journals to supply a short explanation of their ethos, aims and interests. This, we thought, would enable readers unfamiliar with some of the journals to set them within an appropriate context. We begin this series with a statement from Urban History. The series will be continued at the beginning of the Recent Publications section in each Spring issue.

Since 1992, when Urban History moved from a Yearbook to a twice, and now thrice, yearly publication, the pages of the journal have sought to offer a forum for the exploration of the growth, development and relationships within and between towns and cities. This is achieved in several ways. First, articles which analyse town or city development over time, or compare an urban issue or theme between places over time are particularly encouraged. No area of interest is excluded - urban policy, municipal politics, social structure, class relations, urban demography and family structure, imagery and iconography, economic and occupational patterns, public health, leisure and recreational activities are amongst the topics published recently. Wherever possible, contributors are asked to place their research in a contextual framework in an endeavour to avoid the purely antiquarian.

If the historical dimension acts as a common denominator, then the disciplinary background is also diverse – sociologists, demographers, historical geographers, art and cultural historians, economic and social historians, as well as those interested in aspects of the built environment have each made distinctive contributions to the study of urban history. This cross-fertilisation of ideas, methodologies and theories is regarded as entirely desirable, and is encouraged in the pages of Urban History.

A second characteristic of Urban History is the interest in historiographical and methodological issues, and a recent innovation has been to devote space to ‘Surveys and Debates’ where authors have vented their views concerning the prospects and priorities for research on towns and cities. Comparative studies are especially sought, and occasional historiographical surveys of particular countries have appeared written by experts who as native speakers can provide particular insights otherwise unavailable to the rest of us.

A third and highly distinctive element in the ethos of Urban History remains its commitment to enriching the research culture associated with the study of towns and cities. Providing this research apparatus is itself achieved in four ways: firstly through an annual survey of literature undertaken by specialists in medieval, early modern and modern urban history; secondly by producing a
review of recent PhD theses, including some from outside Britain; thirdly, by means of a brief account of key conferences with an urban dimension; and fourthly, and uniquely, by producing a classified annual list of over 1200 publications with an urban dimension. To local historians, graduate students, and librarians these research tools remain amongst the most highly valued aspects of Urban History. For teachers and those developing projects, this is probably the easiest way of updating reading lists. Some say that this element is itself worth the price of the subscription.

The 444 pages of Urban History are published in three issues by Cambridge University Press, priced £28 for individuals. Further information is available from Richard Rodger, Department of Economic and Social History, Leicester University, Leicester LE1 7RH. (Tel: 0116-2522588; e-mail rgr@LE.AC.UK.)

Articles

John Aberth

The author uses evidence from the register of Thomas de Lisle, bishop of Ely from 1345 to 1361, to investigate both statistical data and anecdotal material. The conclusion is that the inhabitants of East Anglia and of Cambridgeshire in particular (approximately one half of the inhabitants died) suffered greatly from the plague.

Abigail Beach
'The idea of Neighbourhood 1900-50', History Today, 45 9 (September 1995), 8-11.

The author takes a brief look at 'community' and at attempts to construct communities in the first half of the twentieth century, taking note of planning and social class.

Peter Christian

This journal has not featured in this review section before. Although clearly orientated toward the genealogist and family historian, the historical demographer interested in local population may find some of the articles of interest. This piece, for example, may prove useful to those historians who are eager to find out what information can be found on the growing world of the Internet (see also notes on Probert and Hawgood, below.)

Di Cooper and Moira Donald

In this article the authors explore the kin-relationships between household heads and resident domestic servants in a suburban road in Exeter. Sources
such as parish registers, wills and building plans are used to focus on cases where the census does not record a kin relationship. The authors conclude that previous statistical studies of household formation probably do not represent the true complexity of household composition.

Will Coster
‘To bring them up in the fear of God’: guardianship in the diocese of York, 1500-1668’, *Continuity and Change*, 10 1 (May 1995), 9-32.

Using evidence from wills and the records of the church courts concerning bonds of guardianship. Will Coster establishes the importance of family, kinship, hierarchy and community through the institution of guardianship, which was a social obligation that employed and reinforced a variety of ties. For many there was clearly a need to rely on persons from outside the limited boundaries of the nuclear family.

C. A. Crompton

Trade directories and census enumerators’ books are evaluated as sources for the study of late-nineteenth-century occupations in a rural context. The article contains a usefully concise description of the sources (trade directories, 194; census enumerators’ books, 194-6), and an introduction to Central Place studies.

Chris Galley

The author presents an alternative to the model of early modern urban growth based on high levels of urban mortality or shifts in rural-urban migration; using evidence for York he argues for overall levels of urban fertility being subject to change and for the urban economy as an important influence on migration, on the ability to marry and on fertility. The broad outlines of York’s population history are revealed by aggregate analysis of the city’s parish registers and periods of crisis mortality are identified. The inevitable problems of under-registration (stemming from non-conformity and birth-baptism delay) are examined. The author ends with a plea for further research into individual components of urban demographies.

Jeremy Goldberg

In an accessible and very well-illustrated article Dr Goldberg surveys contemporary sources as evidence of growing-up for young English women; these range over coroners’ rolls, consistory court depositions, testamentary evidence, clerical accounts recording payments for the churching of women, chronicles, texts by foreign visitors, poll tax evidence, didactic texts and visitation cases. The need to treat such source material with caution is duly emphasised lest they ‘dazzle and mislead’. The discussion is set within the
context of recent work on the subject, including that of Barbara Hanawalt, Nicholas Orme, Shulamith Shahar and Jeremy Goldberg himself.

Edward Higgs

In an article which will have clear relevance for many LPS readers Dr Higgs discusses the difficulties in using nineteenth-century census data relating to occupations, and illustrates the shortcomings by focusing upon one labour sector, agriculture. The implications that the nature of the census-taking process have for economic analysis is clearly indicated. Four tables are presented to illustrate the overall level of the shortfall for Victorian agricultural workers. The final section (712-14) may well be significant for some LPS readers, offering as it does a positive programme of investigation in order to establish more trustworthy time-series, eg detailed comparisons of the occupational data in the manuscript returns and the published tables for a registration county over time. Whilst this is just the sort of suggestion which could encourage LPS readers in a project of their own this one sadly raises a daunting problem; as the author himself indicates this particular enquiry would require work on the original manuscripts in the PRO rather than on microfilms because many of the ticks, emendations and comments made by clerks during the process of abstraction and tabulation are in colour codes. Nevertheless, there remain a number of suggestions which could feasibly be followed up by interested readers.

Sara Horrell and Jane Humphries
‘Women’s labour force participation and the transition to the male-breadwinner family 1790-1865’, *Economic History Review*, XLVIII 1 (February 1995), 89-117.

The authors cast doubt upon census enumerations of women’s work by using a dataset of over one thousand household budgets to explore married women’s labour force participation during the period of industrialization; census-occupation designations understate the number of women participating compared with calculations based on earnings.

R. A. Houston and W. A. Prest
“‘To Die in the Term’; the mortality of English barristers’, *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, XXVI 2 (Autumn 1995), 233-49.

Against the background of the ending of the ‘parish register era’ of English historical demography and the search for less labour-intensive means of reconstructing population patterns the authors analyze a closely documented elite group about whom biographical information has already been compiled, or is readily available to be linked to life histories: English common lawyers in late- sixteenth and seventeenth-century England. Since LPS in its early days was itself very much the product of what the authors call ‘the enormous efforts that went into aggregative analysis’ it is timely for readers to consider the direction of future inquiry into local populations; this article indicates one such direction.
Pat Hudson

Professor Hudson considers the growing impact of computer use on regional and local history, focusing on the effects under three main heads: the greater accessibility of local sources following computer indexing, listing and transcribing; the new intensity and variety of interrogations of local data made possible by new data-storage, retrieval and display techniques; the possibility of rescuing the lives of families, communities and ordinary people from the silence of the historical record. Amongst the sources are included probate inventories, parish registers, hearth tax returns and census enumerators' books.

J. A. Johnston

This is an examination of the changing proportions of bequests made by the inhabitants of eight Lincolnshire parishes to various categories of heirs between 1567 and 1800, which notes that the share of immediate family, of kin and of unrelated people within the community changed significantly during the period; by the eighteenth century the immediate family had become dominant and the community mattered less.

Alison MacKinnon
'Were women present at the Demographic Transition? Questions from a feminist historian to historical demographers', *Gender and History*, 7 2 (August 1995), pp. 222-40.

Since this article explicitly questions historical demographers it should be of some general interest to LPS readers; as is evident from the title it seeks to examine from a feminist-historian point of view the central place of changing relations between the sexes in the fertility and mortality decline between the mid-nineteenth century and the first decades of the twentieth century, generally referred to as the Demographic Transition. LPS readers may wish to reflect upon the conclusion that women were 'explicitly agents of their reproductive futures while evading the aggregate data of the demographers'. LPS 'aggregators' beware!

N. J. Mayhew

Although the focus of this article is a thoroughly economic one, i.e an examination of the Fisher Identity MV=PT (M representing money, V velocity, P prices and T volume of transactions), it does place due importance upon demographic change during this long medieval/early modern period in generating increased demand over supply and a consequent increase in prices. The demographic issue is covered in particular on pages 248 to 250.

Gerald Morgan
An examination of wills kept in the National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth and the Public Record Office, London (most of which perhaps surprisingly were made in English). Lists of common Welsh substantives in farm and field names and of Welsh names in frequent use in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are provided. The general treatment of testamentary evidence is of interest, and the author offers some questions which arise from the study as worthy of investigation, eg the nature of Welsh migration into England.

C. B. Phillips

Dr Phillips examines the fate of orphans which reveals aspects of the upbringing of young girls. LPS readers might welcome a little more guidance in relation to the range of sources which provides the author's well-documented evidence.

Charles Phythian-Adams

For LPS readers interested in the wider context of local history in general this is a review of the contribution of W. G. Hoskins to the development of local history.

David Postles

Dr Postles examines the pace and variety of changes in naming practices in Leicestershire and Rutland, including the interrelationship of demographic changes, cultural change, social organisation and lordship.

Eric Probert

Following the comments made on the article by Christian published in the same issue of this journal (see above), this piece provides information on computer software produced essentially for family historians, but which may be of use to local historians as well.

Ronald Rees

Professor Rees examines the relationship between climate and disease, a topic, he shows, which fascinated eighteenth-century observers on both sides of the Atlantic.
Elizabeth Rutledge

Although not specifically concerned with local demography, this article examines the scale of demand for rented accommodation and the resulting multiple occupation of freehold properties within the context of a growing population at Norwich immediately prior to the Black Death. A variety of source material is considered which includes the Norwich Survey plans of property ownership, tithing rolls and enrolled deeds.

Hugh Shankland

This is an examination of migrant settlement in the nineteenth century, using evidence from the registers of a Catholic church in Newcastle upon Tyne linked with information from census records, local trade directories and inscriptions on headstones.

Barbara J. Todd
‘Demographic determinism and female agency: the remarrying widow reconsidered...again’, Continuity and Change, 9 3 (December 1994), 421-50.

LPS 46 (62) noted an article by Jeremy Boulton on London Widowhood revisited in Continuity and Change 5 3 (1990), 323-55 which established a very high proportion of remarrying brides in the early seventeenth century which fell substantially thereafter. This led to the argument that changing marital opportunities, produced by an alteration in the sex ratio of the capital’s population, best explained this decline; along with changing attitudes to remarriage on the part of both men and women. Barbara Todd challenges this view and advances economic and cultural reasons why even poor widows were part of the one group of women for whom the married state was not automatically desirable. As well as doubting the value of sex-ratio differentials based on burials or estimates of migration abroad as a useful index of opportunity for remarriage, she argues that remarriage can also be demonstrated to have declined among widows in areas where sex ratios remained almost constant.

Joan Unwin

Joan Unwin explains how funding from the British Academy and the Leverhulme Trust has enabled an Adult Continuing Education group to assemble several large computer databases from the archives of the Cutlers’ Company of Hallamshire. Examples are provided to demonstrate the scope of using a ‘fairly simple computer database’ to organise a mass of information of some complexity, eg the very diverse backgrounds of apprentices.
Robert Woods and Naomi Williams
‘Must the gap widen before it can be narrowed? Long term trends in social class mortality differentials’, *Continuity and Change*, 10 1 (May 1995), 105-37.

The authors undertake a re-examination of Aaron Antonovsky’s article of 1967 on Social class, life expectancy and overall mortality. They emphasize the importance of considering differentials over the last seven centuries via a variety of measures and the need to approach with care the problems associated with the definition of social class. Two useful tables are presented: Life expectancy at age 20 among men 1350-1899 and Occupation specific standardized mortality rates for adult men aged 25-64 in England and Wales.

**BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS**

The journal has recently received a large number of publications for review. As such it is only possible to provide a short notice for each rather than a full review. It is also the case that a large proportion of the material received is produced by institutions and societies, sometimes local organisations, without access to the outlets available to national commercial publishing houses. In the tradition of **LPS** we are glad to devote space to such material, especially if it promotes the study of demographic and community history at a local and regional level.

Alan Armstrong (ed.)

Sponsored by Kent County Council, this is a volume of which the county can be justly proud. The series of which this volume forms a part is exactly the sort of initiative which supports and nurtures the study of local history. For historical demographers, this will probably be the most important and interesting volume. The opening chapter is on the population history of the county divided into two key periods: 1640-1831 (by Mary Dobson) and 1831-1914 (by Alan Armstrong). Other chapters take the central themes of Agriculture, Industry, Transport, Towns, Labour and Kent and the Sea. Even for those not particularly familiar with or interested in the history of Kent the volume contains a host of fascinating information: for those undertaking studies for other parts of the country, the numerous tables and appendices alone offer a useful source for comparative analysis. Such county-based or similar regional studies are particularly useful to those undertaking parish or community-level research in that they provide a much-needed contextual framework into which local research can be placed. If only more counties would follow the example shown by Kent!

David Alan Gatley
This is a computerised version of the published census returns for 1861, merged together with information on vital statistics taken from the Registrar General’s Annual Report for 1861 and Decennial Supplement for the same year. Consequently, it provides a useful tool to anyone undertaking census-based research for this period. Given the wealth of information contained within the published census reports the disc serves as a research resource in its own right – consisting of 114 variables for each of the 638 Registration Districts in England and Wales at that time, with information on population size and structure, occupational composition and birthplaces. It will also supplement the work of those drawing primarily on other sources in providing background ‘benchmark’ information. In particular, for those embarking on local studies of this period it would be possible to gauge the ‘typicality’ (if there is such a thing!) of the area in question. Copies of the data files can be obtained for £18 from the author at the School of Social Sciences, Staffordshire University, College Road, Stoke-on-Trent, Staffordshire, ST4 2DE or for £14.40 from the Local Population History Book Club. Dr Gatley has also prepared a further disc which contains for each Registration District in 1861 the OS grid reference for the principal town, the sex ratio, population change between 1851 and 1861 and a number of industrial variables such as numbers employed in agriculture, domestic service, etc. This second disc is available from the same address at the cost of £5.

Jeremy Gibson

Jeremy Gibson and Alan Dell
The Protestation Returns 1641-1642 and other contemporary listings: Collection in Aid of Distressed Protestants in Ireland; Subsidies; Poll Tax; Assessment or Grant; Vow and Covenant; Solemn League and Covenant, Federation of Family History Societies (Publications) Ltd (1995), 83pp, ISBN 1 86006 006 4. £3.95 (+55p p&p).

These ‘Gibson’ guides to sources should be well-known to the readers of this journal, providing a county by county listing of the availability and location of the source under consideration. The second of the two booklets focusing on the Protestation Returns is especially timely given the articles published using this source by Anne Whiteman in both this and the previous issue of LPS. Those contemplating comparative studies can check the availability of returns for their area (few counties, however, are as well covered as Cornwall). The guide also, most usefully, draws attention to contemporary taxation records, of which the Assessment (or Grant) of 1641 might prove particularly beneficial to those interested in local populations. This is due both to its relatively low threshold and the fact that payment was due according to ownership of property rather than residence, thus those owning property across more than one parish should be identifiable. The Quarter Session guide is now in its 4th edition and provides essential information for anyone contemplating the use of these documents, forming, as they do, the fundamental record of county-level administration. Both booklets are available from FFHS (Publications) Ltd, 2-4 Killer Street, Ramsbottom, Bury, Lancashire BL0 9BZ.
David Hawgood


For those wondering what the Internet and the Super Highway, about which we hear so much about these days, actually are and have to offer historians, this small booklet might prove a useful point of entry. It is obviously written for the more specific interests of family historians, but as a starting point it still contains much relevant information. Available at £1.96 (including p&p, or £2.16 overseas) from Family Tree Magazine, 61 Great Whyte, Ramsey, Huntingdon, Cambs, PE17 1HL.

Maryanne Kowaleski


This book is clearly not about population history, however, it is still of great interest to those studying aspects of local population history in the medieval period, such as the plague. As a community study one of the most striking aspects of the work is the importance and strength of relationship between the city of Exeter and its hinterland: each depended on the other. This is an obvious point, but one all too often over-looked by those undertaking community studies. This study demonstrates the extent to which the size and structure of the city’s hinterland changed depending on the goods and services in question, with, in some cases, places in mid-Somerset being of greater importance and in more regular contact with Exeter than places of equal proximity in north and south Devon.

Thelma Munckton


Used in combination with other records such documents as account books can shed much light on the social and employment structure of a local community, as well as the under-lying economic forces. These accounts, made by Charles Tudway, record payments for housekeeping expenses on the farm, wages of the work force and running costs: entries are even made for the payment of the Window and House Tax. Thus we can discover than on 1st November 1766 2s. was paid for ‘4 loves of bread’, whilst on the same day William Gully was paid 5s. for five day’s work. How many people today would work a full day for the equivalent of two loafs of bread? The booklet is available from Harry Galloway Publishing, 39 Nutwell Road, Worle, Weston-super-Mare, BS22 0EW. (In case anybody is wondering, Chancellors Farm is in the parish of West Harptree, Somerset).

Robert Pols


What is the relevance of this volume to historical demography? Well, this issue of LPS does carry the first article to be illustrated by a photograph, that of
William Woollings, the census enumerator. Moreover, it is fascinating little volume: the ‘dating charts’ giving details of fashions in dress are particularly interesting. Available from FFHS (Publications) Ltd, 2-4 Killer Street, Ramsbottom, Bury, Lancs. BL0 9BZ.

Stuart A. Raymond

Stuart A. Raymond

Assuming than all volumes are produced to this standard, this series (other volumes are available for additional counties but these have not been seen) provides a useful introduction for anyone starting a local-based historical study. The volumes provide a detailed bibliography of published work on the county arranged by primary source type and parish, and as such is convenient to those conducting either source-orientated or place-orientated studies. Both of these volumes are available from The Benson Room, Birmingham & Midland Institute, Margaret Street, Birmingham B3 3BS or from S.A. & M.J. Raymond, 6 Russet Avenue, Exeter EX1 3QB.


This is not a book that many historical demographers would think of consulting, especially given that most of the analyses presented relate to demographic developments in the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s, with scarcely a mention of demographic movements prior to the Second World War. However, this said, one central and important point of relevance to those interested in the history of local populations emerges from the book in striking fashion. The various contributions to the volume, especially the eleven chapters which form Part 2 of the book, serve to emphasise how comparatively little is known still about patterns of migration in the past. We know much about the basic characteristics of migration, the importance of life-cycle service, for example, and the rôle it played in urban development, but little has been undertaken on the nature and impact of regional, national or international migration flows in the past. Historical demographers have very little to compare with the many maps produced in this volume showing intra and inter-regional population shifts! Of course, we do not have the same bounty of source material as our contemporary demographer cousins, but such volumes are useful reminders when it comes to setting research agendas.

Tom Richards
The main title to this volume is perhaps a little unfortunate since an initial reaction to this volume is to think "No!" and leave it unopened. Yet readers are advised to change their minds. The key words in the title are in fact 'directory of railway archive sources', indeed this could be prefaced by the adjective 'comprehensive'. Reading through this volume one would discover that there is much in railway archives to interest the historical demographer. A few examples will perhaps suffice. Records on wages and pensions paid to railway employees and ex-employees abound, both an under-researched topic in socio-demographic history. Likewise, although the archival description of the holdings does not allow certainty without further inspection, it seems likely that records also exist providing information on the relief of employees absent from work through sickness and ill-health. If so, this would permit the study of morbidity in the nineteenth century, a subject about which comparatively little is known. A study of the various applications for jobs may shed more light on the nature of the nineteenth-century employment market. The records for the North Eastern Railway even include for 1912 a survey of the weekly household budget of senior clerks! Copies of the booklet can be obtained from FFHS (Publications) Ltd, 2-4 Killer Street, Ramsbottom, Bury, Lancs. BL0 9BZ or from Tom Richards, 1 Apsley Road, Clifton, Bristol BS8 2SH.

Jean Robin

This monograph, the first in the Cambridge Group’s new Working Paper series, illustrates very well what can be achieved from an in-depth analysis of nineteenth census data, linked to other available sources. As such, it should serve as a model for those using similar data in other local studies. Its starting point is all those aged under ten recorded in the 1851 census returns of the famous Devonshire parish of Colyton. These are then traced through successive censuses and linked to other available information up to 1891 (unfortunately the most recent census available to us). What happens to this group through their teens and early adulthood is then charted in some detail, focusing on leaving home, starting work, marriage, family live and in some cases, death. The most striking and perhaps obvious feature is the impact that migration has on the group with 35 per cent of the initial 633 cohort members moving out of the parish by the time of the 1861 census, with only 32 individuals being resident in Colyton at all five censuses. Hopefully this study will prompt similar exercises to be undertaken for other parts of the country.

Margaret Spufford (ed.)

In the most recent New Year's List the editor of this volume was honoured for her contribution to social history as well as her work in support of the provision of education for disadvantaged students. This volume is a fitting tribute to the support and encouragement she has given over many years to the study of history through detailed community-level reconstruction. With the
exception of the chapter by Peter Spufford and the 'Critical Conclusion' by Patrick Collinson, all of the contributors are students or research associates of Margaret Spufford – the collective noun for which appears in the book as Spuffordians – and all share a common approach in which the detailed scrutiny of local sources is paramount. As such, those interested in the reconstruction of local populations in the past will find a plentiful supply of rich pickings in this volume. Each chapter, of course, has its own merits, but the real strength of the book is the combination of research effort, tracking down the social structure and position of religious dissent in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. This book really is a case in which the whole is greater than the sum of the parts. A very useful synthesis of the work is provided by Spufford’s introductory chapter on the importance of religion and this rightly emphasises what appear as the key findings of the latter chapters. Three points are particularly striking. First, that dissent was not confined to any single social group, rich or poor, but was spread quite evenly throughout communities. Second, that dissenters were not necessarily social outcasts or outsiders, but instead appear usually to be integrated community members. Third, it may be possible to trace dissent from one generation to the next; in other words a tendency towards dissent could be inherited. (However, as Collinson points out in his conclusion this issue is in need of further research – so, to your parish records!). Another strand of research that the volume emphasises is the importance of mobility and communication within dissenting society. This is illustrated especially by Watt’s chapter on pedlars and Fearnson’s study of carriage and transport networks. However, Peter Spufford’s useful survey of population mobility in the period demonstrates that despite the importance of communication, some dissenter communities may have remained curiously stable. This is an important book for all those investigating the social and economic history of the period, not just those studying the history of religion – as such, it is a shame that the price of £50 will put it out of the reach of the many local historians for whom Margaret Spufford and the Spuffordians have done so much.

Iain Swinnerton

Iain Swinnerton

Pauline M. Litton

Iain Swinnerton

Michael Gandy

All of these Basic Approach to... and Basic Facts about.... booklets are, as the titles suggest, a quick introduction to the subject matter in question. They are
Obviously intended as little more than initial starting points or 'tasters' and in sixteen pages provide a brief outline of the key issues, a guide to terminology and a reading list to follow up. For those totally new to the subject and not knowing where to start they may prove useful. All of the Basic Approach series, plus other publications of the FFHS are available from the Federation of Family History Society (Publications) Ltd, 2-4 Killer Street, Ramsbottom, Bury, Lancashire BL0 9BZ.

Maurice Turner (ed.)

This small book is a wonderful example of what can be achieved by the combined efforts of a WEA or university extra-mural class – in this case, the members of the joint WEA/Leeds University extra-mural class. The focus of the book is a study of the families living in Nidderdale (North Yorkshire) from roughly 1500 to 1750, taking the distribution of surnames and their persistence as a central approach (see the contribution by Turner in LPS 54). A multitude of sources was used, with parish registers, taxation documents, wills and inventories forming the core. Linking these where possible, overall demographic trends are examined alongside more detailed investigations of migration, marriage, household structures, kinship and proto-industry. All in all the work should serve as a useful model for groups undertaking similar work elsewhere. Copies can be obtained from John Hebden, Aldergarth, Galphay, Ripon, North Yorkshire, HG4 3NJ, with cheques made payable to Ripon Historical Society.

Berkshire Records Society
Details have been received of the newly-formed Berkshire Record Society. Like many other county record societies this new body aims to publish a wide range of documents relating to the county. The first three volumes to be published will be: Volume 1, Correspondence of the Foundling Hospital Inspectors of the Poor; Volume 2, Berkshire Archdeaconry Glebe Terriers; and Volume 3, Records of the Berkshire Overseers of the Poor. For further information on the Society contact Dr Peter Durrant, County Record Office, Shire Hall, Reading, Berks., RG2 9XD.
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
CORRESPONDENCE

Letters intended for publication in LPS should be sent to LPS, Department of History, University of Essex, Colchester, CO4 3SQ

Editors' note

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

Parish Registration

Dear Sir,

Dennis Ashurst is to be congratulated on his detailed and meticulous research on the quality of the Worsborough parish register (LPS 55). His comparison of Bishop Transcripts with parish registers indicates some very revealing inconsistencies and errors in the transcription of parish register entries.

Your editorial comment, quoting Steel’s work on the reliability of parish registers, is also apt and appropriate. Steel’s discussion of the rough note books kept by parish clerks and others is informative, and as a number of these books have survived in county record offices, it is obviously an area of potentially fruitful research.

One note of caution needs to be sounded however: in some cases the note books were used not for recording all baptisms, marriages and burials in a parish, but were a listing of all those yet to pay the fees for these ritual services. One of the witnesses to the 1833 Select Committee on Parochial Registration noted the pitfalls in this regard. The parish clerk of Waldron, Sussex (a local blacksmith) described how he compiled a memorandum book listing baptisms, marriages and burials, fees for which were still outstanding. This listing was then used by the local Vicar as the basis for compiling his parish register at the end of the year. Consequently, those who paid their fees promptly were not included in the clerk’s rough note book, and as a result were omitted from the parish register!

Dennis Ashurst also refers to Lynn Boothman’s work on the comparison of poor law burials of paupers with their registration in the local burial register. She found a very significant omission of burials in the Long Melford parish register during the late sixteenth century (LPS 49). I have repeated a similar research exercise for the parishes of Whitchurch and Folkestone during the late
seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and found that about a fifth of all pauper burials were omitted from the burial registers up to the middle of the eighteenth century.

Another way of evaluating the quality of burial registers is to compare people leaving wills and dying in a particular parish, with their entry in the local register. For ten parishes in Staffordshire, I found that 42.6 per cent of all deaths amongst the will-leaving population in the period 1538-1649 were not registered in the parish registers, a proportion that had fallen to 17.5 per cent by 1750-1837. Some of these burials were found in neighbouring parish registers, but this was only a very small minority of total cases (6.3 per cent for the whole sample).

The inadequacy of parish registration was not confined to 'poor' parish registers. I analysed the registration of 124 people who had left wills in the parish of Colyton between 1554 and 1797, and found 28.1 per cent unregistered in the parish register. I found similar levels of unreliability in other Cambridge Group reconstitution parishes from the comparison of wills with burial registers, a conclusion supported by the application of the 'same-name technique' to the reconstitution schedules of these parishes. (For full details, see my book, Essays in English Population History).

Parish registers have formed the basis of much research published in LPS, and at times, the findings have been interpreted in an uncritical way. In my view, what is required for all research using parish registers, is an initial assessment of their quality by comparing them (where available) with Bishops Transcripts, clerks' rough note books, wills, poor law records of pauper burials, census statements on birth, midwives records and any other local source which independently lists births and deaths. Only when this has been achieved, will we be in a position to generate reliable findings on births and deaths for historical demographic research.

Yours faithfully
Dr Peter Razzell
From childhood to middle age: cohort analysis in Colyton, 1851-1891

Jean Robin

Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure
Working Paper Series No. 1

This working paper follows the life courses of the 633-strong cohort of 0-9 year-olds listed in the 1851 census for the East Devonshire market town of Colyton through 40 years to 1891, or until their earlier disappearance through death or migration, and uses their experiences to explore the rural society of which they were part.

The division of the children of the cohort into five main groups, based on the occupations of their fathers, makes it possible to attempt an assessment of how far their lives were influenced by socio-economic factors, whether within the family or as members of a co-residential group in childhood, or in relation to education, employment, migration, mortality, marriage, social mobility, poverty and related topics, as the children became teenagers and progressed into adulthood and finally middle age.

ISBN 0 9527065 0 4

£2.50 including postage and packing (£3.50 overseas)

Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure
27 Trumpington Street
Cambridge CB2 1QA

Name ..............................................................................................................................
Address ...........................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

Please send me ..... copy(ies) of From childhood to middle age. I enclose a cheque for £........ made payable to the University of Cambridge.

........................................................................................................................................

This form should be returned to the Cambridge Group at the above address.
Social History Society of the UK Conference 1997

TIME AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE PAST

The conference will be held on 3-5 January 1997 in and around the Royal King's Arms hotel in "Time-honoured Lancaster", England. Lancaster is on the M6 and the west coast main line, about three hours from London. Offers of papers are invited from historians and others. The following list of themes is offered as a guide but contributions outside these areas are welcome; there are no limits to period or place.

The contest for time: work, gender, society

Time, work, leisure and economics. Time and gender. Transport and travel. Time and social class. Social uses, definitions and appropriations of time.

Calendars

Religious, scientific and cultural development of the calendar. Calendars in different regions, nations and cultures.

The ritual and leisure year

The religious calendar and the reformation. Secularisation of the calendar. Calendar customs. Seasonal patterns of recreation, leisure and holidays.

Seasonality

Seasonal cycles as tools of historical analysis (e.g. agricultural patterns, the trade cycle, marriage patterns). Relationship between natural cycles and human activity.

The concept of time


The historical construction of "the past"

Uses and discourses of "the past". National and local myths of the past, and the invention of tradition. The development of historical studies. Historical periodization: traditions and alternatives. The radical sense of the past. "The death of the past".

Time, popular memory and nostalgia


Inquiries

All inquiries and offers of papers to Mrs Linda Persson, secretary, Social History Society, Dept of History, Lancaster University, Lancaster LA1 4YG, UK. Tel. 01524 592605; e-mail L.Persson@lancaster.ac.uk. Those interested in offering papers should get in touch by the end of May 1996.
Gypsies Travelling