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EDITORIAL

In this issue of Local Population Studies (LPS) we return to the ‘normal’ three articles. Two of these focus on the nineteenth century, and one on the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Our first contribution is from Peter Razzell, whose work will be familiar to most readers of the journal. In it he takes advantage of the practice, common in historical England, of giving a subsequent child of the same sex the same Christian name as an older, but deceased, sibling. This practice can be used, Razzell argues, to estimate the reliability of burial registration in seventeenth and eighteenth century England. Razzell concludes that, contrary to the belief of many historians, the reliability of burial registration did not deteriorate greatly at the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth century compared with earlier (or, for that matter, later) periods.

The second article is a study by Paul Jennings of those working in the licensed trade in nineteenth century Bradford. This editor found this contribution especially interesting, as in his youth he spent a considerable time engaged in informal researches in the licensed premises of that city. The originality of Jennings’s work lies especially in its comparison of two ‘pictures’ of the licensed trade in Bradford. One is the picture that might be drawn using the occupational descriptions in the census enumerators’ books (CEBs) or the census reports. The second is a picture that can be painted using other contemporary sources (for example trade directories and newspaper articles). His key conclusion is that the two pictures are quite different from one another.

The third article, by Briony Eckstein and Andrew Hinde, is an attempt to show how the rules of family reconstitution might be extended to incorporate data from the CEBs. By combining data from these two sources, it is possible to measure fertility within marriage during the late nineteenth century using a much larger proportion of marriages than would be possible with conventional family reconstitution. Although this paper is mainly methodological in focus, it does present some results from northern Hampshire which indicate that marital fertility there between 1851 and 1891 was at a very similar level to that reported in the Cambridge Group’s reconstitutions for the early modern period.

This issue also includes a number of book reviews. In the past, the majority of book reviews published in the journal have been written ‘in house’ by members of the Editorial Board. For this issue, however, it has been decided to send books out to external reviewers. We are very grateful to Nesta Evans, Alasdair Crockett and Paul Riden for writing reviews for us. In the future, it is hoped to publish book reviews, often (though not always) written by external reviewers in each spring issue of LPS, with the autumn issues containing the annual Reviews of the Current Periodical Literature.
Some readers may notice that this issue of *LPS* is somewhat shorter than either of the last two issues. We try to aim at a target of about 72 pages per issue. *LPS* 63 considerably exceeded this target, mainly because of the increased length of the new-style Review of the Current Periodical Literature. If we continue to publish this Review annually, then it is likely that future autumn issues will be longer than 72 pages, and so to keep printing costs to their current levels it will be necessary for the spring issues to be somewhat shorter.

**LPS projects**

As announced in the Editorial to *LPS* 63, it is proposed to produce a Portable Document File (PDF) version of back issues of *LPS*. This would create a permanent, searchable, archive of the articles and notes published over the years in the journal, and would also make available some of the early issues which the *LPS* General Office no longer has in stock. At present a pilot study of a few issues is being undertaken. If the results are satisfactory, then it is intended to incorporate most back issues of the journal. Readers’ views on this proposal are still welcomed.

Readers are also reminded that the collection of essays entitled *When death do us part: understanding and interpreting the probate records of early modern England* (edited by Tom Arkell, Nesta Evans and Nigel Goose) will be published later this year. Advance orders are now being accepted and will earn a discount of £2 on the published price. Finally, sets of back issues of *LPS* are still available at discount rates: issues 10-20 can be had for £10, and issues 21-50 inclusive for £17.50 (post free). All orders, as usual, to the *LPS* General Office (address at foot of p. 2).

**1901 Census Project**

At the beginning of 2002, the census enumerators’ books (CEBs) for the 1901 census will be released from their 100-year purdah. It is certain that many local historians and demographers will wish to use them, either for new research projects, or to add an ‘extra’ ten years to existing projects. The CEBs for earlier censuses have been made available on microfilm or microfiche at the Public Record Office (PRO) and microfilm or microfiche copies have usually been available at local county or city record offices, and local history libraries. In addition, the Genealogical Society of Utah’s machine-readable version of the entire set of 1881 CEBs has been made available either on microfiche at county record offices or in electronic format from the History Data Service at the University of Essex.

Many readers will already be aware that the PRO plans to adopt a new scheme for making the 1901 CEBs available to users. The plan, known as the 1901 Census project, is to digitise the whole data set and make it available via the internet. According to the PRO’s 1901 Census Project web site: ‘This project is seen as one of the first steps towards achieving the PRO’s vision that in the 21st century, its services and records will be accessible electronically on-
site and around the world’. The digitisation project involves creating scanned electronic images of the pages of the census, constructing a machine-readable index which will allow users to find entries in the scanned pages, and making the scanned images and the index available on-line. A charge of, say, £0.80 to view each page would be made, with a minimum payment of £5.00. To search the index would be free. Note that the digitised images will not replace microfiche: microfiche copies of the 1901 CEBs should in principle still be available in the same way (and in the same places) as they are now for earlier censuses.

In their publicity and information material, the PRO make much of the advantages of the new form of dissemination for the family history community. And it is clear that someone wanting to search for a particular individual person is going to derive great benefit (and save money, if only on travelling expenses) from being able to search the entire census from the comfort of his or her own home. However, what of the local demographer or historian who wishes to view, and possibly to transcribe, whole sequences of pages from the CEBs relating to a village or group of villages, or parts of an urban area? Here the situation is not yet clear, and it is at least possible that the outcome of the changes will mean that access to sequences of pages from the 1901 CEBs is more difficult and more expensive than it is for earlier censuses. This was certainly the view of David Gatley, who, in a recent letter to the *Local Population Studies Society Newsletter*, suggested that local record offices might choose not to purchase microfiche copies of the 1901 CEBs as they have done for previous censuses. Instead they might have more computer terminals installed to allow on-line access (at PRO prices). If this did happen, then clearly this would impose a cost on local historians wishing to study the 1901 CEBs that was not imposed for earlier censuses. Viewing the 1901 CEBs for a parish of, say, 800 persons would cost about £24.00 (27 pages at 30 persons per page + 3 introductory pages = 30 pages. At £0.80 per page this comes to £24.00). Of course, those with access to the internet in their own homes could perhaps offset savings on travelling costs against this.

However, the PRO is aware of the needs of local historians. The December 1999 update on the project’s web site contained a set of ‘frequently asked questions’, one of which was ‘What if I want to view a lot of images in one sequence e.g. a village?’ This drew the response that ‘This is an issue, which is linked to certain types of research [a statement of fact]. We are aware of it and are seeking a solution …’. It is to be hoped that this ‘solution’ involves making sequences of consecutive CEB pages available to local historians and demographers at a price of less than £0.80 per page. An Advisory Panel to the Project has been set up, and *LPS* readers will be interested (and, I am sure, pleased) to know that Kevin Schürer, a member of the *LPS* Editorial Board, is a prominent member of that panel. At a recent meeting, the Advisory panel was due to discuss the use of the 1901 census by historians other than family historians, and news of the outcome of this discussion is awaited.

The preparation of the searchable index involves the transcription of selected
information from the original manuscript CEBs (surname, age and place of birth at least). This will be undertaken by Enterprise Supply Services, which is an agency of the Prison Service.

*LPS* readers can keep in touch with the latest news on the PRO’s proposals by consulting the web site (http://www.pro.gov.uk/census/). Further information may also be obtained from Margaret Brennand at the Family Records Centre in London (tel: 020 8392 5304). An e-mail circulation list has been established to keep interested users informed. Those who would like to receive updates by e-mail, or to offer comments, should e-mail: 1901census@pro.gov.uk.

Congratulations

I am sure that *LPS* readers would like to join with me in congratulating Kevin Schürer on his appointment as Director of the Data Archive at the University of Essex. Kevin has been a member of *LPS* Editorial Board for many years, and was responsible for producing and typesetting many issues of the journal. In his new role he will be taking responsibility for the management of the UK’s main repository of social scientific and historical data, a job of great national importance. It is to be hoped that, nevertheless, he will still find time to continue to be a member of the *LPS* Editorial Board.

Editorial matters

This issue is my first as co-editor. My thanks are due to Margaret Smith for her excellent and timely typesetting work. I shall also be responsible for *LPS* 65, after which Nigel Goose will take over again. Please direct all enquiries and contributions to the *LPS* General Office at the University of Hertfordshire (address at foot of p. 2).

Andrew Hinde
EVALUATING THE SAME-NAME TECHNIQUE AS A WAY OF MEASURING BURIAL REGISTER RELIABILITY IN ENGLAND

Peter Razzell

Peter Razzell has carried out research in the field of historical demography for nearly 40 years, and is currently a Research Fellow at the Open University working on a number of different demography research projects.

Introduction

Anglican parish registers have formed the basis of most English demographic research for the period before 1837, but have suffered from ‘that constant and basic problem, the quality of the parish register being studied’.¹ In an influential study of the subject, J.T. Krause concluded that ‘parochial registration which was relatively accurate in the early eighteenth century, became somewhat less so in the 1780s, virtually collapsed between roughly 1795 and 1820, and then improved somewhat between 1821 and 1837’.² This conclusion was based on a general study of registration accuracy, with a particular emphasis on the impact of religious dissent on the effectiveness of Anglican registration.³ Krause made no direct attempt to measure the reliability of parish registers, and concluded that when estimating the reliability of parochial registration ‘the impressionistic method of the historian, rather than the quantitative method of the statistician must be relied upon’.⁴

Krause’s work influenced the research of a number of other scholars, including Wrigley and Schofield who assumed that the success of the Anglican Church in countering religious non-conformity was a measure of its effectiveness in ensuring the registration of vital events.⁵ It was partly on the basis of this assumption that Wrigley and Schofield concluded that Anglican parish registers were almost perfect at the beginning of registration in the 1540s, but deteriorated significantly at the end of the eighteenth century, mirroring Krause’s general conclusions on the subject.⁶ In addition to figures on the number of non-conformist baptisms and burials, Wrigley and Schofield used estimates of the effects of delayed baptism to calculate ‘residual’ inflation ratios, but because of the large unknowns in these calculations, accepted the ‘arbitrary’ nature of ‘the final inflation ratio’.⁷

Wrigley and Schofield’s assumption that Anglican registration accuracy reflected the amount of religious non-conformity is open to question. There is some evidence to suggest that under-registration was not primarily due to the rise of religious non-conformity but was the result of the negligence of clergymen and parish clerks in registering vital events which took place in their parish, as well as their refusal to register burials on account of non-payment of fees.⁸
Although Wrigley and Schofield did not directly measure the adequacy of parish registration, they did attempt to measure it indirectly for the period 1801–1841 by estimating the total numbers of births and deaths in England and Wales. They achieved this by applying a standard life table to data from national censuses, and although there is a degree of uncertainty in their use of a particular life table and the assumption of zero net migration, at least the procedure enabled them to derive an empirical measure of registration reliability. Because they were reliant on national census returns for their estimates of birth and death under-registration, Wrigley and Schofield could not directly measure the latter in the period before 1801.

I have carried out nominal-linkage research on 45 parishes selected from most areas of the country, comparing information about age and birthplace for individuals in the 1851 Census with data from Anglican baptism registers. Table 1 compares Wrigley and Schofield’s estimates of the proportions of births missing from Anglican registers (as enumerated in Rickman’s national returns), with the proportions of births not found in the sample of 45 baptism registers. The figures for 1801–1841 are very similar, providing some support for the validity of both sets of figures. Table 1 also suggests that the sample of 45 parishes is approximately representative of national totals during the first four decades of the nineteenth century.

Although the Cambridge Group’s findings and my own on the pattern of parish registration in the period 1801–1841 are approximately similar, there is a major discrepancy in conclusions about birth registration in the period before 1801. Wrigley and Schofield have estimated that 13.4 per cent of all births were omitted from baptism registers in 1760–1769, a proportion that increased to 14.4 per cent in 1770–1779, 17.4 per cent in 1780–1789 and 22.7 per cent in 1790–1799. Considered together with their data presented in Table 1, this indicates a gradual deterioration of birth registration in this period, followed by a sharp decline after 1811. However, my findings are different (Table 1). They show that between a quarter and a third of all births had been omitted from the parish registers, with little or no trend in reliability between 1761 and 1834.

The same-name technique as a way of measuring the accuracy of burial registration.

Wrigley, Davies, Oeppen and Schofield have recently discussed ways of assessing parish register accuracy through statistical analysis and general demographic modelling of data. There are, however, a number of difficulties with this mode of analysis. Indeed, Wrigley and his colleagues themselves acknowledge that this approach to measuring registration reliability is somewhat unsatisfactory: ‘In most periods the lack of a reliable alternative data source makes it impossible either to test effectively the completeness of Anglican registration by direct comparison with independent evidence, or to establish whether the demography of the Anglican community was similar to that of the population as a whole. For the bulk of the parish register period,
Table 1  Estimated proportions of missing births

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Wrigley and Schofield’s estimates from national totals of baptisms in England and Wales</th>
<th>Based on comparison of 1851 census with 45 baptism registers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1760–1770</td>
<td>– –</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1771–1780</td>
<td>– –</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1781–1790</td>
<td>– –</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1791–1800</td>
<td>– –</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801–1810</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1811–1820</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821–1830</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831–1836</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The census/baptism register figure in the last row is based on a period 1831–1834, not 1831–1836 as used by Wrigley and Schofield. The numbers of cases on which the 45 census/baptism register figures are based are as follows: 1761–1770, 68; 1771–1780, 347; 1781–1790, 637; 1791–1800, 1,053; 1801–1810, 1,517; 1811–1820, 1,989; 1821–1830, 3,092; 1831–1834, 2,251.


therefore, the testing of registration must depend on the internal plausibility and internal consistency of the results obtained.14

They also acknowledge that the nineteenth century censuses do allow such an independent check of the reliability of parish registers. The data on baptism accuracy in Table 1 above provides such an analysis.15 However, the census/parish register method only allows an assessment of baptism registration from about 1761 onwards, and has nothing to say about burial under-registration. Fortunately in addition to the census/parish register method, there is one source of data which allows the direct study of burial registration reliability.

It was the custom in England and elsewhere sometimes to give the name of a dead child to a subsequent sibling of the same sex. This custom can form the basis of a method for measuring burial registration reliability. Louis Henry in France and Roger Finlay in England explored the use of information on such same-names for this purpose, but concluded that such a method was subject to a degree of uncertainty on account of some living siblings sharing the same names.16 There is, however, evidence that same-names were not given to living siblings in England after the middle of the seventeenth century, and the
practice may never have existed even at an earlier period. This issue will
form a central part of the present paper, but it is first necessary to explain the
nature of the method and how it can be used to measure burial registration
reliability.

The custom of giving same names can be illustrated by baptisms and burials
in the family of Thomas and Ann Duckett in the marsh parish of Canewdon,
Essex, which, listed in date sequence, were as follows:

1. Thomas, son of Thomas and Ann Duckett: baptised 21 June 1724,
buried 4 August 1724.
3. Mary, daughter of Thomas and Ann Duckett: baptised 2 August 1727,
buried 11 October 1727.
4. Mary, daughter of Thomas and Ann Duckett: baptised 14 February 1729,
buried 19 February 1729.
5. Mary, daughter of Thomas and Ann Duckett: baptised 4 March 1730,
buried 20 April 1730.
6. Thomas, son of Thomas and Ann Duckett: baptised 31 May 1731,
buried 26 June 1731.
7. Mary, daughter of Thomas and Ann Duckett: baptised 20 October 1732,
buried 29 November 1732.
8. John, son of Thomas and Ann Duckett: baptised 24 January 1734,
buried 16 March 1734.
9. Thomas, son of Thomas and Ann Duckett: baptised 12 March 1735,
buried 9 May 1735.

The name Mary was given to four of Thomas and Ann Duckett’s children,
three of whom had died before the baptism of their same-name sisters.
Likewise, there were three sons who were given the name of Thomas, two of
whom had died before the baptism of their same-name brothers. In this
family, burial registration was perfect, with the inclusion of all burials of the
first of same-name pairs in the parish register. This practice of same-naming
therefore allows an objective measurement of the adequacy of burial registers,
by expressing the number of first children of same-name pairs as a proportion
of such children found in the burial register. With the Duckett family, this
ratio is five (cases 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6) divided by five (also cases 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6) =
100 per cent.

Other examples of same-name research indicate, however, that a parish
register frequently omitted a significant proportion of burials. For example,
Thomas Turner, who lived in East Hoathly, Sussex in the middle of the
eighteenth century, kept a diary and he listed the births and deaths of his
children as follows:
1. Peter: born 19 August 1754; died 16 January 1755.
3. Peter: born 1 June 1768.
5. Frederick: born 8 December 1771; died 7 November 1774.
7. Frederick: born 3 May 1775; died 13 June 1775.
8. Frederick: born 17 December 1776.

The gap between the birth dates of Turner’s first two children is explained by the death of his first wife, and his subsequent remarriage. The pattern of same-naming is illustrated through the repetition of the names of the first Peter and the first two Fredericks, the name of the dead child being given to the next sibling of the same sex born after his or her death. Turner lived all of his married life in the parish of East Hoathly, and the baptism and burials of his children in the parish register were as follows:

- Peter: baptised 31 August 1754.
- Margaret: baptised 23 April 1766.
- Peter: baptised 28 June 1768.
- Philip: baptised 15 November 1769.
- Frederick: baptised 30 December 1771.
- Michael: baptised 19 May 1773.
- Frederick: baptised 14 May 1775; buried 13 June 1775.
- Frederick: baptised 10 January 1777.

Only one of the three Turner children who died was registered in the burial register, and this is because the other two had been buried in the neighbouring parish of Framfield, where their grandparents had lived and been buried. Under family reconstitution rules, the infant and child mortality rate would be 125 per 1000 (one out of eight children), whereas the true rate was 375 per 1000 (three out of eight). Yet the repetition of names in the baptism register would alert us to the deficiencies of burial registration for family reconstitution research, and we can derive correction ratios by expressing the number of first children of same-name pairs (three) as a proportion of such children found in the burial register (one).

The evidence that exists suggests that there was little significant change over time in the proportion of eligible families (those with dead children who bore a subsequent child of the same sex) who used same-name practices. I have conducted an analysis of the proportion of eligible families that gave same-names to their children for six of the Cambridge Group’s reconstitution parishes (Table 2). There is some increase in the early period and decline in the later one, but, for most of the parish register period, between a half and three-
quarters of all eligible families appear to have given their children the same name as a deceased child.

Evaluation of the same-name technique

There are two potential problems with the same-name method: first, some same-name children might have been alive at the same time; and, second, same-name cases might only be a sample of all burials, and therefore not necessarily representative of the total population.

There is fragmentary evidence that some same-name children who were both alive simultaneously did exist, but this is based on ambiguous information in wills and other sources for the period before the middle of the seventeenth century. More reliable evidence in monumental inscriptions suggests that an elder sibling’s name was only given to a second child when the first child with the same name had died. For example, the brass memorial erected in 1414 in St Mary’s Church, Beddington, Surrey to Philippa Carew, depicted half effigies (indicating death) of seven brothers, Guy, John, John, John, William, William, and six sisters, Eleanor, Lucy, Agnes, Agnes, Margaret and Anne. An even clearer example is to be found in the Millner family, who erected a monument to Isaac Millner in 1713: ‘In a Vault beneath this Monument, lieth the Body of Isaac Millner, late of London, Merchant ... he had Issue six Sons and four Daughters, Isaac, who lieth in the Parish Church of Stepney, Godfrey, Copley, Copley, Elizabeth, Isaac and Jane who lie buried in the same Vault with him, and Anne, Isaac and Godfrey who survived him ... he lived only to his forty-sixth year ... [dying] 12th August 1713.’

The study of monumental inscriptions and other sources should help clarify same-name practices in sixteenth and seventeenth century England. For the late seventeenth century it is possible to examine more systematically the question of living same-name siblings through the study of various enumerations, mainly taken under the 1695 Marriage Duty Act. An examination of 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Number of eligible cases</th>
<th>Percentage using same names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1541–1600</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>50.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601–1650</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651–1700</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>72.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701–1750</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1751–1800</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801–1837</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Original reconstitution schedules for Aldenham, Bridford, Austrey, Dawlish, Hartland and Colyton kindly provided by the Cambridge Group.
census-type lists for Goodnestone, Kent (1676), Clayworth, Nottinghamshire (1676 and 1688), the City of London (1695), Melbourne, Derbyshire (1695), St Mary’s, Southampton (1695 and 1696), Lyme Regis, New Romney, Kent (1696 and 1699), Dorset (1696, 1698 and 1703), Lichfield, Staffordshire. (1697), Swindon, Wiltshire. (1697 and 1702), and Wanborough, Wiltshire. (1697 and 1702), reveals no cases of living full same-name siblings. The same is true of the 45 parishes covered by the census/baptism register research summarised at the beginning of this article. From these the names of 10,954 people were selected from the household schedules of the 1851 Census, and found to include no living full same-name cases. In most of these censuses there are references to step-brothers and step-sisters sharing the same forename, but these can be recognised by their different surnames. Also, in the nineteenth century there are cases of living siblings sharing one common forename (for example, Edward James and Edward George), but no cases have come to light where full forenames are identical. It is therefore important for same-name research that only siblings who share the same parents and have identical names are selected for study.

The problem of the representativeness of the same-name sample is more difficult to assess. The technique requires at least two or more baptisms per family, leading to the exclusion of families with only one child. This is not likely to be a major problem, but the method also cannot be applied to unregistered baptisms or to births not resulting in baptism. This is likely to lead to an underestimation of the number of unregistered burials, as there was probably some correlation between unregistered births and deaths in individual families. Although insufficient research has been carried out to allow firm conclusions to be drawn, first same-name children probably represented about ten per cent of all baptisms, and a quarter of all child burials. It is possible partly to check the representativeness of this same-name sample by cross-matching reconstitution and census data where the latter are available. I have conducted pilot reconstitution research on 11 parishes in the City of London, linked to the published and indexed London 1695 Marriage Duty Act enumeration list. The cross-matching of the enumeration with reconstitution data was facilitated by the genealogical work of Percival Boyd, who compiled 238 volumes of family histories for London inhabitants, covering a total of 59,389 family groups, mainly for the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Boyd used parish registers, guild records, wills and a whole miscellany of sources to create a ‘total reconstitution sample’, which represents a remarkable demographic and genealogical database.

The starting point of the cross-matching procedure is to assess the accuracy of the 1695 enumeration list. Jones and Judges in their classic study of the Marriage Duty Act enumeration for the City of London compared the information in the enumeration with that contained in the 1666 Hearth Tax, the 1673 Eighteen Months’ Tax and the 1678 Poll Tax, and concluded that ‘the 1695 assessment was, almost throughout the City conducted with more diligence and with fuller results than was usual in the period’. This conclusion is confirmed by Gregory King’s post-enumeration survey carried out in 1696.
Note: ‘TW’ – families listed as owning taxable wealth; ‘No TW’ – families listed as not owning taxable wealth. The main form of wealth listed was the ownership of personal estate worth £600 or more, although other categories of wealth-owners were also included.

Source: Data for the study of same names was taken from Boyd’s database lodged in the library of the Society of Genealogists. Eleven parishes were selected: St Christopher-le-Stocks; St Edmund, Lombard Street; St Michael, Cornhill; St Mary, Woolnoth; All Hallow, Bread Street; St Mary, Aldermanbury; St Martin, Outwick; St Helen, Bishopgate; St Michael, Pat. Royal; St John, Walbrook; St James, Duke Place; St Antholin. Information on families with listed taxable wealth and unburied children was obtained by comparing Boyd’s data with that in the 1695 Marriage Duty enumeration list: see D. Glass ed., London inhabitants within the walls, (London, 1965).

of two London parishes, St Benet and St Peter, Paul’s Wharf. He found that about 5 per cent of cases were missing in St Benet and approximately 9 per cent in St Peter, Paul’s Wharf. David Glass concluded from his work on Gregory King’s figures that 10 per cent for the whole of London was not an unreasonable estimate of the degree of under-enumeration in 1695. The London returns include the names of nearly all children and their relationship to the head of household, facilitating the linkage between the returns and associated parish registers.

The next stage in the research is to trace children not listed in the burial register but baptised less than ten years before the date of the enumeration. The method assumes that children under ten not found in the enumeration list or burial register (but with families still living and enumerated in the parish) had died and not been registered in the burial register. This is subject to the qualification of the under-enumeration of living children (which as we have seen was, according to Glass, of the order of ten per cent). This cross-matching exercise yields an estimate of the proportion of children not registered in the burial register, and this can be compared to the ratios derived from same-name research. For the London pilot sample data, we can compare the burial registration experiences of those listed as owning or not owning wealth eligible for extra taxation under the 1695 Marriage Duty Act (Table 3).

Table 3 Burial registration accuracy among children in London, 1681–1709

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TW</th>
<th>No TW</th>
<th>TW</th>
<th>No TW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number found</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number not found</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage found</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children baptised with same</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>names and traced in burial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>register</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unburied children traced in</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the enumeration list</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ‘TW’ – families listed as owning taxable wealth; ‘No TW’ – families listed as not owning taxable wealth. The main form of wealth listed was the ownership of personal estate worth £600 or more, although other categories of wealth-owners were also included.

Source: Data for the study of same names was taken from Boyd’s database lodged in the library of the Society of Genealogists. Eleven parishes were selected: St Christopher-le-Stocks; St Edmund, Lombard Street; St Michael, Cornhill; St Mary, Woolnoth; All Hallow, Bread Street; St Mary, Aldermanbury; St Martin, Outwick; St Helen, Bishopgate; St Michael, Pat. Royal; St John, Walbrook; St James, Duke Place; St Antholin. Information on families with listed taxable wealth and unburied children was obtained by comparing Boyd’s data with that in the 1695 Marriage Duty enumeration list: see D. Glass ed., London inhabitants within the walls, (London, 1965).
The overall percentages of under-registered children are similar under both methods, with 37 to 38 per cent missing among those not listed as owning taxable wealth, and 28 to 32 per cent not found among the group listed with taxable wealth.33 The larger percentage of unregistered burials amongst those listed as not owning taxable wealth is what one would expect from common sense, and the similarity of the findings of the two methods gives a degree of credence to both, although further research is still needed.

Of 37 eligible same-name children not found in the burial register, none could be found in the Marriage Duty assessment listing, confirming the validity of the assumption that a missing same-name case is equivalent to an unregistered burial. Also, there were no living same-name cases among the total of 1,253 children included in the sample, giving further support to the conclusion that the practice of giving the same name to living children did not exist at the end of the seventeenth century. Finlay found 258 same-name cases in his study of four London parishes during the period 1580–1650, of which only 149 (58 per cent) could be found in the burial register.34 He assumed some cases were untraceable in the burial register on account of being living same-name siblings, but the evidence discussed above suggests the probability that all missing same-name cases were the result of burial under-registration.

A further check on the validity of the same-name ratios is to apply them to the uncorrected infant and child mortality rates found from the cross-matching of Boyd’s reconstitution schedules with the information in the 1695 enumeration list (Table 4). This produces a figure of 334 per 1,000 for the infant mortality rate. John Landers has independently estimated that infant mortality in London at the end of the seventeenth century was at least 360 per 1000.35 Given that the estimate reported in Table 4 excludes mortality before baptism, the figure of 334 per 1000 is therefore plausible. Also, according to the London Bills of Mortality, child burials under the age of two represented about 60 per cent of baptisms in the period 1728–1739, suggesting that the estimated infant and child mortality rates in Table 4 are within the expected range.36 Our provisional conclusion from examining all the data is that the same-name method is reasonably accurate in measuring burial under-registration, but only much larger samples and additional evidence will allow a proper assessment of the method.37

A range of other sources does exist to allow further evaluation of the quality of parish registers. For example, many poor law authorities listed the burials of paupers paid for by them, and it is possible to examine whether these burials were registered in the parish register. Lyn Boothman in a study of 52 pauper burials in the parish of Long Melford in Suffolk, found that only 34 (65 per cent) were listed in the parish register.38 Likewise, a study that I carried out on the two parishes of Whitchurch and Folkestone indicates that between 10.1 and 22.1 per cent of pauper burials went unregistered in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.39

At the other end of the socio-economic spectrum, it is possible to compare
information in wills with that in parish registers. Lyn Boothman found that of 97 people leaving wills in Long Melford in the period 1559–1610, 20 (21 per cent) could not be found in the burial register. I have also conducted a study of wills on a sample of 200 cases for Staffordshire, which has a burial index covering all parish registers in the county for the period 1538–1837. The proportion of wills which could not be traced in the burial index fell from 42.6 per cent in 1538–1649 to 27.3 per cent in 1650–1749 and 17.5 per cent in 1750–1837, suggesting that burial registration (at least for the will-making population) may have improved during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

Data on wills and pauper burials are widely available, and could form the basis of a comprehensive study of the reliability of burial information used in reconstitution studies. I examined 124 wills for people resident in Colyton in the period 1554–1773, and found that 35 (28.1 per cent) could not be traced in the parish register. Likewise, of 81 wills registered for people resident in Hartland in the period 1598–1793, 15 (19 per cent) could not be located in the burial register. It is possible that some of these residents were buried outside their parish of residence, but reconstitution studies do not allow for this to be taken into account.

I have also analysed the proportion of same-name cases unregistered in the burial registers of nine of the Cambridge Group’s reconstitution parishes, using reconstitution schedules provided by the Group and relying entirely on their identification of same-names. These parishes were selected for the high quality of their registers, and therefore should have fewer unregistered burials than the average parish register. The results (Table 5) indicate that burial registration in these reconstitution parishes was significantly deficient in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries but gradually improved throughout the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century (the omission rate declined from 34 to 27 per cent). This was followed by a period of overall stability for the rest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4 Corrected infant and child (1-4) mortality rates, London 1681–1709</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infants</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of baptisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Children aged 1–4</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of children (aged 1–4) at risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child burials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>733</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Boyd’s database lodged in the library of the Society of Genealogists.
Table 5  Analysis of burial registration of same-name siblings in nine reconstitution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Total same-name</th>
<th>Burials not found</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1538–1599</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600–1649</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650–1699</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700–1749</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750–1799</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800–1837</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The nine parishes are Colyton, Hartland, Aldenham, Dawlish, Ansty, Bridford, Ecleshall, March and Shepshed. The original data were kindly provided by the Cambridge

of the eighteenth century and the early nineteenth century. This pattern is not dissimilar to that found from the comparison of wills with burial registers, although in the case of the latter, levels were somewhat higher than those found from the same-name method, a pattern that may be the result of the reconstitution sample containing higher quality registers. Also, in future research it will be important to study neighbouring parish registers, in order to measure the proportion of missing same-name cases due to burial outside the parish of baptism.

Conclusion

The evidence reviewed in this paper suggests that the same-name method is a reliable way of measuring burial registration accuracy, and can be applied to parish registers from the sixteenth century onwards. More research will be needed on the earlier period, analysing monumental inscriptions and other sources, to assess whether any living siblings shared the same name. However, the evidence from local censuses from the late seventeenth century onwards indicates that same-names were only given to children where a sibling of the same sex had died previously. The same-name method is suitable for the evaluation of most burial registers, but requires a study of infant and child mortality in individual families, and therefore is not suitable for an assessment of the adequacy of the registration of adult burials.

In order to check the validity of same-name correction ratios, research will be required on a number of other available sources, using the method of ‘triangulation’. The analysis of late seventeenth century data for the City of London in this paper illustrates the method. Same-name research yields correction ratios very similar to those derived from the comparison of censuses with parish registers, and that these ratios yield rates of mortality comparable to those derived from the London Bills of Mortality and other sources.
Information on wills and pauper burials is available for many parishes, and a number of local enumerations have survived for the late seventeenth century and census data are universally available for all parishes after 1841. Application of the same-name method to reconstitution data suggests that burial registration of children improved gradually throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, reaching a steady plateau in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Evidence from wills suggests that burial registration of adults also improved after the sixteenth century, a pattern not dissimilar to that found from same-name research. Taken along with earlier findings on the adequacy of baptism registers, this evidence indicates that both Krause and Wrigley and Schofield were wrong in thinking that parish registration collapsed between 1795 and 1820. The research reviewed in this paper suggests that the quality of parish registration improved during the seventeenth century but was essentially stable during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, with between one fifth and one third of all births and deaths being omitted during the parish register period. However, much more work on both baptism and burial registration is necessary before any final conclusions can be considered valid.
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APPENDIX

In order to help standardise same-name research, I have drawn up some simple rules derived from my own reconstitution work on infant and child mortality. The research requires the reconstitution of families from birth/baptism through to the burial of family members. The family is assumed to come into observation at the birth/baptism of their first listed child, and leave observation at the date of the last recorded event (either birth/baptism or burial) of a family member.

1. For a child to be included in the list of births/baptisms:
   a. the birth/baptism entry should include the names of both parents,
   b. there should be independent evidence of the family’s continued residence in the parish for at least one year after the date of birth/baptism (e.g. the baptism of a younger sibling or the burial of a parent or sibling).

2. Children should be excluded when:
   a. children are born/baptised on the same day (unless specified as twins),
   b. children are known to be more than one year old at the date of baptism.
3. For the burial of a child to be included in the analysis:
   a. the names of the child and at least one parent should be the same as
      that listed in the baptism register, or
   b. the name of the child should be the same as that in the baptism
      register and there should be an indication in the burial register that
      the child is an infant or a child.

4. For a child to be counted as a same-name case, the second child should
   have exactly the same Christian names(s) as the first and be born to the
   same parents.
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Introduction

This article analyses the operation of the nineteenth century censuses by means of a case study of one occupational grouping: the retailers of alcoholic drinks. It aims to highlight, as Michael Anderson has recently written, ‘the importance of understanding the procedures through which the personal and family situations of individuals were transformed into the statistics of the published volumes, mediated as these were by the responses of individual householders, and by the activities of the enumerators, registrars, superinten- dent registrars, and the central Census Office staff’. Further, by relating the evidence of the censuses to a range of other sources for the drink trade it seeks to illuminate some of the wider complexities of occupational analysis.

The case study uses data on drink retailers abstracted from the published census reports and from the census enumerators’ books (hereafter CEBs) covering the borough of Bradford, West Yorkshire for the censuses of 1841, 1851 and 1891. In addition, information on the trade was drawn from trade directories, the detailed reports in newspapers of the annual licensing (brewster) sessions, police registers of licensed victuallers and beerhouse keepers, plus maps, plans and the title deeds to public-house properties. (Rate books were a further possible source, but they have not survived for Bradford.) This work was originally undertaken as part of a study of the history of the public house over some two centuries, to which the reader is invited to turn for the fuller context. For that history Bradford was chosen as a useful case study for two essential reasons. First, it embodied one of the key transformations of modern society in its growth from a small town at the close of the eighteenth century to a great industrial city by the middle of the nineteenth. Second, whilst on the one hand it was a noted centre of the temperance movement – the first Temperance Society in England was founded there in 1830 – and thus at the heart of the great nineteenth century debate on the ‘drink question’, on the other it was not an atypically drunken place. In fact its leading citizens liked to point out its relative sobriety, citing, for example, at the beginning and end of the period under review here, favourable statistics of drunkenness compared to other towns. Thus, whilst
Drink retailing and the licensing system

It will already be clear that the retailer of drink appeared under a variety of designations. Looking at the institutions of drink retailing themselves, there existed by the close of the eighteenth century a fairly clear hierarchy. At the top were the principal coaching inns of a town, alternatively called hotels, distinguished by the scale of their accommodation and their role in long and short-distance coach transport. The latter function, however, was increasingly being superseded from the 1830s with the growth of the rail network. Below them, of varying sizes, were the generality of public houses or taverns, as trade directories, for example, classify them. One should not, however, think of any necessarily clear divide between the two groupings; public houses generally provided food, accommodation and stabling and in property sales the term ‘inn or public house’ was commonly used to describe them. The proprietors of all these places were variously known as hotel- or inn-keepers, (licensed) victuallers or publicans. The older term of ‘alehouse’ was by this time often used pejoratively for ‘low’ (in contemporary parlance), possibly unlicensed, establishments, though it was also still used to describe the form of the licence itself. In addition, some spirit retailers also provided facilities for consumption on the premises in gin, dram or spirit shops, as they were variously known, though it should be noted that public houses also opened such ‘shops’ in part, or as the whole, of their establishment.

In order to trade, all of the above required a licence granted annually by local magistrates sitting in special brewster sessions. However, from 1830 a further branch was added to the retail drink trade when the Beerhouse Act of that year permitted the sale of beer without the requirement of a licence from the justices, a payment to the Excise sufficing. These new outlets were variously known as beerhouses or beershops and their proprietors as keepers of same or as beersellers or retailers of beer. From 1834 a distinction was created between the sale of beer on or off the premises, the fee for the latter costing less, which adds a further complication since in the sources it is often unclear which type of establishment it is. In Bradford these off-licences appear to have been relatively uncommon until the 1860s and they have been excluded from this study. After almost forty years of this free trade in beer the law was changed in 1869 to require beerhouses to obtain a justices’ licence like those establishments selling all types of drink. But they remained a distinct type of public house, clearly recognized as such both in law and by contemporaries, limited still to selling beer. For the most part too they remained, as they had been from their creation, more modest establishments than their fully-licensed counterparts.

The focus of the analysis

The main focus of the analysis will be on the censuses of 1851 and 1891, but a shorter look at that of 1841 will serve as a useful foretaste. The census of 1851
was chosen because of the greater amount of information which it contained relevant to the general study of the retailers than its predecessor, notably of course with regard to relationships within the household and to place of birth. But further (and relevant to the inquiry here) 1851 allowed a test of the issue of dual occupations, which was facilitated also by the existence of a reliable contemporary commercial directory. The census of 1891 was chosen partly as it is the most recent to which access to the CEBs is currently permitted. However, it also permits us to examine some of the effects of the changes in the world of drink and the public house developing from the 1870s. These included: the restrictive nature of licensing policy after 1869, the more purely social role which the public house came to play in society, changing patterns of working-class expenditure, not least on alternative forms of leisure, and changes within the drink industry itself as brewing companies increasingly became dominant. Finally, the opportunity was taken to test the value of the new question on employment status introduced in that year.

The area covered in the study was the same in each census year, comprising the parliamentary borough of Bradford created under the provisions of the Reform Act of 1832, which in turn formed the boundary of the new municipal borough of 1847. Figure 1 shows the borough area and the four townships of Bradford, Bowling, Horton and Manningham from which it was formed. Although the borough itself was subsequently twice enlarged, it was possible
Table 1  Drink retailers in Horton, 1841

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Census</td>
<td>Other Local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beershop keeper etc.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel and Innkeeper</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publican and Victualler</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 1841 Census of Great Britain, Occupation abstract Part 1, BPP 1844 XXVII, 1-, 234; CEBs and other local Horton material cited in text.

also to cover the original area for the census of 1891.7

The 1841 foretaste

In the published census report for 1841 the Occupation Abstract provided totals for, respectively, ‘beer-shop-keeper’, ‘hotel and inn-keeper’, ‘publican and victualler’ and ‘spirit-merchant’, all in turn subsumed under a general heading of ‘tavern-keeper’.8 Looking at those categories there appears to be an attempt at classification, distinguishing the new retailers under the 1830 Act and drawing a distinction between hotels and inns on the one hand and the generality of public houses on the other. With ‘spirit merchant’ it is not clear whether those individuals necessarily held an on-licence, though putting them with other ‘tavern-keepers’ might be taken to imply that. There is, however, an element of doubt on that point as there was no separate grouping of wine merchants whereas there was one for porter and ale merchants. As the Bradford evidence shows that in fact few spirit merchants took out an on-licence they have been excluded here.

These then were the designations into which the temporary clerks at the Census Office had to classify the occupations as they saw them in the CEBs for the purpose of producing aggregate statistics. Since we too can look at those CEBs it should be possible to examine that process. Unfortunately in 1841 the published occupational statistics were only given for two of the four constituent townships of the borough of Bradford, and for one of them, Bradford township, part of another township, not in fact in the borough area, was included. That leaves just Horton township for which a direct comparison is possible.

For this township the data from the CEBs and the published statistics match exactly, which indicates that the clerk did his job conscientiously. The left-hand column of Table 1 shows the figure for each designation. The problem
comes when one asks how accurately this reflects the reality of the trade in Horton. Drawing upon the several sources noted above, it is clear that the terms innkeeper, publican and (licensed) victualler were used interchangeably. None of the establishments in Horton could in fact be described as a principal inn or hotel. Moreover, five of those publicans and one innkeeper were in fact beerhouse keepers, keen no doubt to raise the status of their calling. This has the effect of grouping together in the published statistics markedly different establishments. ‘Publican’, for example, includes both Margaret Reaney, the proprietor of the George Hotel, an imposing coaching inn in Market Street, a principal thoroughfare in the centre of Bradford itself, and Jacob Dawson, the landlord of a two-room beerhouse in a little street in one of the poorest parts of the town.9 Finally, two public houses which certainly did exist in 1841, one of which – the King’s Arms at Great Horton – could lay claim to being the most important in the township, went unrecorded in the census as their respective landlords, who appear as such in a contemporary commercial directory, chose rather to give their other occupations of butcher and stonemason.10 In sum then a more accurate portrayal of the retail drink trade in Horton is shown in the right-hand column of Table 1.

Although one cannot of course read too much into a very small example indeed, the nature of the discrepancy revealed in Horton has some bearing on the differences evident in the total figures for England and Wales between the statistics of the published census report and those for on-licences held. That comparison is shown in Table 2. The much larger figure of on-licences held must be related to the failure of the CEBs to record instances of drink retailing in the way demonstrated. The gap between the number of beer on-licences and the census figure for the keepers of such establishments must also partly be explained in this way, but must mainly be due to beershop keepers being designated as innkeepers, publicans or victuallers. Two points thus emerge from this introductory look at the census of 1841: first the published statistics present a potentially misleading picture of the nature of the retail drink trade, and second they show a marked underestimate of its extent.

The 1851 census

Turning now to the census of 1851 these problems will be explored in more detail. Beginning again with the published reports, a more systematic classification was attempted with the introduction of ‘classes’ and ‘sub-classes’, later to be called ‘orders’ and ‘sub-orders’, the general principles of which were followed down to 1911.11 This now placed innkeepers in sub-class 1, (‘boarding and lodging’) of class VI, (‘persons engaged in entertaining, clothing and performing personal offices for man’). Licensed victuallers and beershop keepers were brought together in sub-class 2, (‘drinks and stimulants’) of class XIII, (‘persons working and dealing in matters derived from the vegetable kingdom’) with no mention of publicans. The census authorities were aware of the problems of this separation, noting in the published report that, in practice, it was not easy to distinguish the two groups.12 The report gives for the borough of Bradford a total of 101 innkeepers and 135 licensed victuallers and beershop keepers. These figures included both males and
females; separate figures were given for the wives of both the innkeepers and the licensed victuallers and beershop keepers, the census thus acknowledging their essential contribution to this particular trade.  

Turning again from the reports to the householder and the enumerator, who began the process, no particular advice was given to either party with regard to these occupations. As was the case in 1841, so in 1851 there seems to have been an element of interchangeability. Enumeration district 46 in Bradford East, for example, contained three fully-licensed houses, the Wharf, the Ring of Bells and the Church Steps, of more or less the same size and type of provision, yet whose proprietors are recorded respectively as hotel keeper, innkeeper and victualler. Similarly, the district also contained the various designations of retailer of beer, beer seller and beerhouse keeper. As was also demonstrated with 1841 the way the occupation was described might obscure the true nature or scale of the business. In the borough as a whole 19 individuals known from other sources to be keepers of beerhouses appear in the CEBS as innkeepers, around 15 per cent of the total in the beer trade, probably

Table 2  Comparative licensing and published census statistics: England and Wales, 1841, 1851, 1891

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Licensing statistics</th>
<th>Census statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full on-licences</td>
<td>Hotel- and inn-keepers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beer only</td>
<td>Publican and victuallers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beershop keepers</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Licensing statistics</th>
<th>Census statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full on-licences</td>
<td>Innkeepers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beer only</td>
<td>Victuallers/beershops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Licensing statistics</th>
<th>Census statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full on-licences</td>
<td>Inn-keeper/publican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beer only</td>
<td>Beerseller/ale etc. dealer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:  
indicating an aspiration to a higher status. There are examples of beerhouses that also functioned as lodging houses, like the White House Inn in Hardcastle Lane, situated in a relatively poor area near the parish church, whose proprietors are returned as innkeepers. But there are others who are not. The same point applies to those beerhouse keepers who hoped to obtain a full on-licence. William Brayshaw, for example, had built premises in Southgate expressly with that in mind and is recorded as an innkeeper, but others similarly hopeful were not.

A further point to note is the possibility that the enumerator, in copying the occupational details from the individual householder’s schedule into his enumeration book, went beyond his instruction merely to correct misstatements and instead standardized them. If one looks, for example, at an enumeration district particularly well-supplied with drinking places, number 25 in Bradford West, this contained three fully-licensed houses, all of whose proprietors appear in the CEB as ‘licensed victualler’ (compare the designations reported above in enumeration district 46). Similarly, the ten individuals in the beer trade are all designated as ‘beer seller’, though one at least ran a music hall - the 2,000-seat Colosseum in Westgate. In enumeration district 9, also in Bradford West, the proprietors of the three fully-licensed houses and two beerhouses are all recorded as innkeepers (one of the former actually an ‘assistant innkeeper’). However, whilst a suspicion of standardisation is reasonable here, where there were relatively few houses it is impossible to be certain. Overall, what is once again clear is that the published reports do not accurately reflect the nature of the trade in the town.

Before the schedules and the CEBs were passed to the Census Office in London further checking was done first by the local registrar and then by the regional superintendent registrar. Since both their signatures appear in the CEB, verifying the work therein, it is possible to see if any amendments were made by them. In fact, only three amendments were made to the occupation as recorded in the CEB. All were cases where it was given as ‘landlord’. In one case, where the handwriting looks like that of the registrar, ‘beerhouse keeper’ was added, possibly indicating local knowledge on his part. In another case – that of the Shoulder of Mutton Inn – ‘landlord’ was replaced by ‘innkeeper’ and ‘Inn Wife’ added to the wife’s name. In the third, ‘Landlord of Swan’ was amended to ‘publican’ (in fact a beerhouse). The latter two amendments would seem to have been the work of the census clerks: first because the handwriting does not appear to match that of any of the other hands in the CEB and second because they would have helped to facilitate classification and counting. The Shoulder of Mutton Inn was described as such on the CEB and thus, logically, the clerk corrected ‘landlord’ to the category ‘innkeeper’. In the second case the correction was a little less logical since, as we saw, ‘publican’ did not appear separately in the published statistics as it did in 1841. However, it is clear from the Bradford example that publicans were included in the same sub-class as the licensed victuallers and beershop keepers. The clerks were probably, therefore, instructed to abstract them together, in the way they were to do for later censuses, though unfortunately
there is no surviving instruction book for the 1851 census.20

For the census clerks, therefore, these particular occupations did not present much difficulty as they worked their way through the enumerators’ books. An innkeeper was an innkeeper and so on. There are, however, two further considerations which the clerks had to keep in mind: what to do with the retired and how to treat second occupations. Both have a bearing on the inquiry here. Given that the underlying organising concept of the occupational data – the nature of materials worked upon – was to facilitate, in conjunction with statistics of mortality, the creation of occupational life-tables, the aim being to show the effects of particular kinds of work on health and life expectancy, the retired were included in the occupational totals.21 In the borough of Bradford 11 individuals in the trade were described as ‘retired’, with a further one as ‘late’ and another as ‘formerly’. Although the instructions to householders mention only the first designation it seems safe to assume both were included in the overall total. Logically, too, the single individual described as ‘no business insolvent publican’ would be counted in the occupational totals. However, from the point of view of one wishing to analyse the retail drink trade, these people were of course no longer in it. This is the main way in which the published statistics inflate the actual number of retailers. One other example tending to overstatement is relatively minor. It seems likely that three women selling table beer would also have been counted with the beershop keepers. But this was weaker beer, which could not be sold in quantities of less than four and a half gallons, so that it was in effect for off sale only.22

The effect of second occupations, in contrast, was to underestimate the numbers in the business, this more than counter-balancing the effect described in the previous paragraph. The instructions to householders stated that ‘a person following more than one distinct trade may insert them in the order of their importance’. The enumerator received the same instruction, with examples. That the census authorities were alive to the great incidence of second, or dual, occupations is clear. They made a check of it in relation to farmers, which showed that in England and Wales nearly 23,000 cited another occupation, of whom 3,434 were inn- or beershop-keepers. As a rule, however, as the published report indicates, it was the first occupation recorded which was ‘generally’ taken for statistical purposes.23 Among drink retailers in Bradford there were 24 instances where another occupation was listed first, thus excluding drink retailing itself from the totals. Yet the persons certainly ran drinking establishments. Notable, for example, is the case of the New Inn, in the centre of Bradford, whose landlord Henry Brown had his first occupation recorded as woolstapler, but whose substantial premises employed six live-in servants. They were supervised no doubt by Henry’s wife and widowed sister-in-law, but only the latter has an occupation – ‘housekeeper’ – recorded. The name of the house was included in the CEB itself for the clerk to see, but one can only assume that the instructions led to this being ignored. Certainly there is no amendment to indicate otherwise. In just one case where the husband gave ‘publican’ as a second occupation was the wife recorded as a ‘public house keeper’ in her own right and thus presumably counted as such.
For fully-licensed houses this problem of under-recording is relatively easily corrected, as in almost half the cases, as with the New Inn, the CEB gives the name of the house. This is much less true of the beerhouses. Using other local sources it is possible to identify 110 fully-licensed houses in the 1851 CEBs. In fact, there were just five more full on-licenses in existence in that year and these were spirit shops where the proprietor did not live on the premises and thus did not appear in the CEB. To assess the extent of under-recording of beerhouses a comparison was made with a contemporary commercial directory, the second such venture by a local printer, publisher and stationer.24 These directories are likely to provide more comprehensive coverage of commercial trades because their primary function was to advertise services.25 This particular directory listed 178 beer retailers for the borough area of Bradford. Taking all instances where a beerhouse is identifiable in the CEBs, including second occupations and a small number of examples where it was mentioned in the description of the enumeration district or noted on the page of the CEB but where the occupation is not recorded as such for the householder, it was possible to identify a total of 131.

How can one reconcile the discrepancy between the two sources? Some of it is to be found within the directory itself. One individual is listed both among the ‘inns, hotels and taverns’, which comprised the fully-licensed houses, and among the beer retailers, though the premises were actually fully-licensed. Four other beer retailers in fact had full licences, though two had but recently been granted them and a further two had theirs suspended for a year, although they had continued to trade selling only beer.26 In a further case a husband and wife are listed separately as beer retailers at the same house. For the bulk of the discrepancy, however, a comparison was made between entries in the directory and those in the CEBs. Of course one would not expect a complete match on the grounds of chronology alone. The directory was published in 1850 after a period for compilation and printing, and the census was carried out in March of 1851. Thus the directory lists Mary Dunn at the Bermondsey Hotel, though the licence had in fact been refused at the September 1849 brewster sessions.27 By the census she was trading as a beer seller at the Colosseum music hall mentioned earlier. Entries in the directory were matched with those in the CEBs using a name index to the census to find individuals with dual occupations but who did not cite beer-retailing in the census.28 There were 29 instances where the address matched exactly or where other evidence, such as the later police registers of beerhouse keepers, showed that they kept a beerhouse. Where the husband had a dual occupation it was likely that the wife ran the beerhouse, but only in one instance does the CEB record that fact. Directories, therefore, are a more reliable indicator of the extent of beerhouse-keeping.

In conclusion, Table 3 summarizes the figures from the various sources. As in 1841 so in the 1851 census, the published statistics present a misleading picture of the nature of the retail trade and underestimate its extent. Further, from the 1851 example it is clear that the CEBs too do not give a full picture. This underestimation is again illustrated if one looks at the statistics of licences held nationally in Table 2. Even if, which was certainly not the case, the whole
of the 6,905 wine and spirit merchants recorded in the published statistics had taken out an on-licence, this would still leave a gap of 19,202 between the published census statistics and those of licensing.

The 1891 census

In the census of 1891 Table 2 shows the problem remained, although the difference was now less marked. It will immediately be seen that the census authorities had again altered the system of classification. The innkeepers, hotel keepers and publicans together formed sub-order 1, (‘board and lodging’) of order 16, (‘persons working and dealing in food and lodging’). In this group the clerks were also instructed to count licensed victuallers and hotel- or inn-landlords and -landladies, proprietors and managers. Sub-order 2 covered ‘spiritious drinks’ and included the occupations noted above – beersellers etc. and wine and spirit merchants and agents – and in both cases it is impossible to determine the number of on-licences among them.29 There is, however, no doubt that the census figures still underestimated the on-licensed retail trade. To demonstrate that point the details of known publican households were again abstracted from the CEBs. Using the other kinds of evidence noted earlier, and aided in this by the fact that from 1869 beerhouse keepers had also to obtain a licence from the justices, it was possible to account for all the licensed premises. This revealed 22 beerhouses of a total of 287 where that occupation was not in fact recorded for the householder as in the directory comparison made for 1851. For example Richard Clark, the licensee of the Eastbrook Hotel, Adolphus Street, was entered in the census as a contractor. It seems likely that the beerhouse was in fact run by his wife Ann (only widows, or more rarely single women, were granted licences in their own right), his son who was described as a ‘tapster’ and a live-in servant. Second occupations would, as before, account for some of the difference. The clerks were now instructed to select what appeared to be ‘the main or most important one’ but ‘if there be none such, the first of the several Occupations is to be selected, and the others are to be ignored’.30 It is not clear how this instruction would have been applied by the clerks, but 18 individuals in the Bradford CEBs are recorded with the alternative occupation first, some or all of whom would not therefore be counted for the occupation totals as drink retailers. Only in the case of the retired was there a significant change, removing the earlier effect of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census report</th>
<th>CEBs</th>
<th>Directory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innkeepers</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victuallers/beershops</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: See text.
inflating the number of retailers, in that they were now to be counted separately rather than included in the total for that occupation.31

Sufficient has already been said, it is to be hoped, on these points. Accordingly for the 1891 census the focus will instead be first on the long-term shift in the way that the occupation appeared in the CEBs and second on the new question on employment status introduced in that year. On the first point, notable among the fully-licensed houses was the decline in the use of the term ‘innkeeper’ between 1851 and 1891 from over two-thirds to little more than a quarter of licensees. ‘Licensed victualler’, accounting for some 30 per cent of cases, was now the most common designation. It seems likely on the one hand that this was linked to the decline of specifically ‘innkeeping’ functions, those concerned with transport, dining and accommodation, as a result of the growth of the railways and the arrival of restaurants and hotels.32 On the other it may also reflect the existence of a licensed victuallers’ society, first appearing in 1837 and becoming permanent from 1851.33 The keepers of beerhouses were now more likely than in 1851 (though not 1841) to be recorded as ‘innkeeper’ or ‘publican’, with just half of them in 1891 referring specifically to beer-retailing, which must be linked to self-perception. Finally of note is the new designation of ‘manager’ or more rarely ‘manageress’, usually linked to a trade term, as with John Tynan, the ‘manager of public house’ of the Washington Hotel off Westgate or Joseph Haley, the ‘brewers manager’ of the Black Horse Inn, Little Horton Lane. There were 20 of these and they accounted for 12 per cent of the fully-licensed houses. This largely reflected a new development in the trade as brewery companies replaced tenants with managers in some of their larger premises. The former paid rent to the company and were obliged to buy its products but retained the profits of the business, whilst the latter were salaried but also earned commission on the level of takings and were more directly responsible to the company.34 I say ‘largely’ reflected, because once again the issue is not clear cut. In the case of Francis Blake, the ‘hotel manager’ of the George in Market Street, the family actually owned the property.35

The above issue might be resolved by turning to the new question in the 1891 census relating to employment status. Of the managers 16 described themselves as ‘employed’ and all their premises were in fact either owned or leased by a brewery company. The only other ‘employer’ (in addition to Francis Blake of the George) was a free house in private (i.e. non-brewery) ownership.36 Of the remaining two houses, however, both brewery controlled, one manager is described both as employer and employed and the other has no entry at all. Since this new question was controversial at the time, it is worth looking at it in a little more detail. It had arisen out of new concerns in the 1880s about employment, which were given a full airing during the hearings of the 1890 Treasury Committee on the Census. Placing little trust in either the householders answering the questions or the temporary clerks processing the results, in fact a long-standing feature of the administration of the census, the General Register Office only very reluctantly accepted the new question.37
### Table 4  Employment status of drink retailers: England and Wales, 1891

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employers</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Working on own account</th>
<th>Others or no statement</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>66,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>28,630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** 1891 Census of England and Wales, Vol III, Ages, conditions as to marriage, occupations etc., BPP 1893–1894 CVI–I-, x–xxv. Table 5.

The new question asked householders to categorize themselves as ‘employer’, ‘employed’ or ‘neither employer nor employed’. Employer was defined as ‘a master employing under him workers in his trade or industry’. It did not refer to the employment of domestic servants. Married women assisting their husbands were to be entered as employed. In the event, the final report of the census claimed that the questions relating to employment status were misunderstood and the answers unusable. Consequently no meaningful analysis of them was made. Only the raw figures for each occupation for the whole country were given. Entries of ‘neither employer nor employed’ were counted as ‘working on own account’ in the published tables. A fourth figure of ‘others’ included persons who had made no cross at all in the appropriate column or who had made two or even three crosses. For the retail drink trade then Table 4 shows the proportions in each category in the whole of England and Wales. For this exercise the two principal employment groupings have been amalgamated. Although this will include in the beerseller etc. group, persons who did not in fact have an on-licence, this is counter-balanced by not including the wine and spirit merchant or agent group, which included a smaller proportion who did have one.

The figures clearly present a somewhat problematic picture. Those for females would seem to be quite unusable, not least as they must include both licensees in their own right and wives assisting their husbands. Looking solely at the males, the very nature of the trade in the late nineteenth century presents a particular problem of interpretation. By that time brewery control had advanced considerably. The Brewers’ Society estimated that 70 per cent of public houses were tied – bound that is to the exclusive purchase of a brewery company’s products – by 1886, though it is in fact difficult to be precise. The Bradford evidence suggests about half were tied through ownership or leasing by 1890 rising to three-quarters by the end of the century. And in Bradford certainly most of those landlords were tenants of the brewery company. The minority who were in fact salaried managers identified themselves in the census logically enough largely as employed. But what of the tenants? A total of 54 brewery tenants of fully-licensed houses were abstracted from the CEBs with the result presented in Table 5. It may be that the employment of staff explains the category which was chosen. The CEBs, however, record only live-
in servants, whereas these sorts of substantial public house would very likely have employed part-time staff. Certainly it is hard to believe that 23 of them who categorized themselves as other than an employer in fact employed no staff at all. There were also instances where there was a live-in servant but where the landlord is not recorded as an employer. But then of course the employment of purely domestic servants was excluded in the instructions to householders. One would expect, however, servants in a public house for all practical purposes to be employed in the trade. In six houses where the licensee owned the premises, all recorded live-in servants but only three were employers, two were neither employer nor employed and one managed to be both employer and neither employer nor employed. There is no need to labour the issue further. In the case of the licensed trade there would seem to be good grounds for regarding the figures of employment status as unusable.

Conclusion

What can one say then in conclusion? Some words of Peter Clark might seem apposite: ‘Occupations are like butterflies – fragile data highly vulnerable to the rough winds of documentation. The more anxiously we pursue them the more the real truth flutters away affected by seasonality and life-cycle, self-perception and sense of status, multiple economic activity, gender bias and a plurality of other methodological problems.”41 Much in this case study certainly supports that. More specifically one must first reiterate here the need to view with great caution the statistics of the published reports, which both markedly underestimate the extent of the nineteenth-century drink trade and present a misleading picture of its nature. Second, the case study demonstrates the need to study the census as a series of processes involving a number of different actors, from the census authorities, through to householders, enumerators, registrars, superintendent registrars, clerks and back to the authorities. Third, and finally, the study shows the importance of viewing the census both in its historical context and as one of a multiplicity of historical sources.
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Table 5  Employment status of selected brewery tenants: Bradford, 1891

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Neither employer nor employed</th>
<th>No information</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES

3. Bradford Observer, 28 October 1852 and 22 August 1895. Such statistics should of course be treated with caution. They may reveal as much about policing as about drunkenness.
6. Jennings, Public house in Bradford, 79–82. They were also known commonly as ‘tom and jerry’ shops, plus by other nicknames such as ‘sidley’ or ‘tiddlywink’ in various localities, though not in the CEBs examined here. For these nicknames see J. Wright, English dialect dictionary, 6 vols. (Oxford, 1898–1905).
14. Bradford Observer, 7 September 1837, for advertisement for the Wharf Hotel. Plan of Ring of Bells in conveyance of 12 May 1880, part of the title deeds to same held by Joshua Tetley and Son Ltd., Leeds, viewed with their permission for which thanks are due. Watercolour of Church Steps Inn by N. S. Crichton (1853–1913), Bradford Art Galleries and Museums.
17. E. Higgs, A clearer sense of the census. The Victorian censuses and historical research, (London, 1996), 15. 1851 Census of Great Britain, Forms and instructions etc., BPP 1851 XLII, 1–, 34.
19. On this question of who was responsible for annotations and alterations see M. Woollard, The classification of occupations in the 1881 census of England and Wales, (Colchester, 1999).
20. For an example of an instruction book from a later census see PRO RG 27/5, no. 69, 1881 Census of England and Wales. Instructions to the clerks employed in classifying the occupations and ages of the people.
28. Name index to the census of 1851 for Bradford, prepared by the Bradford Family History Society and held at Bradford Central Library.
29. PRO, 1881 Census of England and Wales. Instructions to the clerks, RG 27/5, no. 69; PRO, 1891 Occupation abstract sheet, RG 27/6, no. 50.
30. PRO, Instructions to the clerks employed in abstracting the occupations and ages of the people, RG 27/6, no. 61.
31. PRO, RG 27/6, no. 50.
34. Jennings, Public house in Bradford, 156–7 and 182, where the figure cited is actually 21 as included among them is one salaried ‘barman’.
35. Title deeds to former George, Market Street property held by Bradford Metropolitan District Council to whom thanks are due for permission to inspect them.
36. Brewery ownership or leasing was established in these instances from the title deeds to the properties and/or from the police registers of licensed victuallers, which form part of the records of the former Bradford borough police held at the Wakefield office of the West Yorkshire Archive Service, viewed with permission from the West Yorkshire police.
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Introduction

Family reconstitution is familiar to historical demographers as a technique for obtaining estimates of fertility within marriage which are ‘unbiased’ and reproductive history data with which to analyse birth intervals. The data are rendered ‘unbiased’ by the application of strict rules governing exactly which marriages are observed. Specifically, only completed marriages of couples who married in the Church of England are used. The ‘price’ of the unbiasedness is that the resulting fertility rates are based on the experience of only a minority of those who lived within the population to which they refer: the fertility of migrants and nonconformist, for example, is ignored.

In England, family reconstruction (FR) has, in the main, so far been applied to data for the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. For various reasons, discussed more fully in the next section of this paper, it has been less widely applied to nineteenth century data. For the period after 1850, the only examples we have found are Claire Jarvis’s study of three Essex parishes, and Barry Reay’s study of three parishes in Kent. The shortage of work on the period after 1850 is especially unfortunate since it was during the second half of the nineteenth century that marital fertility in England began its secular decline. There is currently a debate among demographers about the nature of this decline, and, in particular, about the extent to which it was due to ‘stopping’ behaviour (by which couples control their fertility once they have had their desired number of children) or to the use of birth spacing. In order to examine this further, it would be useful to have reproductive history data from the second half of the nineteenth century.

This paper will not try to resolve the debate. Its purpose is more modest: to show how data pertinent to the debate might be generated. We describe a method by which data from the census enumerators’ books (CEBs) can be used in conjunction with data from parish registers in an FR-like procedure.
Using this method, it is possible to obtain both unbiased estimates of marital fertility and reproductive histories for a set of couples who married in an area between 1841 and 1891 and who remained living in the area for some time after their marriage (though not necessarily until the death of one or other spouse). The method is quite simple, and can be applied to many English parishes. The addition of census data enables the fertility of a much greater fraction of marriages to be studied than is the case with FR, notably parts of the marriages of migrants.

The next section of the paper discusses some characteristics of nineteenth century parish record data, and suggests why FR has not generally been carried out for the post-1850 period. We then proceed to describe the proposed method, and to apply it to data from seven parishes in northern Hampshire. Next, we discuss the characteristics of the observed marriages and births, and present some of the results, including estimates of marital fertility for marriage cohorts of 1841–1861 and 1861–1890. Finally, we compare these estimates with those for certain other populations.

**Nineteenth century parish register data**

FR using nineteenth century parish register data (especially post-1850) faces several obstacles which either are not present, or are present to a lesser degree, in the better-quality parish registers of earlier centuries.

First, the increase in nonconformity and secularity led to a diminishing proportion of vital events being recorded in the Church of England registers. It is fairly clear that in urban areas, in much of Wales and in parts of northern England, a large proportion of births were not recorded in the baptism registers, suggesting that FR would be problematic for those areas. On the other hand, there is disagreement about the accuracy of baptism registers as a form of birth registration in rural areas elsewhere in England. Most studies of this issue have attempted to measure the proportion of births which went unrecorded in the baptism registers by cross-matching the baptism registers with data from the CEBs for censuses after 1851. In an early study of this type, Peter Razzell found great variability in the proportion of children who could not be found in the baptism registers of the parishes where they had, according to the CEB data, been born. His figures for parishes with less than 1,500 inhabitants ranged from less than 10 per cent to more than 30 per cent, with an average of about 25 per cent. A figure of 27 per cent was recently obtained in a study of seven small parishes in northern Hampshire. However, other studies have found far lower proportions. Claire Jarvis quotes a figure of between six and nine per cent for her Essex parishes, and figures of seven or eight per cent have been reported from the parish of Berwick St James in Wiltshire.

Moreover, there is evidence that some of those who were not baptised in their parishes of birth were children of single mothers who were temporarily
admitted to workhouses, and who consequently appear in the baptism registers of the parishes in which the workhouses were situated. In the baptism register of the Hampshire parish of Old Basing (which contained the Basingstoke Union workhouse), 17 per cent of the 1,708 children baptised between 1841 and 1891 were illegitimate, and the abode of most of these was stated to be the workhouse. However, in other parishes in the Basingstoke Union, fewer than 5 per cent of baptisms were of illegitimate children (for example 4.1 per cent of the 385 baptisms in Ellisfield and 4.6 per cent of the 285 baptisms in Nutley between 1841 and 1891). If this situation was common, then the baptism registers may not be so seriously deficient with respect to births within marriage as they appear to be for all births.

It seems, then, that although the baptism registers in southern and eastern England were sometimes seriously deficient as registers of births, this was not invariably the case. Whereas FR may clearly be carried out for the period after 1850, for it to be successful, a parish must have a baptism register which includes the vast majority of births.

There is in practice a second requirement. The parish must not suffer from a high degree of homonymy (large numbers of people with the same names). The nineteenth-century burial registers hardly ever give information about spouses or relatives of the deceased. Thus one of the links critical to FR, namely that between a burial and an entry in the marriage register, cannot be made reliably if a large proportion of the population has the same name. The difficulty of making this link is compounded by the fact that information about a woman’s age at marriage is, in many parishes, limited to whether or not she was ‘of full age’ (that is 21 years or over), so the age field cannot be used in the linking process. One way of getting round this problem is to use information from the CEBs to confirm the deaths (by looking, for example, to see if the surviving member of the putative couple appears in a subsequent census as a widow or widower), and ages at marriage.

If, however, the CEBs are to be used either to check the reliability of parish registers (a process which assumes that the CEBs are in some sense a ‘better’ source of data on births than are baptism registers, in that their coverage is superior) or to confirm parts of the FR process which the quality of nineteenth-century parish register data renders uncertain, why not incorporate them fully? It seems rather odd to use the CEBs to show that, say, ten per cent of births in a parish went unrecorded in the baptism register, and then to exclude the data which the CEBs reveal about those ten per cent when estimating fertility rates.

Yet neither of the two post-1850 studies mentioned earlier appears to have incorporated CEB data in this way. Jarvis’s study of Essex appears to rely on conventional FR, using the CEBs only for confirming the links made between register entries. Barry Reay, in his study of Kent, mentions the use of ‘total reconstitution’, and he certainly used CEB data to establish the occupations of bridegrooms and to provide ‘some added confirmation of births and deaths’.¹⁸
However, his description of the data he used for analysing marital fertility suggests that it was obtained using conventional FR. He certainly did not consider the marriages of those who migrated out of his parishes during the study period.

There seem to be two arguments in favour of carrying on with FR even into the era of the CEBs. The first is that the rules of FR mean that it produces ‘pure’, unbiased measures of the fertility of completed marriages. This is clearly true, but it does not follow that approaches incorporating other sources cannot be devised that will do the same. In this context, ‘unbiasedness’ simply means that the births in the numerator correspond to the exposed-to-risk in the denominator. Ensuring that this is the case is an actuarial exercise, not some kind of magic that only FR can perform.

Second, it has been argued that the results will only be comparable over time if the methods used in late nineteenth century studies are the same as those used in work on earlier periods. The most obvious response to this is to appeal to the uniqueness of the ‘pure’ or unbiased measures. If FR produces unbiased measures of fertility, then these must logically be comparable with unbiased measures of fertility produced by another method.

This objection cannot be dismissed quite so easily, though. Demographic measures which FR produces only relate to a subset of the population of any place, which may be described loosely as an immobile (or non-migratory) minority. Even if other approaches produce unbiased measures, they may not relate to the same subset of the population, and thus may not be comparable with measures based on the FR rules. The proposed method, however, starts from FR and then adds more data. The set of marriages observed in FR is a subset of those observed using the proposed approach, so results based on the ‘FR marriages’ can be generated quite easily if desired for comparative purposes.

The method

When studying marital fertility using FR, a subset of the marriages recorded in the Church of England registers for a particular parish is observed. This subset comprises marriages for which the deaths of both spouses are recorded at some later date in the burial register for the parish in question. It is assumed that the couples in these marriages resided in the parish throughout their married life, and hence that any children born to these marriages will be recorded in the parish baptism register during the intervening period. This restriction thus preserves the principle that the events in the numerator and the ‘exposed to risk’ in the denominator of demographic rates should correspond.

The proposed extension may best be described as augmenting the subset of marriages which are observed to include all those in which the couple remained living in the parish in which they married for some time after their marriage. The minimum period of residence which will allow a couple to be admitted to observation is that between the marriage and either the death of the first spouse to die, or the first census after the marriage (whichever of these is
Identification of period of observation for each marriage

The method used to identify the period of observation for each marriage involves several stages. It is described as if for a single parish, but it can be applied equally to contiguous groups of parishes.

1. The initial sample comprises all first marriages recorded in the marriage register between June 1841 (when the 1841 census was taken) and April 1891 (when the 1891 census was taken).

2. Each entry in the marriage register is compared with the burial register for the period between the date of the marriage and the next census. If an (apparently) matching entry is observed in the burial register, the CEB for the next census is searched to see if the surviving spouse appears as a widow. If so, the period of observation for that marriage is defined to be that between the date of marriage and the date of burial of the deceased spouse. If entries matching both spouses appear in the burial register, then, provided there is no record in the next census that could possibly refer to either spouse, we observe the marriage between the date of the marriage and the date of the earlier entry in the burial register.

3. The remaining entries in the marriage register are then linked to the CEB for the next census after each marriage. Those marriages in which both spouses appear in the CEB and are stated to be husband and wife are regarded as observed from the date of the marriage until the date of the immediately succeeding census.22

4. All marriages for which no period of observation is defined in stages 2 and 3 are eliminated from the sample.

5. For each marriage observed until the first census after the date of marriage, stages 2 and 3 are repeated, replacing the entry in the marriage register by the entries for husband and wife in the first census after their marriage. Attempts are made to match these ‘first census’ entries with entries in the burial register during the next intercensal interval and in the second census after the date of marriage. Application of this procedure identifies a period during the next intercensal interval for which each of these marriages is observed. All marriages for which such a period cannot be identified are regarded as observed only until the date of the first census after the marriage.

6. For each marriage observed in the second census after the date of marriage, stage 5 is repeated for the third and subsequent intercensal intervals, until the 1891 census is reached.

Application of this procedure produces, for a subset of the marriages recorded
in the register between June 1841 and April 1891, a continuous period of observation starting at the date of the marriage, and ending at one of two dates: the date of burial of the first spouse to die, or the date of the last successive census up to 1891 in which both spouses appear. Thus we have marriages which are either complete, or ‘right-censored’. Right-censoring is an important concept in the analysis of birth history data. When a marriage is right-censored it means that we only observe the first few years of the marriage. The marriage continues for an unknown further period after the couple passes out of our observation. Using such a sample of marriages will produce measures of fertility which can be compared with those obtained from FR provided that the censoring processes are independent of the childbearing process. There are two censoring processes at work in our sample: one is the arrival of the fixed date of 1891, and the second is migration out of the parish. The first of these may be assumed to be independent of the childbearing process. The validity of assuming that out-migration and childbearing are independent is more questionable. It is possible to look at this issue in more detail by comparing the fertility in the first few years of ‘complete’ marriages with fertility over the same marital duration for out-migrants (see below).

Next, we estimate the age at marriage of each wife in this subset. Because marriage registers frequently only indicate whether or not the wife was ‘of full age’, the age information in the CEBs and/or the burial register must be used in addition. These two sources produce, for each observed marriage, at least one record which gives the age of the wife in years. Using all such records, we can estimate each wife’s year of birth. Where a woman has more than one record giving her age, we take the average (ignoring outliers), and assume that the wife was born on 30 June in that year. Clearly, this is an approximate procedure. However, in view of the accuracy with which ages were reported in nineteenth century censuses, we do not think that any more accurate (and time-consuming) method is justified.

Having worked out the wife’s date of birth in this way, we censor the period of observation of all marriages at the (estimated) date of the wife’s 50th birthday, if it is not censored for some other reason at an earlier date.

Identification of births occurring during the period of observation

Two sources of data may be used to compile a list of all births occurring to each observed marriage during the period of observation. First, the baptism register records the dates of baptism of all children of each marriage baptised during the period of observation. Second, the CEBs give the ages and places of birth of all children who survived to the relevant census dates. Clearly, many of the entries in the CEBs relate to the same children as do entries in the baptism register. However, a minority of children who appear in the CEBs and whose ages and places of birth imply that they were born in the parish in question during the period of observation typically do not appear in the baptism register, and children who were baptised and who did not survive
until the next census are not recorded in the CEBs. The sample of births we include in the analysis consists of the union of the two sets of births. Checks for consistency were made (for example, birth intervals of fewer than nine months were identified) and the sample adjusted where necessary.

For children whose baptism was recorded in the baptism register, we took the date of baptism as the estimated date of birth (unless the register gave a date of birth, or an age at baptism). Clearly, birth-baptism intervals pose a potential problem for this approach. However, previous work on nineteenth century baptism registers indicates that the majority of birth-baptism intervals were fairly short. Dewhurst and Hinde’s analysis of the birth-baptism interval in Hampshire between 1851 and 1891, for example, indicates that 75 per cent of baptisms took place when the child was aged less than nine weeks, and 90 per cent when the child was aged less than three months.25 The ages at baptism of children who were unusually old when they were baptised are also often noted in baptism registers. For children identified solely from the CEBs, we estimated dates of birth using a procedure similar to that for estimating each woman’s age at marriage.26

The combination of the baptism register and the CEBs enables us to observe the majority of the children born to each marriage during the period of observation. In order not to be observed, a child has both to fail to appear in the baptism register and to be unrecorded in the household of their parents at the date of the next census. Although it is known that some children were brought up for periods outside their parental household, the most common reason for a child being missing from the next census will probably be that he or she died before the census date. If we suppose that 25 per cent of all births were not recorded in the baptism register of their parish of birth, and that about 15 per cent of the children born during an intercensal interval did not survive until the next census, then the number of births omitted is just under five per cent.27 A figure of 25 per cent of births omitted from the baptism register is probably on the high side (especially if illegitimate children were far more likely to have been baptised outside their parishes of birth than were legitimate children). Thus five per cent is probably an overestimate of the proportion of births to observed marriages which are missing.28

It is clear that some of these omitted births could be observed in the burial register. However, we have not searched the burial register because the information given therein is insufficient to enable us to match the entries for dead children to particular marriages with confidence.29

An application to rural Hampshire

We have applied the method described in the previous section to data from seven rural parishes in northern Hampshire: Cliddesden, Dummer, Ellisfield, Farleigh Wallop, Nutley, Old Basing and Winslade with Kempshott.30 These parishes lie in an arc to the south and east of the (then) market town of Basingstoke. They were largely agricultural throughout the period from 1841 to 1891, although the London and South Western Railway ran through the
parish of Old Basing, and employed a minority of the population of that parish. We treated the group of seven parishes as a single entity: couples married in any one of the parishes were traced in the subsequent CEBs and burial registers for all seven parishes, and the baptism registers for all seven were searched to identify the children born to those marriages. The total population of the seven parishes was around 2,500, and changed little between 1841 and 1891.

In all, 348 marriages were traced for at least some period after the date of the marriage. These marriages represent 46 per cent of the total of 753 marriages recorded in the marriage registers of the parishes between 1841 and 1891. The observed marriages can be classified according to the reason why observation ceased. We observed 85 marriages (24 per cent of the total) until the wife’s 50th birthday. A further 58 (17 per cent) were censored by the death of one spouse prior to the wife’s 50th birthday. One third of the marriages (116 in total) were censored because the couple had (apparently) moved away from study area, and the remaining 89 (26 per cent) were censored in 1891. Despite a certain amount of arbitrariness about this classification of the observed marriages, it is clear that we observe a substantially greater proportion of marriages using our approach than we would if we used conventional FR.

It is worth looking at the characteristics of these four groups of marriages in a little more detail (Table 1). Those women whose marriages were observed until their 50th birthday married, on average, three or four years older than did women whose marriages were ended by a death prior to the woman’s 50th birthday, or who migrated out of the study area. Women whose marriages were censored by the 1891 census married at the youngest average age of the four groups. This last observation is unsurprising, being largely the product of a selection effect: women who marry at young ages are more likely to see their marriages survive until 1891 than women who marry at older ages. To eliminate the distortions caused by the end of the period of observation, we can look just at marriages which took place in the period 1841–1861. This effectively eliminates the possibility of censoring in 1891. Even in this subsample there are differences among the three remaining groups, although they are less than in the whole sample (Table 1). Again, earlier marrying women have more time for the two decrements of migration and death to act prior to their 50th birthday, and thus are more likely to have the observation of their marriages ended for these two reasons. This is another selection effect.

Of the 348 brides we observed, about 30 per cent were pregnant when they married. The proportion of brides who were pregnant varied according to the age at marriage. It was 38 per cent for women marrying at ages 20–24 years, but less than 15 per cent for women marrying at ages more than 30 years. If we restrict attention to those women who had at least one birth after marriage, we find that 38 per cent conceived their first post-marital birth before they married. This is very close to the figure of 40 per cent observed in the Buckinghamshire parish of Medmenham by P. E. H. Hair.

In all, we observed 1,285 births to the 348 marriages during the period of
Table 1  Average age at marriage according to reason for termination of observation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of marriage</th>
<th>Reason for termination of observation</th>
<th>Death</th>
<th>Migration</th>
<th>Censoring in 1891</th>
<th>Woman’s 50th birthday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841–1891</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IQR</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1841–1861         | Mean                                 | 24.3  | 23.3      | – –               | 26.0                  |
|                   | Median                               | 21.7  | 21.4      | – –               | 23.3                  |
|                   | IQR                                  | 7.6   | 7.0       | – –               | 10.1                  |
|                   | N                                    | 40    | 58        | 1                  | 70                    |

**Note:** 'IQR' – Inter-quartile range.

**Sources:** Hampshire Record Office, Parish registers for Cliddesden, 31M82/PR4–5, 8–9; Dummer, 65M72/PR 5–6, 9–10; Ellisfield, 69M72/PR3, 6–7; Farleigh Wallop, 67M72/PR1, 4–5; Nutley, 59M99/PR1, 4, 6; Old Basing, 3M70/PR5, 7–10; and Winslade with Kempshott, 85M82/PR2, 5–6. Public Record Office, Census enumerators’ books, Cliddesden, Dummer, Ellisfield, Farleigh Wallop, Nutley, Old Basing and Winslade with Kempshott, 1851: HO 107/1681; 1861: RG 9/709 and 711; 1871: RG 10/1235 and 1237; 1881: RG 11/1255 and 1257; 1891: RG 12/958 and 960.

observation. Of these, 1,239 were to women aged 20 years and over. The proportion of births which were identified solely from the appearance of the child in a census was 13.3 per cent. These ‘census-only’ births were evenly distributed across the birth orders. There were clearly some couples who did not baptise the majority of their children at any of the parish churches for which we examined the registers. There were also many couples for whom just one or two births (out of, say, six of more) were missing from the baptism register but present in one or more of the censuses.

Age-specific marital fertility rates (ASMFRs) for five-year age groups are calculated by dividing the number of births to women in an age group by the number of woman-years of exposure within that age group. The ASMFRs for the whole sample of marriages are shown in Table 2. These ASMFRs, and all those reported in subsequent tables, incorporate a correction for bridal pregnancy. This correction involves ‘artificially’ backdating the marriages of women whose first post-marital birth occurred less than eight months after their marriage by 12 months.34

The total marital fertility rate (TMFR) between ages 20 and 49 was 7.5. Also shown in Table 2 are ASMFRs for certain other populations in the nineteenth century, and for England as a whole in earlier centuries. Our northern
Hampshire parishes exhibit marital fertility levels very similar to those reported from FR studies in England between 1550 and 1849. However, they are lower than those found by Barry Reay in Kent during the second half of the 19th century (also using conventional FR). On the other hand, the TMFR in northern Hampshire is similar to that of 7.0 reported for three Essex parishes between 1800 and 1880 by Claire Jarvis.35

In order to examine trends across marriage cohorts, we divided the observed marriages into two roughly equal groups, those taking place in 1841–1860, and those taking place in 1861–1891. The TMFR in the two marriage cohorts was much the same, but there was a change in the pattern of the ASMFRs, with fertility increasing over time for women in their twenties, and declining for women aged more than 35 (Table 3, rows 1 and 2). This pattern is similar to that reported by Barry Reay for three Kent parishes, when comparing marriages between 1850 and 1864 with those between 1865 and 1880, and by John Knodel

Table 2 Agẹ-ụlọ marital fertility rates (ASMFRs) for northern Hampshire and for se-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Age of mother</th>
<th>Total marital fertility rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 parishes in northern Hampshire, 1841–1891</td>
<td>0.368 (786) 0.359 (1,006) 0.329 (680) 0.251 (713) 0.133 (603) 0.026 (502)</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 English parishes, 1550–1849</td>
<td>0.383         0.350         0.304         0.243         0.134         0.028         7.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German villages, 1850–1874</td>
<td>0.533 (450)   0.450         0.362         0.288         0.128         0.015         8.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Kent parishes, 1850–1864</td>
<td>0.481 (450)   0.361         0.315         0.260         0.162         0.020         8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures in brackets denote the number of woman-years of exposure on which the ASMFRs for each age group are based.

Sources: For Hampshire parishes, see Table 1. Figures for 14 English parishes, 1550–1849 from C. Wilson, ‘Natural fertility in pre-industrial England’, Population Studies, 38 (1984), Table 2, 228; German villages from J.E. Knodel, Demographic behaviour in the past: a study of fourteen German village populations in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, (Cambridge, 1988), Table 10.2, 257; three Kent parishes from B. Reay, ‘Before the transition: fertility in English villages, 1800–1880’, Continuity and Change, 9 (1994), Table 3, 100.
Table 3  Marital fertility in northern Hampshire by date of marriage and age at marriage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of marriage</th>
<th>Age at marriage</th>
<th>Age of mother</th>
<th>Total-marital fertility rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841–1861 All ages</td>
<td>0.337</td>
<td>0.342</td>
<td>0.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861–1891 All ages</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td>0.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841–1891 Under 22.5 years</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>0.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841–1861 22.5 years and over</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>0.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841–1891 Under 22.5 years</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>0.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841–1861 22.5 years and over</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td>0.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861–1891 Under 22.5 years</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>(0.317)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861–1891 22.5 years and over</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.358</td>
<td>(0.348)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:  Unbracketed figures are based on more than 200 woman-years of exposure. Figures in brackets are based on between 100 and 200 woman-years of exposure. Figures based on fewer than 100 woman-years of exposure are not quoted.

Sources:  See Table 1.

for 14 German parishes when comparing the marriage cohorts of 1850–1874 and 1875–1899.36

One interpretation of this pattern is that it represents the sum of two distinct trends in marital fertility, an increase in underlying fertility, and the increasing practice of family limitation.37 However, previous work has shown that English marital fertility in the past varied with marital duration as well as age. At all ages, later marrying women have higher ASMFRs than earlier marrying women.38 Thus it is possible that the pattern also reflects a change in the distribution of ages at marriages between the two marriage cohorts. The mean age at marriage for those marriages prior to 1861 was 24.6 years, and for those between 1861 and 1891 it was 23.8 years. More significantly, the proportion of marriages in the age group 20–24 years was 41 per cent for the 1841–1860 marriage cohort and 55 per cent for the 1861–1891 marriage cohort.

To explore this in more detail, we divided the marriages in our sample into two groups: those where the wife was aged less than 22.5 years when she married, and those where the wife was aged 22.5 years and older. The ASMFRs for the two groups (Table 3, rows 3 and 4) exhibit some differences, but the rates for the older marrying women are not systematically higher than those for the younger marrying women (indeed, at ages more than 35 years they are
We have also estimated ASMFRs for subgroups classified according to both marriage cohort and age at marriage (Table 3, rows 5–8), though small numbers mean that the results should be interpreted with caution. The increased fertility at aged 20–24 years between the 1841–1860 and 1861–1891 marriage cohorts appears to be unrelated to changes in the age at marriage. At ages 25–29 there is a complex pattern, with the rates increasing for the early marrying women but remaining about the same for later marrying women. The decrease in fertility at ages 35–39 between the two marriage cohorts seems to be partly (but only partly) to changes in the age at marriage.

Finally, we can compare the fertility of couples who subsequently out-migrated with that of couples whose marriages were observed until the woman’s 50th birthday or until a death ended the marriage (Table 4). Women who were subsequently to migrate out of the study area had somewhat lower fertility at ages 25–34 years than those who were to stay in the area until either their 50th birthday, or until a death ended the marriage. This impression of lower fertility for subsequent migrants is confirmed by an examination of the distributions of the number of children born in the first five years, and the first ten years, of marriages in the two categories. One reason for the lower fertility of the migrants seems to lie in the higher proportion of migrant couples who were childless. After five years of marriage, 19 per cent of couples who would subsequently migrate were still childless, compared with 13 per cent of those whose marriages would be observed until death or the woman’s 50th birthday (‘stayers’). After ten years of marriage, the corresponding figures were 11 per cent (for subsequent migrants) and one per cent (for ‘stayers’). These differences between migrants and ‘stayers’ suggest that the assumption that migration and childbearing are independent of one another, which is necessary if the results of our procedure are to be comparable to those of FR, is questionable. This needs to be examined further.

**Conclusion**
We hope to have shown in this paper that the use of parish registers and the CEBs in combination enables us to estimate age-specific marital fertility schedules for English populations between 1841 and 1891. While our method would benefit from certain refinements, notably in connection with the estimation of dates of birth, we do not believe that these would greatly affect the results we have presented. The combination of CEB and parish register data to analyse birth histories in late nineteenth century rural England offers considerable potential for future research. One obvious avenue to pursue is the use the occupational data in the CEBs and baptism registers to look at variations in fertility between different social and economic groups. However, the greatest returns are likely to be achieved by analysing the birth histories themselves. The method we have outlined generates, for each marriage, a set of dates starting with the date of the marriage and including the dates of birth of each subsequent child. These ‘reproductive histories’ are ideal data with which to examine the extent of ‘stopping’ and ‘spacing’ behaviour. There is an urgent need for such data at the present time, as the debate about ‘stopping’ and ‘spacing’ mentioned in the introduction to this article has hitherto been conducted in the absence of the kind of true reproductive history data which would allow the various arguments to be tested rigorously.

Our results for northern Hampshire show that marital fertility in the late-nineteenth century was similar, in both its level and its age pattern, to that observed for England as a whole in earlier centuries using FR data. There is also evidence to confirm the observations made by earlier studies of Kent and Germany, that a shift in the age pattern of marital fertility towards the younger age groups was occurring between 1841 and 1891. Although shifts in the distribution of ages at marriage might explain part of this pattern, it is also possible that it reflects the onset of family limitation, combined with a rise in the underlying level of fertility.
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NOTES

1. Demographic rates are ratios of occurrences of events (for example births) divided by populations at risk of experiencing those events (for example married women). By ‘unbiased’ is meant that if a woman is included in the exposed-to-risk in the denominator, and she experiences a birth during the relevant time period, then that birth must be included in the numerator. Conversely, if a woman experiences a birth during the relevant time period, and that birth is included in the numerator, then the woman must be included in the exposed-to-risk in the denominator.


4. Wrigley, Davies, Oeppen and Schofield, English population history from family reconstitution, includes results from some early nineteenth century reconstitutions, but they are few in number compared with those for the preceding centuries. One FR study which does deal extensively with the early nineteenth century is D. Levine, Family formation in an age of nascent capitalism, (New York, 1977).


7. For example, H.R. Davies, ‘Automated record linkage of census enumerators’ books and registration data: obstacles, challenges and solutions’, History and Computing, 4 (1992), 22, found that only eight per cent of the births recorded in the civil birth register for the Welsh parish of Llanuwchllyn for the period 1841–1881 were recorded in the baptism registers.


9. Razzell, Essays, Table 6, 92–3.

10. S. Dewhurst and A. Hinde, ‘Age at baptism in rural Hampshire in the second half of the nineteenth century’, Local Population Studies, 57 (1996) 73, 75. Dewhurst and Hinde’s seven parishes only include two of the seven parishes studied in this paper.
11. Jarvis, ‘The reconstitution’, Table 1, 48 and 50; P.R.A. Hinde, ‘The population of a Wiltshire
village in the nineteenth century: a reconstitution study of Berwick St James, 1841–1871’, Annals
England further examined’, Population Studies, 24 (1970), 62, writing of the parish of Medmen-
ham, Bucks., says that ‘parish registers may be almost as comprehensive a record for the
Victorian period as for any earlier period’.
1861’, Local Population Studies, 61 (1998), 48–9, pregnant unmarried women often entered
workhouses shortly before they were due to give birth in order to take advantage of the
workhouses’ ‘lying-in’ facilities. However, they typically only stayed for a short period,
discharging themselves fairly soon after the birth took place.
13. Hampshire Record Office, Winchester, (hereafter HRO), Old Basing baptism register, 3M70/
PR5, 8, 10.
14. HRO, Ellisfield baptism register, 66M72/PR3; Nutley baptism register, 56M69/PR1.
15. The problem of homonymy can be overcome using complex computer algorithms, but the effort
involved is substantial. See Davies, ‘Automated record linkage’, 22–5 and H.R. Davies, ‘Nominal
record linkage of historical data: procedures and applications in a north Wales parish’,
22. The need to have information about marital status in the CEBs makes the use of the CEBs for the
1841 census more difficult than those of subsequent censuses, since marital status is not given,
and we have not used them here.
23. Note that the method does not use the information about place of residence given in the baptism
register in the identification of the period for which each marriage is observed. Doing this would
clearly lead to a violation of the assumption of independent censoring.
24. Ages were frequently misreported, though individual errors were not often large. See K. Schürer
and accuracy in the censuses of six Kentish parishes, 1851–1881’, Local Population Studies, 50
25. Dewhurst and Hinde, ‘Age at baptism’, Table 1, 74.
26. In censuses up to 1881, enumerators were told to write down the ages as they were reported to
them. From 1881, ages in completed years (i.e. ‘last birthday’) were asked for. E. Higgs, Making
sense of the census: the manuscript returns for England and Wales, 1801–1901 (Public Record Office
handbook 23), (London, 1989), 69, mentions a tendency to think of the ages of children in ‘age
next birthday’ terms. We followed Dewhurst and Hinde, ‘Age at baptism’, 75 and assumed that
the age as reported in the census was an exact age, which amounts to an ‘age nearest birthday’
assumption. Clearly, the three methods of reporting ages (i.e. in ‘last birthday’, ‘nearest
birthday’ or ‘next birthday’ terms) imply different estimated dates of birth.
27. The figure of 25 per cent is based on Dewhurst and Hinde, ‘Age at baptism’, 73. The figure of 15
per cent for mortality is estimated from model life tables.
28. It might be argued that the birth histories of families with any children identified only from the
CEBs are potentially problematic. If this is thought to be the case, then it is possible to use in
analysis only those families whose children were all identified from the baptism registers. Note
that this does not mean going back to conventional FR, as we can still use the marriages of
subsequent out-migrants.
29. Jarvis, ‘The reconstitution’, 50, points out, correctly, that ‘it is possible to insert burials without
previous baptisms tentatively into family groups’. However, she admits that her ability to do
this relies on the number of marriages analysed being small, and the range of names in use being ‘relatively large’. In our study, we found quite a large number of contemporaneous marriages with the same surname, and so did not feel comfortable in following this procedure.


31. When subdividing the sample in this way, the number of marriages we observe becomes rather small, so the results should be interpreted with caution.

32. This figure has been calculated by assuming that all brides who had a child baptised within nine months of the date of their marriage were pregnant when they married. The denominator also includes a few women whose marriages were not observed for nine months. Since some women having a child eight months after their marriage might have conceived that child after marriage, we probably slightly over-estimate the proportion of brides who were pregnant.


35. Jarvis, ‘The reconstitution’, Table 4, 52.


39. The comparison after ten years of marriage is based on small numbers, so the results should be interpreted cautiously.

The first edition of this atlas, which appeared in 1988, was only the second English county atlas to be published. Since then another five have appeared, and at least two more are in preparation.

This new edition of the Suffolk atlas contains 86 maps, 26 more than its predecessor, and others have been revised. There are 39 contributors, all specialists in their fields. The maps are clear and the cover and frontispiece present a striking image of the county from an altitude of 438 miles.

The majority of the maps occupy an A4 page with a facing page of explanatory text, but in a few cases there are several smaller maps on a page. Where necessary the text is illustrated by photographs or drawings. At the back of the Atlas are 28 pages of notes describing the sources used. A pocket in the back cover contains two large maps of Suffolk: one shows the civil parishes based on the Ordnance Survey’s 1888 diagram of Sanitary Districts, and the other the same parishes as they are today. A transparent overlay would have been more useful, but apparently this is not feasible.

There is much to interest historians of many periods, with the subjects covered ranging in date from the Middle Pleistocene to fortifications and airfields built during the two World Wars. Sections on geology and early settlement are followed by maps depicting many aspects of the history of Suffolk from the Roman period to the early twentieth century. Medieval markets, parish gilds, industries, nonconformity and leisure are among the many subjects covered. Among the maps new to this edition are those showing the distribution of known medieval masons, a study of the Abbey church of Bury St Edmunds, and the layout of some of the smaller medieval towns of the county.

A county atlas is an indispensable tool for archaeologists and historians, and for teaching local history. A good map conveys information far more succinctly than the written or spoken word. The gradual publication of county atlases is providing essential works of reference for regional historians.

Nesta Evans

The Religious Census of 1851 is an unrivalled source for historians and sociologists interested in Victorian religion. Following what is becoming an established format for publishing the census results, this volume comprises 50 or so pages of expert editorial comment followed by the census results for Kent.

In her editorial, Margaret Roake provides an introduction to the historical geography of Kent, and describes the general operation of the census and any local peculiarities therein. She also introduces the themes of substantive interest to social historians, such as rural-urban differences in churchgoing, and the contrasting parochial characteristics that favoured Anglicanism and nonconformity. The secondary literature is carefully referenced throughout. The quality of the editorial should help to ensure that anyone proceeding to examine the Kentish data should be well informed as to their strengths, defects and potential uses.

In the main part of the volume - the 1,003 census returns covering Kent - the information is clearly presented (in registration order), and any additional comments that were written on the original returns are noted. To those unfamiliar with the Religious Census, the principal information comprises numbers of free, appropriated, and ‘other’ sittings; numbers of attendances at religious services in the morning, afternoon and evening; average attendances over a recent period; Sunday school attendances at the three times of day; dates when post-1801 places of worship had been built; and sources of income for the established church.

For each parish, this volume usefully appends the number of acres, houses and population from the 1851 census of population, and this will facilitate researchers to calculate, for example, population density or churchgoing rates. Another welcome enhancement is the third appendix, which reproduces the results of the *Daily News* survey of London churchgoers in 1902-1903. This covered the more metropolitan areas of Kent, and allows one to chart changes in churchgoing in these areas across the 50 or so intervening years.

All in all, this volume is a welcome and well-organised addition to the 11 English counties and the whole of Wales for which the Religious Census returns have already been published.

[Editorial note: this book is obtainable from Mr D.W. Harrington, Ashton Lodge, Church Road, Lyminge, Folkestone, Kent CT18 8JA (e-mail: Dun-canHRS@aol.com).]

Alasdair Crockett

In 1981 the Leicester Local History Department issued a bibliography of 1,217 items published by staff and students between its establishment in 1948 and its 30th anniversary; this new publication is a much-enlarged successor marking the department’s 50th birthday.

Like the earlier title, this list of publications is prefaced by an essay on the development and philosophy of the department, written on this occasion by Charles Phythian-Adams, who has recently retired after over 30 years’ distinguished service at Leicester. This is fascinating and alone makes the book, which is reasonably priced, worth buying.

The bibliography itself, as in 1981, is arranged by subject, with seven main headings, a section of miscellanea and 40 pages of reviews. Most of the headings, including that on ‘Family, Population and Kinship’, are subdivided, making it reasonably easy to find material. On the other hand, the titles are not numbered, which makes the two indexes less useful than they might be. The ‘Names Index’ (i.e. an author index) appears to be complete; the ‘Select Topographical Index (England and Wales)’ leaves a certain amount to be desired. The principles of selection are not explained; there are no county suffixes; and the headwords include a mixture of ancient and administrative counties, regional names, and a scattering of general terms (such as ‘common lands’ in what is basically a place-names index.

The bibliography includes the work of all present and past members of the staff, which has never been large, but has seen a fair turnover of temporary appointments, and of students who have completed either MA or research degrees. A surprising number of historians thus appear, as well as a huge number of students. All the published work of both groups, from the time they joined the department up to their death or the present, is included, and thus the book lists numerous articles (and for some people several books) with no direct connection with the department. Regarding professional historians who spent some years early in their careers at Leicester, such as Joan Thirsk or David Hey, it is interesting to see how their work later developed. The long list of pieces written by amateur historians who have taken the MA is, however, of more limited value, including as it does contributions not merely to refereed journals but also to more modest outlets, including the *Railway Modeller*. A separate list of higher degree dissertations might have made it easier to see the wood from the trees.

The references themselves appear to be accurately and consistently presented, although the overall design and production of the book are disappointing by present-day standards. Nevertheless, this is a useful addition to bibliographical
finding-aids for the local historian, including those interested in population history.

[Editorial note: this volume is obtainable from Friends of the Department of English Local History, c/o Department of English Local History, University of Leicester, Marc Fitch House, 5 Salisbury Road, Leicester LE1 7QR.]

Philip Riden

Notes on reviewers

Alasdair Crockett is Prize Research Fellow at Nuffield College, Oxford.

Nesta Evans is a contributor to An historical atlas of Suffolk.

Philip Riden is at University College, Northampton, and is County Editor of the Victoria History of Northamptonshire.
NOTES ON SOME OTHER RECENT PUBLICATIONS

An inventory of German family reconstitutions

Most readers of Local Population Studies will be aware of the recent publication of the Cambridge Group’s English population history from family reconstitution 1580-1837. Most will also probably know that the technique of family reconstitution is not an English invention. However, fewer may be aware that the small number of English parishes on which it has been carried out pales into insignificance beside the wealth of reconstitutions available for other countries in Europe.

We have recently received a most impressive volume, written by Volkmar Weiss and Katja Münchow, which comprises an inventory of all German local family reconstitutions published and collected at Leipzig. Most of these reconstitutions relate to German parishes, though there are also a substantial number from Romania and Alsace-Lorraine, and a few from Switzerland, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovenia and Latvia.

The volume includes a history of local family reconstitution in Middle Europe and a comprehensive review and bibliography of all scientific empirical work based on such parish family reconstitutions.

Note that the book is written in German. However, the bibliography (on pp. 177-96) includes French, English, Czech and Dutch publications which relate to Middle European parishes.

The full reference of the volume is:


It may be ordered from any general or scientific bookshop.

Wiltshire Family History Society publications

Local Population Studies has been sent copies of the following four publications of the Wiltshire Family History Society:


These four volumes contain all known early censuses for Wiltshire. The first two include the listings associated with the Marriage Duty Act of 1695 for the following places: Bincknoll, Cliffe Pypard, Hilmarton, Lydiard Tregoze, Lyneham, Tockenham and Wootton Bassett (part I); and Chiseldon, Liddington, Little Hinton, Swindon, Wanborough and Wroughton (part II).

The second two volumes are mainly devoted to the pre-1841 listings of inhabitants made for the decennial censuses of 1801 to 1831, though a few eighteenth century listings are included, and there is one from 1887. Places for which listings survive include (dates in brackets):

Box (1801)
Brixton Deverill (1791)
Bromham (1831)
Bulkington (1801)
Chiseldon (1787)
Corsham (1770)
Donhead (1695)
Foxley (1811)
Grittleton (1811)
Highworth (1801)
Horningsham (1797, 1799, 1801)
Little Cheverell (1785)
Manningford Abbots (1810)
Mere (c. 1650)
Stanton St Bernard (1744)
Stourton (1821, 1831)
Steeple Ashton (1770, 1800, 1813, 1818?, 1826, 1827)
Stratford sub Castle (1821)
Sutton Veny (1821, 1831)
Trowbridge (1821)
Woodborough (1811)
Woodford (1887)

These four publications can be ordered from Mrs L. Williams, Wiltshire Family History Society, 10 Castle Lane, Devizes, Wiltshire SN10 1HJ. Please add 90p postage and handling charge for one volume, £1.40 for two volumes, £1.90 for three volumes and £2.40 for four volumes. A list of all the publications and transcripts of the Wiltshire Family History Society is obtainable from the same address, or by e-mailing wfhs@devizes39.freeserve.co.uk
CORRESPONDENCE

Letters intended for publication in the journal should be sent to the Local Population Studies General Office, Department of Humanities, University of Hertfordshire, Watford Campus, Aldenham, Watford, Herts., WD2 8AT.

Editors’ note

Readers are reminded that the Editorial Board is always prepared to offer advice on subjects within the scope of Local Population Studies. 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, please do not hesitate to contact us at the address above.

Local demographic studies in Surrey and south-east England

Dear Sir,

My interest having been whetted by the historical demography sessions at the British Society for Population Studies conferences, when I retired from the population projections desk at the Government Actuary’s Department, I decided to learn some history. I am now nearing the end of my final year of a part-time BA Combined Studies degree at University of Surrey and for my final history module have submitted a dissertation on ‘The causes of the seasonality and short-term fluctuations in deaths in England, and, in particular, in 13 Surrey parishes, in the eighteenth century’.

I took as my starting point an analysis of Wrigley and Schofield’s 404 parishes according to the proportion of the total number of burials in the eighteenth century that occur in the first half of the year. This produced an interesting map, with, for instance, a clear division stretching across the middle of Surrey and beyond at a 54 per cent level, with some Wealden parishes producing some of the highest proportions in England and the two Gravesend parishes the lowest at 48 per cent.

Because in the demographic aspect of this undergraduate exercise I have been working much on my own, I should glad to hear from anybody else who is working on these data at a local level with whom I can exchange results or ideas.

Yours faithfully,

John Field
10 Blackstone Close,
Redhill, RH1 6BG
johnlfield@compuserve.com
NOTICES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Histories for the Millennium Conference

23-24 June 2000


Presented by the PRO in association with the Family and Community Historical Research Society of the Open University.

Includes sessions on Parliamentary Enclosure in Harrow, Ironbridge (Shropshire) in 1851, and collecting evidence on workhouses.

Registration fee £60 (concessions £40) for both days or £35 (concessions £25) for one day.

Further details from Oliver Hoare, Interpretation Department, Public Record Office, Ruskin Avenue, Kew, Richmond, Surrey TW9 4DU (tel: 020 8392 5323; e-mail oliver.hoare@pro.gov.uk).

Yorkshire Quaker Heritage Project

Quakerism in Yorkshire took hold at the beginning of the movement. This was largely because its founder, George Fox, travelled and preached throughout the region in the years 1651 and 1652. One of the first organised communities of ‘Children of the Light’ (early Quakers) was at Balby in the West Riding.

A pyramid structure of Meetings at local, regional and national levels was devised by Fox in the 1660s. He attached special importance to written records. From the earliest times, minutes of Meetings, membership, financial and educational records, records of property ownership, and registers of births, marriages and burials were kept. Particularly significant are the accounts of Sufferings. These are records of imprisonment, fines, distraint of goods, excommunication and other penalties imposed on Quakers for their religious beliefs.

The aims of this new project are to increase awareness of and broaden access to the Quaker archives and printed collections that relate to Yorkshire, whether they are held within the county or beyond. It is also hoped to establish a model of what can be achieved which other regions might follow. The project has been funded for three years from August 1999 under the Research Support Libraries Programme. This is a joint initiative of the Higher Education Funding Councils. The project is led by the Brynmor Jones Library, University of Hull, in partnership with the Brotherton Library, University of Leeds and the Borthwick
Institute of Historical Research, University of York.

Yorkshire is a particularly fruitful place for research into Quaker history, due to a combination of early Quaker roots in the region and the rich variety of records which have survived. Most of these records are now held by the project partners. They range from the records of the Yorkshire General Meeting and its constituent Monthly Meetings (including Pickering and Hull, Brighouse, Knaresborough, Leeds, Settle, Thirsk and York), through libraries of Quaker tracts built up by local Meetings, to the papers of Quaker families, such as the Tukes of York, the company archives of the chocolate and confectionery manufacturers, Rowntree and Mackintosh, the archives of the pioneering Quaker-run Retreat, and the social survey material of Seebohm Rowntree.

One of the first outcomes of the Project has been the creation of a central website (address below). At present, the site’s main feature is a series of links to other electronic finding aids and information. However it will eventually host an online database describing and locating collections held by the participating libraries and elsewhere, a name index to the Quaker archives held by the Brynmor Jones Library, and a research guide to Quaker source material held throughout Yorkshire.

If you would like further information or have a particular research query relating to the project, please contact Helen Roberts, Yorkshire Quaker Heritage Project Archivist, Brynmor Jones Library, University of Hull, Hull HU6 7RX (tel: 01482 465681; e-mail: h.e.roberts@acs.hull.ac.uk).

Web site: http://www.hull.ac.uk/lib/archives/quaker

British Society for Population Studies annual conference

Utrecht, Netherlands, 31 August – 1 September 2000

The annual conference for the British Society for Population Studies will, this year, take place in Utrecht, The Netherlands, as the meeting is being held jointly with the Nederlandse Vereniging voor Demografie (Netherlands Demographic Society).

Although the Conference will include papers on all aspects of population studies, there will be two historical demography sessions.

‘Migration in history’ (31 August, 11.30 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.). This will include papers by Ros Davies and Eilidh Garrett (Cambridge Group) on migration to, from and around the parishes of the Isle of Skye, 1881-1891; and by Andrew Hinde (University of Southampton) on the depopulation of the countryside of southern England during the nineteenth century.

‘Population change in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries’ (1 September,
11.15 a.m. – 1.15 p.m.). This will include a paper by Sam Sneddon (Queen Mary and Westfield College, London) on infant mortality in fenland England during the nineteenth century, as well as a number of other contributions.

Further details may be obtained from Dr Andrew Hinde, Department of Social Statistics, University of Southampton, Southampton SO17 1BJ (e-mail: prah@socsci.soton.ac.uk).

News from the Local Population History Book Club

The Local Population History Book Club now has the following three new books in stock at a price substantially less than that charged by high-street booksellers.


To order these books, or to obtain copies of the complete list of titles available, contact Dr Peter Franklin, 46 Fountain Street, Accrington, Lancashire BB5 0QP.