

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.⁹ 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.¹⁰ 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 1790–1799.¹¹ 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.¹² There are, however, a number of difficulties with this mode of analysis.¹³ 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

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

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.

Sources: E.A. Wrigley and R.S. Schofield, *The population history of England 1541–1871: a reconstruction* (London 1981), 135; P. Razzell, 'The evaluation of baptism as a form of birth registration through cross-matching census and parish register data: a study in methodology', *Population Studies*, 26 (1972), 129.

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.¹⁷ 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:¹⁸

1. Thomas, son of Thomas and Ann Duckett: baptised 21 June 1724, buried 4 August 1724.
2. Ann, daughter of Thomas and Ann Duckett: baptised 13 April 1726.
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:¹⁹

1. Peter: born 19 August 1754; died 16 January 1755.
2. Margaret: born 20 March 1766.
3. Peter: born 1 June 1768.
4. Philip: born 9 November 1769.
5. Frederick: born 8 December 1771; died 7 November 1774.
6. Michael: born 29 April 1773.
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:²⁰

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-

Table 2 Proportion of eligible families using same names, 1541–1837

Period	Number of eligible cases	Percentage using same names
1541–1600	293	50.1
1601–1650	330	57.9
1651–1700	291	72.9
1701–1750	339	67.8
1751–1800	411	65.6
1801–1837	279	59.5

Source: Original reconstitution schedules for Aldenham, Bridford, Austrey, Dawlish, Hartland and Colyton kindly provided by the Cambridge Group.

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.²¹ 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, John, William, William, and six sisters, Eleanor, Lucy, Agnes, Agnes, Margaret and Anne.²² 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.'²³

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

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, Wilts. (1697 and 1702), and Wanborough, Wilts. (1697 and 1702), reveals no cases of living full same-name siblings.²⁴ 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.²⁵ 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.²⁶ 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 understatement 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.²⁷ 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.²⁸ 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.²⁹ 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'.³⁰ This conclusion is confirmed by Gregory King's post-enumeration survey carried out in 1696

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

		Number found	Number not found	Percentage found
Children baptised with same names and traced in burial register	TW	46	18	72
	No TW	51	30	63
Unburied children traced in the enumeration list	TW	97	46	68
	No TW	108	66	62

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.³¹ 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 1695.³² 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).

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

Table 4 Corrected infant and child (1-4) mortality rates, London 1681–1709

Infants			
Number of baptisms	Infant burials	Same-name correction ratio	Estimated mortality rate
1,253	280	145/97	334 per 1,000
Children aged 1–4			
Number of children (aged 1–4) at risk	Child burials	Same name correction ratio	Estimated mortality rate
733	121	145/97	247 per 1,000

Source: Boyd's database lodged in the library of the Society of Genealogists.

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.⁴⁰ 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.⁴¹

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.⁴² 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 5 Analysis of burial registration of same-name siblings in nine reconstitution

Period	Total same-name	Burials not found	
		Number	Percentage
1538–1599	358	122	34.1
1600–1649	465	144	31.0
1650–1699	617	167	27.1
1700–1749	858	191	22.3
1750–1799	594	160	27.0
1800–1837	451	104	23.1

Source: The nine parishes are Colyton, Hartland, Aldenham, Dawlish, Ansty, Bridford, Eccleshall, 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 1841.⁴³ 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.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my appreciation to the Wellcome Trust for providing a research fellowship making the research in this paper possible. I would also like to thank the Editorial Board of *Local Population Studies* for detailed comments on earlier drafts of the paper.

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.

NOTES

1. R.E. Jones, 'Further evidence on the decline in infant mortality in pre-industrial England: North Shropshire, 1561-1810', *Population Studies*, **34** (1980), 250.
2. J.T. Krause, 'The changing adequacy of English registration, 1690-1837', in D.V. Glass and D.E. C. Eversley eds, *Population in History*, (London, 1965), 393.
3. Krause, 'Changing adequacy', 379-93.
4. Krause, 'Changing adequacy', 380.
5. E.A. Wrigley and R.S. Schofield, *The population history of England, 1541-1871: a reconstruction*, (London, 1981), 137.
6. Wrigley and Schofield, *Population history of England*, 561.
7. Wrigley and Schofield, *Population history of England*, 137.
8. Negligence appears to have primarily resulted from the practice of entering events in rough note books and only copying them up at very irregular intervals, a practice that was present from the very beginning of parish registration. For a detailed discussion of this topic see D.J. Steel, *General sources of births, marriages and deaths before 1837*, (National Index of Parish Registers, Volume 1, 1968), 27-31. For further discussion, see P. Razzell, *Essays in English population history*, (London, 1994), 108-11. For evidence on the role of non-payment of fees see note 38 below.
9. Wrigley and Schofield, *Population history of England*, 135.
10. P. Razzell, 'The evaluation of baptism as a form of birth registration through cross-matching census and parish register data: a study in methodology', *Population Studies*, **26** (1972), 129. The issues and procedures involved in this census/baptism register comparison are complex, but although there are a number of problems in comparing census with parish register data, it is possible to check the reliability of the census/parish register method by using additional civil registration information on individuals born between 1837 and 1851. I concluded from this research that the census/parish register method accurately measured the quality of baptism registration. See Razzell, *Essays*, 82-149.
11. Wrigley and Schofield, *Population history of England*, 561.
12. E.A. Wrigley, R.S. Davies, J.E. Oeppen and R.S. Schofield, *English population history from family reconstitution, 1580-1837*, (Cambridge, 1997), 101-6.
13. See P. Razzell, 'The conundrum of eighteenth-century English population growth', *Social History of Medicine*, **11** (1998), 476-7.
14. Wrigley, Davies, Oeppen and Schofield, *English population history from family reconstitution*, 91-2.
15. Wrigley, Davies, Oeppen and Schofield, *English population history from family reconstitution*, 109-10.
16. L. Henry, *Manuel de demographie historique*, (Paris, 1967), 22-3; R. Finlay, *Population and metropolis*, (Cambridge 1981), 45-9.
17. See the *Genealogists' Magazine*, June 1998, 59; September 1998, 95-7; and December 1998, 145.
18. This information is taken from the Canewdon parish register lodged in the Society of Genealogists' library.
19. For details of information on the Turner family, see G.H. Jennings, *The diary of a Georgian*

shopkeeper, (London, 1979), 79–84.

20. I am grateful to the East Sussex Record Office Society for conducting a search of the East Hoathly parish register.
21. See the *Genealogists' Magazine*, June 1998, 59; September 1998, 95–7; and December 1998, 145.
22. I am grateful to Mrs E.A. Digby for providing the details of this monument.
23. See J. Le Neve, *Monumenta anglicana*, vol. 1 (London, 1717), 267–8.
24. For London see D. Glass ed., *London inhabitants within the walls*, (London, 1965).
25. For details of this sample, see Razzell, *Essays*, 93–4.
26. An extreme example of identical first names but different middle forenames is to be found in the family of William Thomas Spencer, 6th Earl Fitzwilliam. His sons' names were as follows: William, William Henry, William Thomas, William Charles, William John, William George, William Hugh, and William Reginald, and all but one of these children survived childhood: see *Burke's peerage*, 104th edn. (1967), 958.
27. For example, 8 per cent of all baptisms and 26 per cent of child burials included in a reconstitution study of two rural Bedfordshire parishes in the period 1700–1849 were first same-name children, whereas the equivalent proportions in London during the period 1681–1709 were 12 and 23 per cent. For details of the Bedfordshire study see Razzell, 'The conundrum', 491; the London research is discussed later in the present paper.
28. For details of the London enumeration list see Glass, *London inhabitants*.
29. This material is deposited in the library of the Society of Genealogists. For details of this source, see A. Camp, 'Boyd's London burials and citizens of London', *Family Tree*, 1 (September–October 1985), 12.
30. P.E. Jones and A.V. Judges, 'London population in the late seventeenth century', *Economic History Review*, 6 (1935), 48.
31. D. Glass, 'Introduction' in D. Glass ed., *London inhabitants*, xxviii.
32. Glass, *London inhabitants*.
33. Theoretically these figures can be compared to those derived by David Glass and Jeremy Boulton from their study of parish register and collectors' returns of births and deaths made in London for the 1695 Marriage Duty Act. Unfortunately the collectors' figures were derived from the returns made by Anglican clergymen and were not therefore independent of parish register figures. There is evidence that clergymen were negligent in recording all births and burials, which was one of the reasons why the Marriage Act legislation was repealed in 1706. See Glass, 'Introduction', xxxvi–xxxvii; and J. Boulton, 'The Marriage Duty Act in London', in K. Schürer and T. Arkell eds, *Surveying the people*, (Oxford, 1992), 222–52.
34. Finlay, *Population and metropolis*, 85.
35. Personal communication from John Landers.
36. See J. Marshall, *Mortality of the metropolis*, (London, 1832), 63. Boyd's data probably includes more people listed as owning taxable wealth than was typical for London as a whole. Glass estimated that about 27 per cent of the population paid higher levels of taxation, lower than the proportion in Table 3. See Glass, 'Introduction', xxi.
37. In addition to the problem of the representativeness of the sample in Table 4, there is the issue of the proportion of eligible children who were given same names and its effect on the reliability of the same-name method. Andrew Hinde (personal communication) has kindly carried out some simulations of the effect of different degrees of same-naming and burial registration quality on the overall reliability of the same-name method. Although limited to two possible scenarios, his conclusion is that the simulations provide some reassurance that non-universal same-naming and moderate degrees of burial under-registration do not invalidate the method.
38. Boothman found that one of the reasons for the under-registration of pauper burials in Long Melford was the non-payment of burial fees by the parish authority. It is possible that the non-payment of fees was an important general reason for burial under-registration. In six parishes with occupational information at the end of the eighteenth century - Highworth, Swindon, Clayworth, Woodford, Bedford St Paul's and Rochester St Margaret's - which I have analysed, there was a significantly higher proportion of unregistered same-name burials amongst

labourers' children (12 out of 59) than among other occupational groups (11 out of 97). This suggests that poverty may have been a factor in the non-registration of burials, presumably through the non-payment of fees. For the information on pauper burials in Long Melford see L. Boothman, 'Letter on Long Melford parish registers', *Local Population Studies*, 50 (1993), 80–1. I am grateful to Lyn Boothman for letting me have additional information on pauper burials in Long Melford.

39. Razzell, *Essays*, 212.
40. Boothman, 'Letter on Long Melford' and personal communication.
41. Razzell, *Essays*, 210.
42. Wrigley, Davies, Oeppen and Schofield, *English population history from family reconstitution*, 77, 144.
43. Census/parish register comparison methods are likely to be most appropriate for the nineteenth century because of the decline of infant and child mortality in that period. This decline in mortality led to a reduction in the number of same-name cases (the number of such cases is usually a good indication of the level of infant and child mortality), and there are not likely to be enough cases in small rural parishes for purposes of analysis. Also the growing use of two or more forenames in the nineteenth century complicates the analysis of same-names, as discussed earlier in this article.