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EDITORIAL

The three articles in this issue have two things in common: they all focus upon the latter part of the nineteenth century, and they all make use of the census enumerators’ returns. There, however, the similarity ends, for their subject matter is quite diverse, testifying to wide variety of uses to which the nineteenth-century censuses can be put.

Our first article is a study of the provenance of Brighton’s railway workers across the years 1861-81. Most previous studies of this subject have relied largely upon the published census reports and railway company records, but here the census enumerators’ books are employed to allow a more detailed analysis. The London to Brighton railway opened in 1841, and connections extended to Portsmouth in the west and Hastings in the east by 1847, with a branch line to Newhaven. By 1861, The London Brighton and South Coast Railway Company employed over 1,000 men in Brighton at the passenger and goods stations, on the trains and in the workshops. The 1861 census birthplace data show that local-born men predominated in the less skilled occupations and distant migrants in the skilled workshop jobs, a discovery that reinforces the findings of much previous research into social class differentials in terms of distance of migration. Nominal linkage to the 1851 census returns was made for those men living in Sussex in 1851, and reveals earlier occupations and in some cases the occupations of fathers. Almost half of those whose father’s occupation could be traced were following their father into railway employment, and this tendency was particularly marked among skilled workshop men and semi-skilled machinists. Those who were not the sons of railwaymen came principally from a small trade and crafts background, or from labouring families. However, most of the latter appear to have come from established and settled rural families, capable of eliciting the necessary references, and few rural-born recruits came from among casual agricultural labourer families. Brighton’s railway, therefore, provided only a restricted channel for upward social mobility.

The second article makes use of the same dataset, but this time with a view to highlighting some methodological issues concerning multiple occupations. It is not argued that the census enumerators’ books are the best source to measure the incidence of multiple occupations, only that the terminology found within them gives both the fullest picture of the types of multiple occupation which existed in the later nineteenth century, and also some idea of the scale of the problem. Five types are identified: those that are only apparently a multiple occupation but are in fact a single one; those that would usually be classed to the same occupational group; those that would be classified to the same occupational order; those that are unrelated; and those that are made up of a combination of occupational and status descriptors. The rules issued for the allocation of both apparent and real multiple occupations with regard to the 1881 census were, to some degree, contradictory, and hence
the procedure adopted at the UK Data Archive in classifying occupations in the enriched version of the census was the common sense one of giving primacy to the ‘main’ occupation, where that could be identified, which effectively meant the one apparently most important in terms of income generation. An analysis of a number of selected occupations in the three counties of Cornwall, Derbyshire and Westmoreland (total population 856,619) gives an indication of the scale of the problem, and how this could vary geographically. Hence for grocers the possible shortfall through the ignoring of multiple occupations is 12, 10 and 7 per cent respectively, and for auctioneers 19, 10 and 9 per cent for other occupations (notably wheelwrights) there was a much larger discrepancy. Comparison with data from Anderson’s 2 per cent sample of the 1851 census suggests, perhaps against expectations, that the problem was growing in scale over time. Of course, occupational titles do not reveal details of work practices, while the issue of seasonal employment is a further variable that is hidden from view. To make the best of the information we do have, however, the importance of a clear operational definition of a multiple occupation is emphasised, as well as the importance of the adoption of a single classification scheme against which to measure inconsistencies with the method of classification.

Our third paper employs the machine-readable 1881 census data, originally collected by the Genealogical Society of Utah in conjunction with the Federation of Family History Societies, and now held in an enriched version at the UK Data Archive at the University of Essex. This database comprises some 26 million people, with some 41,000 different surnames. Through an analysis of the 41,203 surnames in this database with a total frequency of 25 or more, a search is conducted for the ‘Holy Grail’ of cultural territories. Regional patterns are immediately evident in the distribution of surnames, and they cut across rural-urban divides, but when mapped at parish level they do not correspond either to physical geography or to the geography of administrative counties. Analysis of patronymic and metronymic surnames, and of a select group of occupational titles, confirms the persistence of regional associations into the later nineteenth century, while further investigation of the degree to which particular places shared surnames with parishes across England and Wales indicates that surname correspondence was not a straightforward function of distance. However, it did prove possible to distinguish parts of the country with low, middling and high separation distances, although this was partly—though not exclusively—a function of distance from London. The exceptional pull of the capital city is reflected in the fact that there was not a single surname ranked in the top 10,000 in any parish in England and Wales that was not also found in London. Cluster analysis of the top 1,000 surnames suggests a diagonal divide running from the mouth of the Mersey to the Thames, roughly demarcating the southern limit of the Danelaw in the ninth century, with an enlarged East Anglia standing out as a distinct cluster, while less clearly defined clusters are again evident for surnames ranked from 2,000 to 7,500. Admittedly a tentative and speculative exploration, this study does begin to identify regional divisions, while the agenda for further research suggests that attention needs to be given to a range of variables, including
physical barriers, demographic variation, agricultural regimes, political entities and the geography of religion, as well as to change or stability over time. Cultural territories, of course, like communities, overlap, and it is this that makes them so hard to define or identify.

Our Research in Progress piece reports upon an aspect of the work of the University of Hertfordshire’s Centre for Regional and Local History that has been underway for several years. Analysis of the incidence of farm service in the St Albans region (population 17,991) allied to the testimony of Edwin Grey in his reminiscences of the parish of Harpenden in the 1860s, appears to indicate that farm service was far less moribund than either widespread contemporary report or historical orthodoxy would suggest. After carefully scrutinising the descriptors of living-in ‘servants’ and ‘farm servants’ for each enumeration district, and adjusting where necessary for misrecording, it was discovered that the incidence of farm service was considerably higher in this district than might have been expected, and considerably above the county level shown in the published census report: indeed, the level was at least double the published figure for the county, while fully 75 per cent of all farms kept at least one living-in farm servant. Although there is no reason to believe that this region was exceptional, extension of this analysis across the county—currently underway— will be necessary to determine whether or not this indicates that the published census report is in error, and might highlight some of the local economic variables that impacted upon the survival of farm service. Our research note is offered by a previous correspondent to LPSS, and was stimulated by Alan Wright’s piece on birth-baptism intervals in Whickham parish, County Durham, published in the last issue. From her PhD research into Cerrigydrudion and the surrounding area, Sally Brush provides information on birth-baptism intervals for various periods between the years 1662 and 1812, extracted from the parish registers of Cerrigydrudion in the late seventeenth century, and Llangwm and Bettws Gwerfyl Goch in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. This Welsh evidence clearly indicates the variability of local practice, as well as confirming the existence of differences by social class.

The new LPSS constitution

The movement towards full merger of LPS and the LPSS is gathering pace, and at the Annual general Meeting of LPSS held during the annual conference on 17 April 2004 a draft constitution was considered, amended and approved. At the last LPS Editorial Board meeting held on 8 July, this constitution was ratified. All that remains now is for approaches to be made to the Charity Commission to obtain formal approval for a merger of the two hitherto distinct charities. In view of the recent statements issuing from the Commission about their intentions to ease the procedures necessary for such mergers, no further obstacle is foreseen.

The reconstitution of LPSS and LPS will require that a new Editorial Board is convened, and the current Society and the Board would like to retain a
balance between professional and non-professional membership. Anyone who feels that they might like to serve on the reconstituted Board, or would like further information about what it entails, is invited to contact Nigel Goose at the General Office (address on p. 2). The new constitution of the Local Population Studies Society is reproduced on pages 119–121.

The Local Population Studies Society Annual Conference

The chosen theme for next year’s conference is ‘Old age in English history’, and it is hoped to be able to offer a range of papers that examine old age in general cross a broad chronological range, as well as from the point of view of gender. The structure of the conference, with two or three longer papers and two panel sessions comprising shorter presentations, has proved very effective during the past four years and is likely to be retained. Offers of papers, to fit either of these categories, are invited. The provisional date of the conference is Saturday 16 April 2005, and the venue will again be the Law Faculty of the University of Hertfordshire in St Albans. The fee for registration and all refreshments is likely to be held at £25, although if our application for support from the Economic History Society—who kindly provided financial support for the last conference—is successful, it will again be possible to offer a number of free student places.

LPS projects

While the development of our projects on women’s work and children and childhood remain ongoing, it has unfortunately been necessary to terminate — at least for the time being — our project on medical sources, a consequence of the departure of Graham Mooney to John Hopkins University and the new pressures and priorities that face him there. The publication of Eddy Higgs’ new book, *Life, death and statistics: the General Register Office, 1837-1952* is, however, imminent. It will sell at £12.50, plus £1.50 post and packaging, and will be available very shortly from the LPS General Office at the address given on p. 2 above.

Editorial matters

I would like to extend my thanks to Jo Shelton who has served very cheerfully and efficiently as LPS administrator for the past few months, and to wish her well in her new life in Norfolk and in her MA studies at the University of East Anglia. I am, however, also pleased to be able to welcome back Vanessa Chambers, who will have rejoined the team by the time this issue of the journal is received. For the typesetting of *LPS 72*, I am grateful, as ever, to Ken and Margaret Smith.

Nigel Goose

July 2004
OBITUARY

LESLIE BRADLEY: AN APPRECIATION

Roger Schofield

Leslie Bradley died on 18th December 2003, aged 102 years. Most readers of Local Population Studies will have got to know Leslie through the first issue of the magazine, published in the autumn of 1968, in which we carried a letter from him, on ‘estimates of population size and the hearth tax’. In fact he was a member of one of the University of Nottingham Adult Education Groups in Derbyshire, and he had become aware of the existence of the magazine, which was also funded by the University of Nottingham. More particularly he concluded, in his own words that ‘the editors had little interest in the nuts and bolts of production, so I appointed myself business manager’. Leslie not only wrote something for almost every one of those early issues but he also collated the pages, read the proofs and negotiated deals with the University of Nottingham reprographics department.

In the second issue, he went on to refer to himself as an ‘amateur’, and he always had the amateur’s interests passionately at heart. In the early years of Local Population Studies he was, indeed, an amateur in historical demography, as we all were in those days. Nevertheless, in 1971 he wrote A glossary for Local Population Studies, which sold widely, and which became the vade-mecum of the historical demographer with anything technical to communicate.

Earlier in life, Leslie had also been a successful Headmaster of Derby School, and originally he was ‘a mathematician by training’. It was a training that he wore very lightly. In fact, he was also a good linguist, translating the mathematical treatise by the Swiss-French author Daniel Bernouilli and, in 1991, learning enough Swedish to read, and to reconstitute, a manuscript early eighteenth century parish register, which was written in a gothic hand. This was not his only triumph, for he also managed to translate several articles from the Swedish, on the plague that was current there in 1710-11.

In England he, is perhaps best known for his three articles on ‘An enquiry into the seasonality in the distribution of baptisms, marriages and burials’ (LPS 4, 21-40; LPS 5, 18-35; LPS 6, 15-30). He was also, a key author in a book on The Plague reconsidered, which was published by Local Population Studies in 1977. For this he did a major study of ‘The most famous of all English plagues: a
detailed analysis of the plague at Eyam 1665-6', and he added a most useful chapter on ‘Some medical aspects of plague’.2 His investigation of the patterns of the disease in Eyam was quite exceptional, so much so that Leslie seemed the obvious choice to investigate the patterns of mortality in Bräkne-Hoby, Sweden in 1710-11. Here the undoubted excellence of the Swedish registration system meant that there was no doubt that plague was the operative disease in that crisis. But the patterns of mortality seemed so very unusual that they required a detailed investigation of the kind of which he was an unassuming, but always a very patient, master.

NOTES

1. I am very grateful to his son Nick Bradley for the loan of a copy of ‘A self-indulgent autobiography’, penned by Leslie himself, in February 2002.
WAR AND DEMOGRAPHY IN TWENTIETH-CENTURY BRITAIN

The fourth Local Population Studies/Local Population Studies Society conference was held at the Law Faculty of the University of Hertfordshire in St Albans, and was attended by over 50 delegates.

The conference was introduced by David Gatley who hoped that the day would help participants understand how war affected population in Britain. Edward Higgs (University of Essex) opened the conference by discussing 'War and the development of the information state'. In his paper he drew heavily upon his recent book, The information state in England: the central collection of information on citizens since 1500 (Macmillan, 2004) arguing that the modern information state emerged, to a large extent, as a result of warfare. His main thesis was that the central state in the period before the 1800s was mainly concerned with warfare and diplomacy. In order to support these, taxation was necessary and with taxation came information gathering. State information collecting post-1830, Eddy argued, had a broader range of influences—social improvement, property rights and more equitable constituency boundaries. The second half of the paper concentrated on legislation relating to registration for World War One and Two where the government collected additional information on individuals, again partially for military purposes. He argued that other government information collection exercises, like passports and wireless licensing, also emerged because of war. Eddy's conclusion that while there was a strong relationship between information gathering and demography, this relationship was not always directly functional.

After questions, the first panel session was devoted to the period from the Boer to the Great War. First, Bernard Harris (University of Southampton) spoke on the origins of 'The Physical Deterioration Committee'. Bernard argued that the traditional explanations of the origins of the terms of reference of the enquiry, and the reasons for the lack of a subsequent Royal Commission, as originally put forward by Bentley Gilbert, are overstated. Bernard argued strongly that the physical health of army recruits was not the only influence on the enquiry, but children's health and education was also important. The change in terms of reference were more chancy than political. Michael Williams (retired Professor of Anatomy at the University of Sheffield) then presented a paper entitled, 'How many for what? Estimates of local service commitment in south-east Wales in WW1'. In this presentation Michael showed how he has tried to calculate the numbers of soldiers serving in the war from his native Monmouthshire. Using a number of sources,
including the relatively neglected Absent Voters Registers for the 1918 election, he provided convincing estimates. The final paper in this session was given by Daniel Coetzee (Pembroke College, University of Cambridge) who spoke on variations in voluntary enlistment in Scotland between August 1914 and December 1915. He presented the results of the reworking of county-level voluntary enlistment figures, correlated against variables drawn from the census and other sources. The results showed a clear Highland/Lowland split, with the Highlands disgorging high proportions of eligible men. The causes put forward for these high levels of ‘patriotism’ were more likely, Daniel suggested, to be structural rather than personal. A lively discussion preceded the break for lunch.

The afternoon session began with a talk by Briony Eckstein (University of Southampton) entitled, ‘As soon as the baby is coming they are told to go: childbearing and housing provision in inter-war Britain’. Briony began by charting the course of marital fertility decline in the inter-war years and revealed that the total fertility rate reached a low of 1.7 in 1933. According to the 1946 Family Census, middle class families within the 1930s cohort had only 1.5 children in their first ten years of marriage and working-class families only 1.3. Whilst admitting that a variety of factors were responsible for these levels Briony then sought to identify how housing provision could be linked to low fertility. Using evidence from the Royal Commission on Population (1944–49) and Mass Observation reports she showed how local authority housing was expensive and in some instances families with babies were excluded—hence the quote in the title. Although the private housing market boomed, such houses were expensive and this meant that many would-be mothers had to work in order to afford suitable housing which resulted in many births being postponed. Briony concluded that the most important issue relating to the impact of housing on fertility was economic and could be summarised by the quote, ‘a certain standard of living once obtained will be defended at all costs’.

The second panel concentrated on WW2. David Gatley (University of Staffordshire) began by introducing the 1939 enumeration. This little known and rarely used census was organised and carried out within three weeks on 29 September 1939. The enumeration was used to create a national population register, facilitate the issuing of identity cards, help with rationing and conscription and identify key workers. In many ways the 1939 enumeration was carried out like the nineteenth-century censuses with questions relating to name, sex, address, date of birth, marital status, occupation and membership of the armed forces. The results were published in 1944 and the abstract gives population statistics for the usual divisions. Areas were also identified as ‘evacuation’, ‘neutral’ or ‘reception’. David also revealed that the results from the enumeration had been digitised and the figures reworked to provide estimates for English and Welsh post-1974 counties. Using these results David examined population change in the 1930s and showed that the drift in population from the north towards the south east was also a feature of that decade.
The other two contributions in this session dealt with social conditions during WW2. Jane Howells, a teacher and editor of Local History News, spoke on ‘Wartime education in Salisbury’. Utilising a wide variety of sources, such as LEA committee and NUT minutes, newspaper reports and interviews, Jane examined the impact of evacuation in the education system in the city. Salisbury was classified as a reception area, but it received only 4,000 of the expected 11,000 adults, children and babies from nearby Portsmouth and 1,000 of these had returned home by autumn 1939. Schools from Portsmouth were paired with ones in Salisbury which resulted in alternate day or morning/afternoon attendance. Overall there appears to have been few criticisms of the evacuees; for instance, the noted increase in scabies appears to have been more apparent than real, and resulted from school nurses being ‘over zealous’. The panel ended with Maggie Escott (Senior Research Fellow at the History of Parliament Project) talking about, ‘Utilising oral history evidence on evacuation’. Maggie began by providing an overview of the importance of oral histories and giving a short introduction to the historiography of oral history. She then played us a recording of the voice of an evacuee. She discussed the greater freedom of war-time children and confirmed that many had little formal education; ‘half-time sharing’ was commonplace and usually it was just ‘up to the appropriate standard’. Overall, Maggie provided a picture of the process of evacuation that was ‘military, male and middle class’.

Nigel Goose (University of Hertfordshire) closed the conference with a discussion of the report of the Royal Commission on Population published in 1949. He highlighted the care with which the report was prepared, its employment of specialist sub-committees, the conduct or commissioning of broad demographic surveys, and consultation of an extensive range of witnesses. But the very breadth of its remit has rendered it an almost inevitable target for attack from historical demographers and politicians alike, and it has come in for particular criticism for its interpretation of the long-term fall in family size in England and Wales in terms of a ‘complex of causes’. Since the report was written, however, demographic orthodoxy has swung from a search for causation in terms of specific changes in economic and social factors and contexts, to the pre-eminence of broader cultural features, and back again, producing a recent appreciation of the complexity of the phenomenon which, Nigel suggested, paints the interpretation offered in 1949 in a far more favourable light. In the context of the subject matter of the day’s conference, the report showed little concern with the military implications of falling family sizes, but a great deal of concern with regard to the economic implications of both a potentially stagnant or falling—and particularly an ageing—even population. An interesting discussion followed of the range of factors that affect individual decisions to reproduce or limit family size, which ranged from bland academic generalisations to fascinating anecdotal insights.

Local Population Studies and the Local Population Studies Society would like to thank the University of Hertfordshire for providing us with excellent accommodation for the day together with lunch and refreshments, for which we are again very grateful to Barbara Bennett. Sponsorship by The Centre for
Regional and Local History, University of Hertfordshire, and the Economic History Society is gratefully acknowledged. The Board would also like to thank David Gatley and Nigel Goose for organising the conference, Peter Franklin for organising the bookstand and Jo Shelton for ensuring that the day proceeded smoothly.

Next year’s conference is provisionally scheduled for Saturday 16th April.

Matthew Woollard (University of Essex)
Chris Galley (Barnsley College)
THE PROVENANCE OF BRIGHTON’S RAILWAY WORKERS, 1841–61

June A. Sheppard

June A. Sheppard is Reader Emeritus in Geography at Queen Mary College, University of London. This article is part of an ongoing study of Brighton’s railwaymen in the nineteenth century.

When a railway was opened, a need arose for employees, and the number of employees grew as that railway attracted more passengers and freight. Some men were required in country areas as linesmen or porters at small stations, but most were employed at major foci such as terminal and junction stations or railway engineering works. At such a focus, where were the railway employees drawn from? What proportions came from the immediate vicinity, the rural hinterland and distant places? The proportions would have varied from one railway centre to another, influenced by the site itself, the character of the hinterland and the distance from other centres of population. At one extreme were large cities like London and Birmingham with many suitable employees among their own citizens; at the other extreme were railway engineering works established in small settlements like Crewe, Swindon and Wolverton where most employees perforce came from a distance. This article examines the case of Brighton, which falls between these two extremes, in that the terminus station and engineering works were situated on the fringes of an existing resort town with a population in 1841 of 46,000.1

The London to Brighton railway was opened in 1841, and by 1847 the Brighton terminus was also serving a West Coast line to Portsmouth and an East Coast line via Lewes to Hastings, with a branch to Newhaven. Both passenger and goods traffic expanded rapidly during the two decades 1841–61, requiring a growth in the number of employees. (The network as it existed in 1861 can be seen in Figure 3 below.) From the start there were limited facilities in Brighton for the repair and maintenance of rolling stock, but until 1846 the major engineering depot was at New Cross, near the London end of the main line. The decision was then taken to shift this work to Brighton where, over the next few years, new workshops were established on land adjacent to the passenger and goods stations. From the late 1840s there was therefore a steady increase in the number of men employed with engineering and metal-working skills. The London Brighton and South Coast Railway Company (henceforth LBSCR) ensured that no other railway company gained access to Brighton, or to a large part of the rest of Sussex, hence the approximately 1,000 railwaymen in the town in 1861 were all its employees. Brighton was 85km (53 miles) from London and some 200 to 300 miles from the major industrial districts of the
country, with a predominantly rural hinterland. Where did Brighton’s railway workers come from?2

In 1961, Michael Robbins commented that ‘no one has yet studied the origins of the 100,000 or so staff of all grades who were employed on the British railways in 1851’.3 Since then there have been a number of important studies, among which that of Kingsford is especially valuable for its detailed analyses based on the records of several railway companies, including the LBSCR.4 While Robbins had suggested that two major sources of recruits were the rural poor and former soldiers and sailors, Kingsford observed that former servants and shop workers were also numerous among operating staff.5 He did not include workshop men in his analysis, but Turton noted that many of the skilled men employed in the railway workshops at Ashford, Swindon and Wolverton came from the older industrial areas of England.6 Drummond’s study of Crewe and Revill’s article on Derby (both places with railway workshops) revealed a similar pattern of skilled men drawn from a distance and less skilled men from the rural hinterland.7 In other words, migration among railway workers has been shown to conform to broad nineteenth-century migration patterns in Britain.8

These earlier studies use as their main sources of evidence the published census reports and the extant manuscript records of the railway companies. Census volumes provide rather general data on sources of migrants and can offer a valid picture for towns where railway employment dominated, but they are less informative in those cases where the new railway community was attached to an existing town. To meet this limitation when studying Derby, Revill used 10 per cent samples from the 1851 and 1881 Census Enumerators’ Books (CEBs). Railway company registers of employees and other records, exploited especially by Kingsford and Drummond, provide details of the different occupational groups, the skill or experience each required and their levels of pay.

In this study of Brighton’s railway workers, two aspects of their provenance will be considered: the area of origin and the social background, the latter represented by the occupation of the father or, where relevant, of the worker himself prior to transferring to railway employment. Because the railway community grew up alongside a resort town that itself attracted migrants, the summary data provided in the published census reports is of limited value for establishing the places from which the railwaymen were attracted, and the preferred source is the birthplace data included in the CEBs. This has the long-recognised limitation of telling us nothing about intermediate moves (except where the birthplaces of children can be used), but is adequate for sketching in the broad pattern.9 Evidence for the occupational background for young workers living with their birth family can also be extracted from the 1861 CEBs. For some of the 1861 employees who can be located in the 1851 CEBs living with their birth families, similar details of fathers’ occupations can be identified, while for others details of their own employment can be used. Enough evidence has been found to provide a broad indication of the type of
person recruited during this early period of railway growth. By later decades of the nineteenth century, Brighton’s recruitment patterns probably resembled those of other railway centres, where members of the families of existing employees played a much bigger role.10

An earlier study that used a microfiche index to the 1851 CEBs covering the whole of Brighton demonstrated that virtually all of Brighton’s railway workers then lived within 300 metres (half a mile) of the passenger and goods stations or the workshops, especially in a newly built-up part of the town just to the east of the railway land.11 Farther east lay the open ground occupying an intermittently flooded valley which linked at its northern end with the dry valleys followed by the main roads to London and Lewes (Figure 1). In 1851 there was already a little development on Round Hill and Race Hill, to the north and east respectively of these valleys, but many more houses had been built by 1861, some occupied by railway families. Other new houses had appeared just west of the station. The 1861 analysis was confined to these northern parts of Brighton, covered by Enumeration Districts 14 to 42.12 A quick scan of the CEBs for adjoining Enumeration Districts revealed virtually no railway workers.

Kingsford and Revill have both emphasised the large number of employment grades and the extent of inter-grade rivalry within railway companies.13 Each grade within the LBSCR’s administrative departments (traffic, locomotive and workshop) had its own entry requirements, and these inevitably influenced where their recruits were drawn from. The occupational groupings distinguished below and used in the analysis of birthplaces are therefore based on these entry requirements. The CEB occupational data are far from perfect for this purpose, principally because there was no obligation put on the enumerator to identify the employer. While most traffic and locomotive staff are clearly identifiable (e.g., railway porter or engine driver), it is only in a few instances that workshop employees are labelled as ‘with the LBSCR’. There were, however, few other potential employers in the area, and in the case of most types of workshop employee any errors resulting from assuming that all were railwaymen are likely to be few. There is greater scope for error in the case of carriage workers, for the term ‘carriage’ could also be applied to a road vehicle, and some men described as carriage workers may have been employed by local coach makers. In addition, it is possible that some of the numerous carpenters and sawyers in the area may have been employed in the LBSCR carriage works. Carriage worker numbers used in this article may well be understated, and this may affect conclusions relating to their places of birth.

Occupational groups

The numerous grades make some form of grouping necessary, and the descriptions here are based on similarity of entry requirements.14

Inspectors and supervisors were usually well-educated men who could if necessary frame a report to the Board of Directors. Some had been promoted
from other grades, others came from other railway companies or comparable organisations. Because the LBSCR management was based in London, there were relatively few such senior staff in Brighton, earning between 40s. and 60s. a week.

Engine drivers and firemen were required to be reliable and have stamina and aptitude rather than formal education. By the 1850s, a chain of recruitment had been established from teenage engine cleaner (pay 10-12s. a week) to fireman (20-30s.), with eventual promotion for many to driver (30-45s.). Senior drivers were thus well paid and highly respected employees.

Engineers, fitters, turners and boilermakers required high levels of skill, which usually involved several years of apprenticeship followed by experience with other firms. The training was available in engineering firms, including the earlier-established workshops of other railway companies; pay was in the range of 30-36s. a week. Blacksmiths required several years of apprenticeship or training, in many cases provided in village or small town smithies. Levels of pay were broadly comparable with those of engineers, 30-36s. a week. Hammermen, iron-moulders, brass and copper workers also required several years of training, mainly provided by metal-working concerns in the older industrial districts of Britain. Pay was generally somewhat lower than for blacksmiths.
Clerks were responsible for collecting and paying out money, as well as keeping accounts and other records, so needed to be well-educated by contemporary standards, as well as totally honest. Apprentice clerks recruited at age 16 started at around 10s. a week, while men aged 21 and over received between 20s. and 30s. according to responsibility. Porters, ticket-collectors, guards, signalmen, switchmen (pointsmen) and railway policemen did not need much in the way of skill or education on recruitment, but they were required to be reliable and honest. Porters in particular needed to be strong and healthy, so this was a job well-suited to men in their late teens or twenties. Pay was modest at 16-19s. a week. Other grades carried more responsibility and were often filled by men promoted from the porter grade, along with some non-railway men whose former employers provided references that commended their honesty and reliability. Policemen could earn 20-21s. a week, ticket-collectors up to 23s., signalmen up to 24s. and guards 25-29s.

Machinists formed a small but distinctive group of semi-skilled workshop employees, resulting from the introduction during the 1850s of a few simple machine-tools such as foot-operated lathes. These jobs provided an entry route for men with aptitude but less formal training, with pay around 22-25s. a week. Carriage workers were a miscellaneous group, some of whom required only modest levels of training and skill. Carriages and wagons were constructed on a metal frame provided by the main workshops. Carpenters, or men who had previously built road vehicles, then added the main structure, and carriages were finished by trimmers and painters, who had often learnt their skills working for a coach-maker. Pay varied with the level of skill required but most men probably earned between 20s. and 30s. a week. Labourers were needed in various branches of railway work. They required strength and stamina but little education, training or skill. Pay was 2s. 6d. to 2s. 8d. per day, so a man employed for the whole of a six-day week could earn 15-16s.

These different entry conditions meant that each branch of railway employment provided openings for men with differing skills and backgrounds. The broad occupational groups outlined above therefore provide the most suitable framework for the following discussion of the source areas from which the LBSCR drew its mid nineteenth-century work force.

Areas of origin

Table 1 classifies the men identified as railway employees in the 1861 CEBs by their occupational group and household status. Out of a total of 1,008 men, 714 (71 per cent) were classified as heads of household, 144 (14 per cent) as lodgers or boarders, and 150 (15 per cent) were living with their parents or other relatives. Only a handful of women employees were identified, all cloakroom attendants or carriage trimmers; these are not included in any of the tables. Some of those recorded as heads of household were single men living in one room. Most lodgers and boarders were also single, the few who
were married but living alone may have been recent recruits, looking for suitable accommodation before moving their family to Brighton. The analysis that follows is restricted to the 850 heads and lodgers (out of the total of 858) for whom detailed birthplace data are available. Some of the larger

Table 1  LBSCR employees in Brighton, 1861: household status of occupational groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Head (a)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter (b)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guard (c)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine driver</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireman</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine cleaner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmith</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron worker</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brass worker (d)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filter or turner</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boilermaker</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinist</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriage worker (e)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (f)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: (a) includes some older relatives not classed as head but who were chief wage earners; (b) includes ticket collectors; (c) includes signalmen and policemen; (d) includes copper workers; (e) includes sawyers and carpenters; (f) includes mechanics, railway servants, timekeepers, telegraph workers, a chain maker and a spring maker.

Percentages may not sum exactly to 100 because of rounding errors.

Source: 1861 Census CEBs, PRO RG9 / 595-7.
occupational groups described above have been subdivided (for example, porters are distinguished from guards, and engineers from fitters and boilermakers), in order to test whether they exhibited differences of provenance.

Figure 2 and Table 2 show the areas of birth of men in each occupational group, using four birthplace categories: Brighton itself; the rest of Sussex; London and the adjacent counties of Kent, Surrey, Middlesex and Essex; and the rest of the British Isles. In total nearly half of the men were born in Sussex (16 per cent in Brighton, 32 per cent in the rest of the county), 16 per cent in London and adjacent counties and 36 per cent elsewhere, but some occupational groups differed markedly from this overall pattern. These differences are revealed in Table 2 and Figure 2, which show the numbers and percentages respectively. Both use the same order of occupations, from machinists with the highest percentage of Sussex-born men, through to boilermakers with the lowest percentage. This occupational order is retained in the discussion that follows and in subsequent tables.

Machinists, labourers and porters were most likely to have been born locally, though the small size of the machinists group means that its percentages must be treated with caution. Because machinists required little initial skill, local men with a technical bent or background but too old to start as an apprentice were given a chance; those who showed promise could be promoted to more skilled work, but others would have proved unsuitable. Such modestly-paid jobs did not attract many distant migrants. Seventy per cent of porters were born in Sussex (18 per cent in Brighton, 52 per cent in the rest of the county). The entry requirements (health and a good character reference from a local worthy) could be met by at least some young countrymen. The pay was higher than their contemporaries who remained in the countryside could earn, and had the great merit of being reliable. However, a significant proportion of recruits seem to have found it difficult to adapt to railway standards of discipline and left or were dismissed after a short time. Sixteen per cent of labourers were born in Brighton and 56 per cent in the rest of Sussex. Because entry requirements were low, rural migrants as well as Brighton-born men had a good chance of acceptance. Those who had experienced the hard physical work involved in farm labour may have been preferred, but again there was a probably a significant turnover, with some moving on to less demanding jobs.

A second group of occupations also drew men predominantly from Sussex, though the Sussex-born were not so predominant as in the first group. Guards (including signalmen and policemen) had a smaller Sussex-born proportion (42 per cent) than porters, with a larger proportion from Brighton itself (21 per cent) or from London (39 per cent). Likely reasons for the difference were the recruitment of some older men from other companies in the early years after establishment, and transfers from the London end of the line on promotion from porter grade. Local promotions, however, kept the balance in favour of Sussex-born men. Blacksmiths also show a predominance of Sussex-born men (41 per cent from the rest of Sussex and 17 per cent from Brighton). Small iron
furnaces and forges were common in the Wealden district of East Sussex and there were village smithies throughout the county. Young men who had trained in these establishments usually moved away for further experience, and when the Brighton works opened it was able to attract some of them. Clerks, also predominantly local-born, were more likely to come from Brighton itself (34 per cent) or from London (31 per cent) than from the rest of Sussex (23 per cent). Many were recruited as teenagers when they were still living with their parents, and if the 'young relatives' of Table 1 had been included in this birthplace analysis, the Brighton proportion would have been even higher. Promotion after several years of service often involved transfer, bringing London-born men to Brighton and vice versa.

Four occupational groups had between 40 and 50 per cent of locally-born men: carriage workers, inspectors and supervisors, brass and copper workers, and iron workers. In each case, the Brighton-born element formed between 18 and 22 per cent of the total. Among carriage workers, each of the four birthplace areas provided about a quarter of the 1861 employees. Carpenters or men with skills in coach and wagon building were to be found throughout the lowland parts of the country, so it is not surprising that men were attracted to the Brighton works from a wide area of southern England. The small inspector group comprised largely older men; the 27 per cent born in Sussex had probably been promoted within the company, as had some of the London-
born (12 per cent), but many of the 41 per cent born elsewhere would have
been recruited from other companies.20 The broad spread of birthplace areas
among the brass and copper workers no doubt reflects the scattered nature of
small specialist works throughout the country alongside major centres such as
the West Midlands; 40 per cent of these workers came from the rest of the
British Isles. Nearly half of the iron workers were born outside south east
England; their skills were most likely to have been acquired in large iron
works, heavy engineering and shipbuilding concerns that had grown up on
Britain’s major coalfields during the previous decades 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Brighton</th>
<th>Rest of Sussex</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>Rest of British Isles</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Machinist</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guard</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmith</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriage worker</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brass worker</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron worker</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine driver</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireman</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitter or turner</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boilermaker</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>136</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Some totals differ from those in Table 1 because of incomplete birthplace data.
Percentages may not sum exactly to 100 because of rounding errors.
London includes the surrounding counties of Kent, Middlesex and Surrey.
The three adult engine cleaners are omitted.
Around a third or less of the men in the final four occupational groups had been born in Sussex. The footplate men (engine drivers and firemen) were 34 per cent Sussex-born and 28 per cent London-born, with 38 per cent born elsewhere. However, when drivers alone are considered, we find that 52 per cent were born in the rest of the British Isles and only 23 per cent in Sussex. This pattern is likely to have resulted from the need to recruit the first drivers in the early 1840s at a time when the company had no facilities to train its own men. Drivers had to be poached from earlier-established railway companies, and although some of these men later left or died, enough remained with the company in 1861 to influence birthplace patterns. Company training and promotion among men recruited as firemen in the earlier years of operation meant that some locally-born men had joined the ranks of drivers by 1861, but it is when the birthplaces of the 1861 firemen are considered that a change of provenance becomes apparent: 52 per cent were Sussex-born (16 per cent in Brighton, 37 per cent in the rest of Sussex). London-born men may have started work in the LBSCR’s sheds at the London end of the main line, and might have been in Brighton on the night of the census as a result of either transfer or rostering.

Most likely of all to be born in the rest of the British Isles were three groups of workshop employees: 57 per cent of the engineers, 59 per cent of the fitters and turners, and 72 per cent of the boilermakers. Table 3 shows that a major source area for engineers and fitters was Yorkshire (principally the Leeds area), while Lancashire and Cheshire provided a third of the boilermakers. The North-East, comprising the counties of Northumberland and Durham,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Boilermaker</th>
<th>Fitter or turner</th>
<th>Engineer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London and adjacent counties</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire and Cheshire</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland and Durham</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincolnshire and East Anglia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of England</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1861 CEBs PRO RG9 / 696-7.
was another significant source area, while the 13-18 per cent born in London and adjacent counties came mainly from the older railway engineering works such as Stratford in Essex. When John C. Craven was appointed Locomotive Superintendent at the end of 1848, he brought to Brighton some of the men he had previously worked with in Leeds and Stratford, and these men may have instigated the migration of relatives and former work-mates. By the 1850s, some local men were being trained in the relevant skills, but it was not until some years later that the local contribution to the skilled engineering workforce became significant.

The overall pattern is thus of the less skilled jobs being filled largely by Sussex men, the more skilled jobs largely by migrants from distant parts. Many of the less-skilled men came from Brighton’s rural hinterland rather than from the town itself. Such findings, of course, are in line with those of Turton, Drummond and Revill discussed earlier. Figure 3 maps the Sussex birthplaces of the 1861 porters, guards and labourers. Most had been born within a radius of 20km (12.5 miles) of the town; those born farther away often came from parishes with a railway station by 1861. In contrast, the skilled workshop jobs were filled during these early years predominantly by northerners who brought an interesting new element into the town’s social geography.

Family and occupational backgrounds

It is possible to discover a little more about some of the LBSCR employees by means of nominal linkage, bringing 1851 CEB evidence alongside that of 1861. The evidence discussed above shows that in 1861 a sizeable proportion of LBSCR employees had moved to Brighton from places outside Sussex, in many cases during the 1850s when growth among workshop employees in particular had been rapid. It would require a nation-wide study like that conducted by Pooley and Turnbull to discover more about the backgrounds of these long-distant migrants. The following analysis is therefore confined to men living in Sussex in 1851, whether they were Sussex-born or pre-1851 migrants. The names of all 1861 railwaymen who were heads of household or
lodgers, and for whom there was no evidence such as children’s birthplaces that they were elsewhere in 1851, were sought in the indexes of the 1851 CEBs, available for Brighton, the whole of East Sussex and parts of West Sussex (Figure 4). Where 1851 and 1861 first names and surnames were identical (apart from minor variations of spelling), and ages (within one year) and birthplace details tallied, it was assumed that the same person was recorded. All names were sought initially in the 1851 indexes covering the whole of Brighton; names not found there were sought in the index for the district that included the birthplace recorded in 1861. As a result of the search 275 men were located living in Sussex in 1851.

The first two columns of Table 4 show for each occupation group the number found in the 1851 CEBs and the percentage this number formed of the 1861 total. The proportion found ranges from 13.6 per cent of the small boilermaker group, a result of few such workers being needed before the building of locomotives began in 1851, to 58.5 per cent of inspectors and supervisors, many of whom were working locally before promotion. Although conclusions based on such relatively small numbers can only be tentative, the following discussion of occupational history and family details can throw a little light on the backgrounds from which employees were drawn.

The three final columns of Table 4 summarise the details in the occupation columns of the 1851 CEBs for the 275 men found. Nearly 10 per cent were then classed as scholars (though many were probably doing some part-time or unpaid work), and 63 per cent were already working for the LBSCR, though not all in the same grade as later. It is the remaining 27 per cent in other occupations who are the most interesting; most numerous in this category are the 1861 labourers, machinists, porters, drivers and firemen, contrasting with very small numbers of 1861 blacksmiths, clerks and skilled workshop men.

Table 5 subdivides the ‘other’ occupation category of Table 4. It shows that railway labourers had been recruited largely from among 1851 general labourers already living in Brighton and teenage agricultural labourers living
in rural Sussex. A few porters, guards and footplate men had been labourers in 1851, but more had been working in shops or craft workshops. Most strikingly, the bottom row of Table 5 shows that if the railway labourer group is excluded, 39 out of the 52 former non-railway occupations were of a trade, craft or service type.

Further evidence of occupational backgrounds was sought by extracting details of the fathers of all employees (in this case including the ‘young relatives’ identified in Table 1) who were living in the parental home in either 1851 or 1861 (Table 6). Out of the 172 fathers found, 81 (47 per cent) were working for the LBSCR; 33 (19.2 per cent) were engaged in a trade or craft; and 42 (24.4 per cent) were general or agricultural labourers. The tendency for sons to follow fathers into railway employment was particularly marked among both skilled workshop men (76.4 per cent) and semi-skilled machinists (63.5 per cent). One third of the 1861 railway labourers had a father in railway

### Table 4 1851 employment status of 1861 LBSCR employees in Brighton (heads of households and lodgers).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1861 Occupation</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>% of 1861</th>
<th>% of those found in 1851 who were returned in that census as:</th>
<th>Scholar</th>
<th>LBSCR employee</th>
<th>In other employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Machinist</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guard</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmith</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriage maker</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/brass worker</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver/fireman</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer/fitter</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boilermaker</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Some groupings presented in earlier tables have been combined.

**Sources:** 1861 CEBs, RG9 / 595-7; Sussex Family History Group, The Brighton 1851 census microfiche series (1997-8).
employment, while 42 per cent had a labourer father. Porters and guards had nearly equal proportions of railway and labourer fathers. Smiths, iron and brass workers mostly had metal-working fathers, some employed by the LBSCR, but 20 per cent had labourer fathers.

The evidence from this small sample of Sussex-born men suggests that those who were not the sons of railwaymen had been drawn into LBSCR employment principally from two types of background: traders and small craftsmen, and labourers. In both cases, some men or their fathers were already working in Brighton in 1851, but others were then living in other parts of the county. In view of the important role that migration from rural area played in the growth of nineteenth-century towns, and the emphasis that Robbins, Kingsford and others place on rural sources of railway employees, it is worth focusing briefly on the latter group. Can the sample provide clues as to the type of rural migrant that LBSCR employment attracted to Brighton? An attempt is made here to find hints in the case of two specific occupational groups.

In 1861, in the parts of Brighton studied, there were living 87 blacksmith heads of household or lodgers, of whom 36 (44 per cent) had been born in a Sussex parish other than Brighton, 29 of these in parishes covered by the published

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1861 Occupation</th>
<th>1851 Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trade or Craft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinist</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guard</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmith</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriage maker</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/brass worker</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver/fireman</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer/fitter</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boilermaker</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total excluding labourers</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of these 29, nine were already living in Brighton by 1851, two were teenagers living with their parents in their birth parishes, and five were living and working in other Sussex parishes. The remaining 13 were not found; a few of these might be accounted for by name discrepancies, but the majority must be presumed to have been living and working elsewhere in 1851. It was common practice among rural and small-town craftsmen, including blacksmiths, to take on their own teenage sons and some of the sons of neighbouring craftsmen or farmers as apprentices. Once trained, these apprentices went off as ‘improvers’ to gain further experience wherever they could find employment, often in distant parts of the country. Some such men were attracted back to Sussex when the LBSCR opened its workshops, as exemplified by Edmund Muddle, who was born in East Grinstead, but was living in Brighton by 1861, with children born in Shropshire and Yorkshire.

While it seems likely that many of the Sussex-born blacksmiths employed by the LBSCR in 1861 were the sons of, or at least trained by, Sussex rural blacksmiths, it would require lengthy studies in family history to prove the point. One sample case must suffice here, that of Reuben Ellis, born in Hailsham in 1813, the middle of three surviving sons of John and Judith Ellis. In 1841, both John and Reuben were blacksmiths in Hailsham; Reuben, with his wife and three children, was living a short distance from John’s smithy and home and is likely to have been working with his father. John was then in his early 60s and perhaps hoping that Reuben would take over the business. By 1851, however, no member of the family remained in Hailsham, and Reuben

Table 6  Occupations in 1851 or 1861 of fathers of men employed in 1861 by the LBSCR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Son's occupation</th>
<th>Father's Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Machinist</td>
<td>Railway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter or guard</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith or metal worker</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriage worker</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver or fireman</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer, fitter or boilermaker</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 81 33 18 24 4 12 172

Sources: 1861 CEBs, PRO, RG9 / 595-7; Sussex Family History Group, The Brighton 1851 census microfiche series (1997-8).
was living close to the Brighton works; judging by his children’s birthplaces, he had moved to the town soon after the 1841 census was taken and may have been one of the first blacksmiths employed by the railway company. He must have prospered, for by 1861 he was living in the newly developed Islingword Road with a large family.

The second group of rural-born men whose family backgrounds were sought were those employed as porters, guards, drivers, firemen and carriage workers. The 1851 published CEB name indexes were searched for all rural-born men in these occupations who were aged under 35 in 1861. Thirty-two names were sought and 22 located. Of these, six had fathers with non-agricultural occupations (five craftsmen and one railway porter), while the remaining 16 fathers had agricultural occupations. Two were gamekeepers and one was a gardener in Horsham (with three railwaymen lodgers); the remainder were listed as agricultural labourers or farm workers. Several features suggest that these were not commonplace rural labourers: three had a second occupation (messenger and two parish clerks); three shared a family name and probable kinship with a nearby farmer; and three had relatives who were traders or craftsmen. More detailed study would probably reveal that all were permanent employees, perhaps stockmen, living in tied accommodation. Since the LBSCR required any applications for employment to be supported by a reference from a person of some standing, young men with permanent agricultural employees as fathers and who were integrated into the local kinship network would have found it easier to obtain such a reference than those whose father relied on weekly or casual engagements. In addition, sons of families of permanent employees would be more likely to have received some education, helping to widen their horizons and making them more ambitious. Railway employment provided a potential route out of rural poverty and drudgery for this type of rural youngster, a route that was rarely open to the sons of casual labourers.

Conclusion

Recruitment to railway employment in Brighton conforms to the broad picture painted by earlier writers. Many of the skilled workshop jobs were filled by long-distance migrants from the older industrial areas of the country, while local men were recruited for many of the less skilled jobs. The merit of using 1861 CEB evidence is that it has made possible a far more detailed picture of recruitment patterns for each sub-group of employees, revealing interesting variations in the proportions born in Sussex, and within Sussex between those born in Brighton itself and the rest of Sussex. Nominal linkage between the 1861 and 1851 CEBs has also provided pointers to the selective nature of migration from rural Sussex. In this county, railway employment in the mid-nineteenth century offered prospects to better educated rural migrants from established families, but did little for those from a background of casual agricultural labour.

The same conclusions relating to rural recruits would not necessarily apply in other parts of the country, in view of the significant regional variations in farm
sizes and the composition of the agricultural work force. Further CEB-based analyses of mid-nineteenth century worker recruitment at other railway centres are needed before the Brighton experience can be set fully in context.
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NOTES

9. The records of the LBSCR for this period can be used to identify within-company transfers, but not the prior place of residence of new employees, Public Record Office (National Archives), London, (hereafter PRO) RAIL 414.
12. PRO, RG9 / 595-7.
14. Pay details for Traffic Department staff are taken from PRO, RAIL 414 / 770 (1857); for footplate staff from PRO, RAIL 414 / 863 (a muddled and incomplete register, but with some pay details for the 1860s); for inspectors from PRO, RAIL 414 / 767 (details of appointments, promotions and pay for a few of these men); see also Kingsford, Victorian railwaymen, 88-108. There are no LBSCR extant records of workshop pay, and the figures given are estimates based on figures in J. Burnett, Useful tool (London, 1974), 267-70, and C. Booth, Life and labour of the people of London, second series: industry (London, 1901), 235, 301, 331, 346.
17. Kingsford, Victorian railwaymen, 58-9; PRO, RAIL 414 / 770.
20. M. Robbins, The railway age, ch.9. William Balchin is a good example of local promotion: he was recruited in 1839 as a railway policeman at 21s a week, became stationmaster at Lewes in 1846 at 24s, stationmaster at Brighton in 1847 at 30s, rising to £130 per annum in 1851, PRO, RAIL 414/767.
22. The extent of rostering in Brighton is not known. Since most routes were short, it may have been insignificant.
24. Pooley and Turnbull, Migration and mobility in Britain.
26. The five blacksmiths living in 1851 in a parish other than that in which they were born were Thomas Dawes, born in Laughton and living in Framfield; Henry Ellis born in Hellingly and living in Ripe; William Fowler born in Westmeston and living in Jevington; Thomas Smith born in Lewes and living in Hamsomy; and Samuel Willett born in Pyecombe and living in Portsme.
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Introduction

This article deals with the reporting and analysis of ‘multiple occupations’ in the 1881 census of England and Wales.1 Multiple occupations occurring in routinely-generated sources are of particular interest because they provide evidence of occupational diversity, or what one might now call portfolio work practices. As sociologists and economists are becoming more interested in these forms of work practices, historians are slowly re-examining their sources for evidence of ‘multi-tasking’ in the past. However, the study of occupational diversity in past times has progressed slowly in the recent years, mainly because the sources available for use are neither explicit enough in their detail to allow a full understanding nor provide clear means to measure the complexity of individuals’ work patterns. Recent theorists have suggested areas where historians might examine multiple occupations and the diversity of work, but very few historians have taken up the challenge because of the unreliable nature of the sources.2

Most of the traditional sources used in local population studies which record occupations are potential candidates for the analysis of these practices, though clearly some are better than others, and some require higher levels of interpretation. Probate inventories, for early periods, give indications of multi-skilling, but require considerable tact in their interpretation. Other early-modern sources have different problems, especially in the reporting of occupations, but should not be discounted. Parish registers do occasionally record dual occupations, as noted in a recent study in LPS, but the coverage of these sources is limited, and comes with a number of health warnings.3 Commercial directories too, provide evidence, but may be biased in the opposite direction, where individuals who provide services list as many as possible to gain maximum custom (See Figure 1).4 Census enumerators’ books (CEBs), are, as will be discussed below, a problematic source for this form of analysis but, it is argued here, give both the fullest picture of the types of multiple occupation carried out in the late nineteenth-century as well as an indication of the scale of this phenomenon. This article does not argue that the
Figure 1  Examples of multiple occupations from a commercial directory.

census enumerators’ books are the best source to measure the incidence of multiple occupations, but they perform the function over the whole country, at what must be seen as at an approximately representative level. The result of the analysis of multiple occupations which follows must only be seen as a signpost towards the understanding of these multiple occupations and the plurality of occupational activity, rather than a complete map of these areas. CEBs would seem to be the only source of representative individual-level data which asked respondents explicitly to list more than one occupation if they followed more than one distinct occupation. This article takes an abstract approach towards the classification and analysis of multiple occupational titles based on a machine-readable version of the manuscript census of England and Wales of 1881.5

There are two prevailing definitions of a multiple occupation. The first relates to an occupational description which includes a number of skilled tasks being carried out by an individual in the pursuit of their occupation: most notably farm labourers must be able to drive a cart, plough, reap, sow, perhaps thatch, and mend agricultural equipment. Some of these tasks may be considered specialist enough in their own right to be an occupation, for example, they could be called carters, ploughmen, reapers, sowers and thatchers, but not all those who carry out these tasks would describe themselves as such. These are task-oriented skills which form part of the activities necessary to carry out an occupation, a point not strictly noted by writers on the subject.6 The second sense of the term is less ambiguous: where multiple occupations are actually more than one (separate) occupation or trade carried out by an individual. This grouping can be decomposed into those who, perhaps like a rural ‘baker and grocer’, may carry out two occupations in the same place, and those who receive an income from two separate activities, for example ‘innkeeper and farmer’. Not only is location a factor but skill where, even though the skills carried out by two occupations may to a certain extent (and for certain individuals) overlap, they should perhaps be considered two separate occupations. It is the second general type that is examined here, because it is the only type that one can explicitly discern in the CEBs. It is obvious that the occupational descriptions given in the nineteenth-century CEBs will never give full and detailed information about occupational diversity but it is the only mass source which allows the examination of occupational diversity over the whole country and over time.

The procedure followed in the collection of the census data may also impinge on the manner in which these occupational titles are handed down to us. In Britain, enumerators left schedules for the householder to complete, and once complete collected them and transcribed them into the volumes we presently call census enumerators’ books.7 So one must also always keep in mind the fact that we do not really know how individuals thought when they came to complete their schedules—the majority of individuals would have had little influence on how they were recorded in the schedules and thus the CEBs—and even for those who did complete the forms, we have no real idea of how they interpreted the instructions for the column headed “Rank, profession or
occupation”. On the other hand, it might be argued that the working population were more likely to be completing the schedules themselves, as they were more likely to be the heads of household. It is also necessary to remember that the CEBs (and indeed the machine-readable version being used here) are multiple recensions of the householders’ schedules and may, in many cases, not even reflect the individuals’ own interpretation of importance in their occupational entry.

Definitions

This section deals with the problems surrounding the definition of a multiple occupational title. Traditionally, a multiple occupation, is one which involves more than a single trade or occupation. For example, ‘baker and draper’ is understood to be someone who carries out both trades, and if it is found in a CEB we make an assumption that either the first mentioned is more important or the two trades carried out are of equal importance to the individual concerned. The former interpretation seems more probable because of the wording of the instructions on the householder’s schedule which stated (in 1881) that ‘A person following more Distinct Occupations than one, should insert each of them in the order of their importance’. This instruction obviously does not allow for the latter interpretation to be true. And the rules for classification were generally, as we will see below, in correspondence with this statement. However, as with all matters occupational in micro-level census studies, not all titles are quite so simple to interpret; there are other considerations in defining multiple occupational titles. Take the occupation, ‘Spirit Merchant Draper & Woolen Manufacturer Mayor Of Appleby’ for example. This individual, John Pearson, is involved in three trades, and he also holds an elected mayoral post which, strictly speaking, one understands not as an occupation but as a status or a condition. Whichever way this particular occupation demands to be treated it is clearly a multiple. What is more difficult is to decide whether an occupational title like ‘Mayor Alderman Iron Merchant’ is a multiple or not. The problem arises because there is only a single occupational title here.

For the purposes of analysis of the CEBs an operational definition of a multiple occupation is necessary. A multiple occupational title is just that: an occupational entry made up of more than one occupational title—but what the CEBs give us are occupational entries, and, as those entries which are not occupational titles are sometimes considered to be classifiable (for example, naval pensioner, pauper, etc.) then those part-entries which are not occupations must also be considered in the classification process. Similarly, the order of each of the entries must also be considered. The title ‘innkeeper and farmer’ is clear here—taken at face value this means that the person kept an inn and farmed some land; but it should also be obvious that while someone described as a ‘farmer and innkeeper’ carries out the same basic tasks, the occupational entry should not be interpreted in the same way. William Bindloss, whose occupational entry is ‘Mayor Alderman Iron Merchant’, almost certainly earns his income from dealing in iron and should
thus be considered first and foremost an iron merchant, but there is also a
matter of prestige here. Both Pearson and Bindloss (probably, being heads of
household) read the instructions on the householder’s schedule quoted above
about the order of importance of occupational information. These two men
clearly have differing opinions of the importance of their mayoral activities,
compared to their more usual businesses. We can look at this in two ways,
either Bindloss just considers his mayoral (and aldermanic) position(s) as more
important than his iron dealing or his local governmental activities are more
important than his iron dealing; in the former case he would be classified as
an iron merchant, in the latter he might be classified to some local government
category. Given that it is not possible to know which is ‘more important’, rules
must be created to effectively interpret some of these multiple occupational
titles and to facilitate comparative research.

Before considering the rules which may or may not assist in understanding
some of these multiple occupational entries, some clarification is needed to
separate those occupational entries which look like multiples but are in fact
single titles. It would seem to be the case that those occupational entries which
are a single occupational titles are those that do not usually have the maker,
dealer, merchant part of the entry repeated, therefore wine and spirit
merchant is a single occupational title. If the entry usually said ‘wine dealer
and spirit dealer’ it might be considered two titles. While there are no
occurrences of this particular phenomenon it is necessary to consider the
possibility. There are also occupational entries which are so similar in terms of
economic function that they can be carried out in the same premises and with
similar skills, so one assumes they do not refer to separate occupations: for
example ‘brass and iron moulder’, ‘spade and shovel finisher’, ‘black and
whitesmith’, ‘tin and copper miner’, ‘shoeing and general smith’, and so forth.
However, each of these titles could be classified, under the 1881 classification
rules, to two separate occupational groups. There are also occupations which
are so similar that they are often considered synonymous but are usually
treated as one, even though they do exist separately: examples are, ‘chemist
and druggist’, ‘fitter and turner’, ‘hedger and ditcher’, and ‘carver and gilder’.
There are also those that profess to perform more than one process on certain
similar raw materials, for example ‘cotton stripper and grinder’, ‘book folder
and sewer’.

There would thus seem to be five types of multiple occupation:

· those that are in fact a single occupation;
· those that would be classed to the same occupational group;
· those that would be classified to the same order;
· those that are unrelated within the classification scheme;
· those that are made up of occupational entries as well as titles.

The first category is typified by occupations like boot and shoe maker/closer/
clicker, ‘wine and spirit dealer’, ‘watch and clock maker’, ‘carver and gilder’,
‘painter and decorator’, and ‘ship and boat builder’. There are some
ambiguities here which are not easily resolvable: do ‘china and glass dealer’, ‘spade and shovel finisher’, ‘rope and twine manufacturer’ belong here or in the second category? The second group includes, typically, ‘saddle and harness maker’, ‘stove and grate fitter’, ‘cart and wheelwright’. Some of these can probably be considered to be the same occupation but for this discussion, as they are classed in the same grouping in the occupational classification scheme, they are considered equivalent. Obviously while these are classified to the same category in 1881 they may not have been in other census years. The third category has the same problems of temporal indecision as the second, and may be typified by occupational entries such as ‘baker and grocer’, or ‘draper and milliner’. The fourth type includes occupations like ‘stone mason and grocer’. A particular problem surrounds this form of title, which is that we do not know whether these represent the ‘life-time’ occupation of an individual along with their ‘current’ occupation or a clear contemporary division of tasks. (It would seem unlikely that anyone would be carrying out the trades of ‘Butcher and Rat Catcher’ simultaneously, but that is exactly what William Horne of Mollington in Oxfordshire was described as.) The final grouping suggested here includes those occupational entries which include either ‘status’ or ‘inactive’ occupational entries, for example, ‘grocer and retired baker’. (The potential for ambiguity in entries like ‘retired grocer and baker’ or ‘grocer and farmer’s wife’ should not be neglected.) It is important to highlight the fact that the decision on which of the three true multiple occupation categories (types 2, 3 and 4 above) apply is dependent on the classification scheme being used.

As part of a process of re-examining the figures published in the census reports, the third and fourth of these types are of particular interest, because the method of classifying the occupations by the census tabulators may have distorted the occupational landscape. For a more detailed examination of occupational diversity, those in the second and fifth groups are also of interest. These groups allow us a greater understanding of the diversity of working practices in the late nineteenth century. Random occupational entries show that we do know a considerable amount about the ‘multi-tasking’ of people in various occupational categories. For example, nineteenth-century farm labourers would have carried out a range of different tasks; many rural craftsmen would have had to have been master of a number of trades in order to survive throughout the year; the distinctions between certain retail trades were frequently blurred—there would be an overlap in the goods that grocers, provision dealers and butchers would have sold; even within the professions, dentists would (before the 1850s at least) often have had another string to their bows. The problem faced is how these occupations should be classified—and also how, once classified, they can usefully be analysed.

**Methods of classification**

Before considering the methods which might be used in analysis of historical occupational titles it is necessary to consider any contemporary classification rules which may impinge on our interpretation of these titles. The instructions
to the clerks for classifying ‘multiple occupational titles’ in 1881 are clear, though it is worth repeating the whole rule:17

A person is often returned as following several Occupations. The general rule in such case is to select for ticking that Occupation which would seem the main or most important one. If there be none such, the first in the entry is to be selected; but:

(a) A Clergyman who is also a Schoolmaster must be ticked to Schoolmaster.

(b) A Member of Parliament or a Magistrate who is also engaged in a profession or a branch of industry, say as a Barrister, or a Brewer, is to be ticked to the special profession or industry.

(c) “Auctioneer and House Agent” or “Auctioneer and Surveyor,” or other combinations including Auctioneer, to be ticked to Auctioneer.

It should be noted that the schedules and the tabulators’ instructions potentially contradict each other, for the schedules tell the householder to put their most important occupation first, while the clerks are asked to classify the main or most important occupation regardless of position and if this isn’t clear then the first given occupation. However, the 1881 General report gives a slightly different picture. This states that the three general rules followed were, first: ‘that a mechanical handicraft or constructive occupation should be preferred to a mere shop-keeping occupation’; second, that the more important should be chosen and third, ‘in default of such apparent difference the occupation first mentioned should be taken, on the ground that a person would be likely to mention his main business first’.18

In classifying the occupations in the machine-readable version of the 1881 CEBs these rules were followed as consistently as possible—where there was conflict the rules reported in the General report were followed as they probably described the most up-to-date practice. A further rule followed in this classification, which relates to farmers, should also be highlighted here. The instructions to the clerks are not completely clear. They say that ‘All persons returned as farming land, whether the land be their own or hired, are to be ticked to Farmer’.19 This suggests that all individuals with farmer in the title (except farmers’ wives, daughters and so on) would have been classified to this group. The rule followed in the re-classification of the 1881 occupations is that in multiple occupational entries, not just farmer has to occur but Farmer (or similar) and either the number of labourers or the number of acres. This means that huge numbers of occupational titles (probably with a national frequency of 1) are classified to this category rather than to either their first listed occupation or potentially the ‘most important’. In summary ‘farmer and grocer’ is classified to Farmer (which was given the code of 100); ‘grocer and farmer’ to Grocer (236 – the code for ‘Grocer, Tea, Coffee, Chocolate Maker, Dealer’) but ‘grocer and farmer of 5 acres’ to Farmer (100). Some effort has been made to judge some of the titles here, but it is by no means perfect, that is, someone described as ‘Farmer and Baker employs 3 labourers 95 in biscuit
works’ will have been allocated to biscuit making, but given the sheer volume of entries in the occupation column it is not clear whether this has been done consistently. A further exception here concerns titles like ‘gardener and farmer of 10 acres’. All of these have allocated to the market gardener category. The rules quoted above have informed the basic classification of the 1881 occupations, though the interpretation of the phrase ‘main or most important one’ may not be consistent. Pearson would have been classified to [wine and] ‘spirit merchant’ and Bindloss to ‘iron merchant’.

Other commentators on the subject have tended to follow the same line. Classify the occupation that is the most important (which is a roundabout way of saying if one part of the entry is income-generating and the other is not then the income-generating one is classified); if both are income-generating then classify the one that comes first (on the basis that the individual listed the income-generating jobs in order of importance). Honorary, voluntary and preaching jobs are always considered ‘less important’ than other entries within an occupational entry. Anderson et al., in the documentation for the machine-readable two per cent sample of CEBs for Britain, note that only the first given occupation is used for their classification and two further variables are available for the second and third listed titles. Harvey et al., on the other hand, working with eighteenth-century poll books for Westminster, said the ‘general rule was followed that the occupational description which conveyed most information took precedence’. They also ruled that dual occupations which occurred in an inverted form to one which they had already decided upon would receive the same codes. Thus they classify the occupation ‘stationer and perfumer’ in the same way as ‘perfumer and stationer’, though it is not possible to tell (without checking their code book) whether either is classed to an order of people who manufacture or sell perfume or one of those who manufacture or sell stationery.

The scale of the problem

What is the scale of the problem? As a data reduction problem it is quite difficult to say because to calculate it each and every recorded occupation must be inspected. This study examines three English counties from the 1881 census. The total population of this selection is 856,619. Within this selection there are no more than 800 multiple occupational titles which affect two or more people, while there are in the region of 5,000 that affect only a single person. The combination means that around 9,000 people are affected out of a combined population of 850,000. If we say that some 60 per cent of the population are ‘inactive’ (that is, outside of the labour market) then approximately 1 in 30 of those ‘occupied’ are affected by this problem. This is very much a maximum, as not all titles that only affect a single person have been checked. This is because there is a problem in extracting the multiple titles: it is not just a question of searching for those with ampersands or the word ‘and’ (for example, ‘Employing 2 Men & 3 Boys’ or ‘Employed by Jones and Co’), but there is also the problem of deciding whether there are two trades being carried out or not given that two parts of an entry may be
Table 1  Numbers of people whose occupational title includes the term ‘Grocer’ in 1881 but classified elsewhere.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Cornwall</th>
<th>Derbyshire</th>
<th>Westmoreland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Domestic Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Animals</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Working, Dealing in Machines</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Houses, Furniture etc.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Carriages and Harnesses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ships and Boats</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Chemicals and Compounds</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Food and Lodgings</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Dress</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Animal Substances</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Vegetable Substances</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mineral Substances</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>General/Unspecified</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>304</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in Grocery</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,286</td>
<td>2,499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: see text for explanation

Source: Genealogical Society of Utah, Federation of Family Historians, 1881 census for England and Wales, the Channel Isles and the Isle of Man [computer file] (Colchester, Essex, The Data Archive [distributor], 1997). SN 3643.

Table 2  Numbers of people whose occupational title includes the term ‘Dentist’ in 1881 but classified elsewhere.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Cornwall</th>
<th>Derbyshire</th>
<th>Westmoreland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Chemicals and Compounds</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in Dentistry</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: see Table 1 for source.
Table 3  Numbers of people whose occupational title includes the term ‘Wheelwright’ in 1881 but classified elsewhere.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Cornwall</th>
<th>Derbyshire</th>
<th>Westmoreland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Houses, Furniture etc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Carriages and Harneses</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Food and Lodgings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mineral Substances</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Wheelwrights</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>673</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: see Table 1 for source.

Table 4  Numbers of people whose occupational title includes the term ‘Auctioneer’ in 1881 but classified elsewhere.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Cornwall</th>
<th>Derbyshire</th>
<th>Westmoreland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Working, Dealing in Machines</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Houses, Furniture etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Food and Lodgings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mineral Substances</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total in Auctioneering</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: see Table 1 for source.

semantically identical. The inclusion of these erroneous multiples in this calculation may be balanced by those which are not so easily identifiable, that is those titles which do not include an ‘and’ or an ampersand, for example, ‘Cook Wainwright’. Presently only four occupational titles have been examined in their entirety. Further work will allow reporting on the scale of the problem in greater detail and at a greater level of accuracy. The large number of people who record multiple occupations give us some ability to
Table 5  Numbers of people whose occupational title includes the term 'Grocer' in 1851 but classified elsewhere.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>(8)</th>
<th>(9)</th>
<th>(10)</th>
<th>(11)</th>
<th>(12)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Service</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machines</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House, Furniture</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriages/Harness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals etc.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food/Lodging</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal products</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minerals</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All in Grocery 92 146 82 197 123 294 160 78 120 88 138 97 1,615

Note: Columns: (1) East Anglia; (2) London; (3) North Midlands; (4) North West; (5) North; (6) Scotland; (7) South East; (8) South Midlands; (9) South West; (10) Wales; (11) West Midlands; (12) Yorkshire.

look at some of the numbers that were involved in more than one trade, but also allow us to see in a more general manner some of the connections between different occupations.

Table 1 demonstrates the potential effect (in a single direction only) of taking into account multiple parts of occupations in the three county sample. This table shows the total number of people whose occupational title was not classified to the grocer grouping because another occupational title took precedence. The table can be read that there were seven individuals in Cornwall whose subsidiary occupation included a term which would have been classified to group 236, but because of the first (or more important) title were classified in local government. For all counties the influence of the rule
### Table 6  Summary of tables 1–5 with additional material for 1851.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>same code</th>
<th>extra</th>
<th>percentage change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grocers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>2,286</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>11.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbyshire</td>
<td>2,499</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>9.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881 total</td>
<td>5,232</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>10.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851 total</td>
<td>1,615</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>6.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dentists</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbyshire</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881 total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851 total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wheelwrights</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbyshire</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>17.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>230.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881 total</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>14.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851 total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auctioneers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbyshire</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881 total</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851 total</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** This table should be read: in Cornwall, a total of 2,286 people were recorded with an occupation falling into group 236 (Grocer). There were 304 people who, if their second occupation had been classified would have been classified here; 32 of these were already classified here because their first occupation also placed them in this group. The final column is the percentage increase that would have been recorded in that particular category if the additional people were included.

**Source:** See Tables 1 and 5.
for classifying farmer (see above) is noticeable, but in Derbyshire it seems that grocers predominantly shared occupations with others in the food and lodgings sector, whereas in Cornwall, the textile sector provides a healthy overlap. (In essence the occupational titles baker and draper cause these two groups respectively.) It should also be noted that other occupations like cocoa manufacturer that would have been allocated to the grocery category have not been examined (as part of the multiple element) in this example, meaning that these figures are the lowest possible estimates. The total at the base of the table shows how many people are allocated to the occupational category 236 using the classifications for the 1881 census occupations. Note that there is some double counting here: the ‘total’ in grocery includes those already counted in the sixteenth order in the earlier part of the table, and these need to be deducted to calculate the possible percentage change. Thus if all those involved in grocery in Cornwall had been classified to grocery, the minimum number would be 2,558, representing an increase of around 12 per cent from 2,286. Derbyshire would have seen a 10 per cent increase and Westmoreland would show a 7 per cent increase. The same exercise is carried out in Tables 2 to 4 for dentists, wheelwrights and auctioneers. The number of dentists is rather small but shows their continuing dependence on other forms of occupation in order to sustain themselves. Wheelwrights present a particularly varied picture. In Cornwall only a single additional percentage point is added, but for Westmoreland the increase would be 230 per cent: more than double the number of those who used the term Wheelwright used it in a (lesser) combination with another occupation (in this case all 23 are Joiners and Wheelwrights). The spread for auctioneers is not that different ranging from 9 per cent in Westmoreland to 19 per cent in Cornwall with Derby in between with around 10 per cent. These four tables clearly demonstrate that the method of reporting of multiple occupations can significantly affect the final tabulations. It also shows that there are regional variations for some occupations whereas for others there seem to be rough uniformity. What has not been checked in this experiment is the effect of the reverse phenomena, that is, ignoring the first occupation. For the three counties however, there are no fewer than 209, 437 and 59 (in Cornwall, Derbyshire, and Westmoreland respectively) individuals who are classified to the grocer category who have multiple occupations where the part of the title referring to grocery is first.

The data for Tables 1 through 4 are sufficient to demonstrate the existence and the extent of the problem for 1881. It is also possible to examine the extent of this problem at an earlier date using Michael Anderson’s two per cent sample of the 1851 census. Here the total population under examination is only 398,401. In 1851 0.40 per cent of the total population under examination were grocers (that is, have the word grocer in their occupational title), whereas in 1881 this figure (for our three sample counties) has increased to 0.61 per cent. This may be an artefact of the counties selected for 1881, but is more likely to be explained by structural changes in the economy. However, not only does the proportion of grocers in the population increase in the period, the number who are being allocated to a different class because the proportion of
occupational titles which could have been allocated elsewhere rises from 9.5 per cent to 12.7 per cent. The figures for 1851 for grocers are large enough to demonstrate their significance. For dentists however, the figures are not so clear. There were 20 people classified as dentists in the 1851 sample. Had those whose occupations simply included the word dentist a total of 24 would have been recorded. Two were also surgeons (and not ‘Surgeon Dentists’) and two were also chemists. For wheelwrights the pattern is less conclusive; only 21 would be added to the total of 542 already recorded. Finally, auctioneers would have increased by around 7 per cent. Table 6 shows the alterations that could be made for each of the three counties for 1881 and for the whole of the 1851 sample. It also demonstrates that the minimum percentage increase for each of the occupational groups for 1881 is always larger than that for 1851. This would tend to lead to the conclusion that multiple occupations (for these four occupational clusters) were more prevalent in 1881 than in 1851 and also that they were of greater significance in the classification of occupations. The very slight difference in the question posed to householders in 1851 and in 1881 should be mentioned again (see note 9). Another possible reason for this finding, which is counter to the intuitive view that multi-tasking became less common towards the end of the century, may be that individuals were more clear in their minds about what constituted an occupation. Hallas’s work on rural North Yorkshire has demonstrated that the proportions of the workforce with dual occupation almost trebled between 1851 and 1891. The largest numbers of those with multiple occupations were to be found in agriculture, but the sector with the largest proportion of multiple occupations was in crafts and services. Hallas suggests that the reason for this increase was an individual response to the declining employment opportunities in the area in this period rather than the general expansion of the economy and its increasing diversification.23 A more detailed examination of patterns of the plurality of work will allow a much greater understanding of the economy and peoples’ work choices in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Conclusion

The CEBs are certainly not the ideal source to help us establish the incidence of multiple employment, for they do not tell us about seasonal employment and a bland occupational title may hide a multitude of work practices which cannot be uncovered. However, the CEBs do allow us to glimpse at those in multiple employment and to gauge the relative importance of multiple employment in different areas. The secondary occupation of a grocer in Cornwall is more likely to be a draper than in Derbyshire where grocers with other occupations are more likely also to be bakers. Wheelwrights in Derbyshire are more likely to follow secondary agricultural employment than in either Cornwall or Westmoreland. The introduction of the 1851 data also suggests that there is a temporal dimension here. The analysis of four occupational groupings in 1851 and 1881 shows that despite similar rules used in the tabulation of the information within the census that there was a consistent increase in people’s propensity to record more than one occupation, which is perhaps contrary to expectations. And not only can temporal change
be ascertained by using a uniform classification scheme, gender divisions and
the effects of location can be explored. The manner in which one interprets
multiple occupational entries does encroach on their study and it is important
that a clear operational definition of a multiple occupation is designed before
starting out on any such project. It is also the opinion of the author that all
definitions of multiple occupations must be based on a single classification
scheme which will determine the parameters of an inconsistency within the
method of classification—for while it is interesting to know that someone who
defines themselves as a butcher is also a meat salesman, it does not help us
probe how the classification scheme affects the creation of official statistics.

This discussion has by no means exhausted the possible analysis of multiple
occupations as reported in the census. There are many other relatively
common multiple occupations. Many farmers, for example, are well known to
have had other strings to their bow, and this feature was noticed in the reports
for the 1851 census and has been commented on by historians. Further
research could be carried out which would draw out these patterns of work in
the past, giving us a greater understanding of the economy, and the
individuals’ work-practices.
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9. 1881 Census of England and Wales, *General report*, BPP 1883 LXXX, 583–, 116. The schedule for 1851 contains the instruction: 'A person following more than one distinct trade may insert his occupations in order of their importance' (1851 Census of England, Wales and Scotland, *Forms and instructions prepared for the use of the persons employed in taking an account of the population…*, BPP 1851 XLIII, 6). The two subtle differences, relating to trade rather than occupation and gender are unlikely to have made a considerable difference in reporting though the gendered distinction in 1851 may affect the scale of female reported multiple occupation.
12. This may or may not be the case depending on one’s understanding of the term ‘alderman’, but the point should be clear.
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14. Of these titles only one, Carver and Gilder, is mentioned specifically in P. L. Simmonds, *A dictionary of trade products, commercial, manufacturing and technical terms* (London, 1858), 73, though he includes Watch and Clock Tool Maker. Also note Booth’s comment: ‘We have already dealt with wood-carvers, and shall shortly deal with gilders. The combined name [carver and gilder] has a special significance as applying to picture-frame makers’: C. Booth ed., *Life and labour of the people of London*, Vol. V (London, 1897), 190.
17. PRO RG 27/5 *Instructions to clerks employed in classifying the occupations and ages of the people*, 3. (Italics as in original.)
19. PRO RG 27/5 *Instructions to clerks employed in classifying the occupations and ages of the people*, 3.
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Introduction

The parish has undeniably been an important point of reference for past populations. A place to worship, a place to wed, a centre of jurisdiction, and for those unfortunate enough to fall upon hard times, a place of settlement, welfare and charity. Arguably the parish was less important in the lives of urban populations than rural, and equally diminished in importance from the eighteenth century as the pace of urbanisation quickened, yet this should not detract from the presence of the parish in the lives of many. The parish has also been the focus of observation for many articles published in this journal. Hardly an issue passes by without one or more articles examining some aspect of the demographic past of a particular parish. This, of course, is a reflection, perhaps more so than anything, of the administrative processes that led to the creation of the primary sources through which historical demography is chiefly explored, namely parish registers and to a lesser extent census enumerators’ books. However, although the parish is a very practical, and in many cases, convenient unit of study, and although it was a geographical focus to many important activities within an individual’s life, to what extent was the parish subordinate to a wider region when it comes to attempting to understand how populations in the past interacted?

Arguments to study past populations in a regional rather than parochial context are not new. In particular Marshall has long argued for the need to ‘find out how contemporaries formed their allegiances to particular districts’. Marshall is in many respects concerned with social and economic activities rather than demographic analysis per se but it is realistically impossible to separate the timing of demographic events from the socio-economic contexts within which they occur, which in turn are strongly influenced by place. Such sentiments are clearly echoed in Woods’s advocacy of what he has termed ‘spatial demography’.

In recent years Phythian-Adams, the former Head of the Department of English Local History at the University of Leicester, has argued for a greater emphasis to be placed on the identity of cultural regions in the past. In particular Phythian-Adams has called upon historians to move away from
single parish or community-based research to a more regionally-orientated approach, stating that ‘there may exist regionalized social systems that, over significant stretches of time in pre-modern periods at least, involve personal interactions more within broadly recognizable territories than between such territories’.5 To enable the reconstruction of such territories Phythian-Adams has called for the ‘measurement and understanding of such systems and their inter-connectedness in terms of actual people living on the ground in the past’6 In short, Phythian-Adams has urged historians to use the ‘cultural province’ as the territorial basis of their studies.7 In a similar vein, stressing both the importance of regional identity in the past and the need to study territories with which individuals would themselves have identified, Hey has stressed the importance of examining regions through the notion of ‘countries’.8 This, he shows, was a term often used in the nineteenth century to describe ‘a district to which people felt that they belonged, one which could evoke sentimental feelings amongst those who had moved away’.8 To this he adds ‘the word “country” had no precise meaning, but it is nevertheless a useful concept for local historians, for it conveys a sense of a local society much wider than that of a town or a rural parish, but usually smaller than that of a county, a sense of the district which people felt was inhabited by their relations, friends and fellow workers and which had a character all of its own’.10

However, whatever they are called—regions, countries or cultural provinces—identifying the geographical territories ‘to which people felt that they belonged’ is no easy task. The problem is heightened by the fact that the cultural territories by which individuals identified themselves may have differed according to a person’s class or situation. Phythian-Adams has argued that such regions of ‘human activity’ should be bounded ‘preferably in more or less coincidental physical and cultural terms’. In seeking to find a geographical entity that matches this requirement, the answer, he suggests, may lie in the country’s drainage system: ‘the great centrally-focused river-drainage basins on the one hand or, on the other, those de-centralized but localized groups of broadly parallel or slightly convergent rivers that are delimited inland in each case by the same watershed line, and which share an identifiable stretch of coastline at their points of outlet’.11 An alternative approach to the study of historic regions has been to focus on a particular region and examine a range of different sources such as diaries, journals and account books in an attempt to reconstruct patterns of regionally-based activity.12 However, due to the idiosyncrasies of the sources used, this approach cannot easily be replicated for comparative purposes for other parts of the country. In other words, it is neither practical nor possible to undertake such studies at a national level. In order to overcome this problem it is necessary to turn to an historical source which is available in a standard form across the entire country.

In an attempt to overcome this problem, Hey has recently utilised a sample of surnames covering England and Wales drawn from the Registrar-General’s quarterly indexes of deaths for the period 1842-6.13 The frequencies of
surnames and the extent to which they change over time have previously been
analysed to provide surrogate measures of the stability of local populations, yet
Hey’s study concentrates on the geographic distribution of individuals
with the same surname. Hey’s study is not the first to use surname
distributions to examine patterns of regional identity and behaviour, yet it
provides an important attempt to undertake a systematic historical survey of
the entire country. However, Hey’s study is not without its limitations. One
drawback is the source itself, which only allows analysis to be undertaken at
the level of the Registration District. More problematic is the general approach
taken. The analysis is essentially based on the examination of a series of maps
for individual surnames, each showing a particular regional distribution or
concentration. In his article a total of 13 surname maps are presented and
discussed. Although it is clear from this work that the study of historic
surname distributions ‘is a useful tool for determining the nature and
boundaries of local societies’ and that for the surnames presented there is a
distinct tendency toward geographical concentration, it remains unclear as to
whether there were distinct zones of similar surnames that might be labelled
regions. This article is an attempt to expand the work of Hey by examining the
graphical distribution of surnames in order to determine regional divisions
in the past.

Sources

Obviously there are many historical sources that record the surnames of
individuals. However in order to study the geographical distribution of a
particular surname a source is required that is universal both in terms of its
spatial and demographic coverage. In order to observe where people with a
given surname are at a particular point in time, arguably a cross-sectional
source is preferred over one compiled over a period of time. Thus an obvious
candidate source with which to examine the geographical distribution of
surnames is the census. Of all available historical sources the nineteenth-
century census enumerators’ books (CEBs) are the nearest it is possible to get
to a complete coverage of the population. Fortunately, it is also the case that
the returns for one historical census, that of 1881, are available for research in
computerised form. This article is therefore based entirely on an examination
of the surnames extracted from the 1881 census.

The 1881 CEBs for England and Wales were originally transcribed and
converted into computerised form by an army of volunteers from the
Federation of Family History Societies and the Genealogical Society of Utah. The
resulting data were then subsequently subjected to further processing by
the Department of History at the University of Essex. This processing
exercise not only standardised and classified much of the information
captured by the census, it also, most importantly for this article, linked the
administrative geography of the 1881 census to a parish-based Geographical
Information System (GIS) so that the information recorded within the census
can be mapped. As anyone who has tried to trace individuals across
successive censuses will know, the recording of surnames in the nineteenth-
century CEBs can be inconsistent, for a variety of reasons, and in this respect the 1881 census is no different. The surnames contained with the 1881 database used for this article also suffer from the possibility of transcription or data entry mistakes. That said, there is nothing to indicate that the surnames recorded in the database do not represent a statistically representative cross-section of the surname pool of England and Wales at this moment in time.

Prior to discussing the analyses presented in this article it is important to note some basic characteristics of the surname pool. First, the size of the surname pool in England and Wales at this time was considerably larger that might have been expected or guessed at. In all, the database used in this research contains a total of 396,776 unique surname strings. Obviously this number conceals a number of both transcription and typing mistakes, as is indicated by the fact that the database contains 158,876 surnames with a frequency of one. For this reason, the analyses presented in this article, unless otherwise stated, are based on only those surnames with a total frequency of 25 or more, of which there are 41,203. This equates to an average of one new surname per 630 persons across the whole population. However, even concentrating on just those surnames with a frequency of 25 or over, the frequency distribution of these surnames was very far from even. Basically a large number of people shared a relatively small number of surnames, while, conversely, a large number of surnames were attributed to a small number of people. This exponential-type relationship is indeed common to most populations, both historic and modern. The details are given in Table 1, which illustrates that a fifth of the population shared just under 60 surnames, a half of the population accounted for by some 600 surnames, while the top 10,000 surnames covered 90 per cent of the population. Conversely, ten per cent of the population, those with the rarest surnames, jointly accounted for some 30,000 surnames, more if those with frequencies of less than 25 are also considered.

One further characteristic of the data source needs consideration. Surnames, certainly by the nineteenth century, are inherited from one’s father and women usually take their husband’s surname upon marriage. Thus in the 1881 there are 5.4 million women, some 21 per cent of the population who no longer have the surname they were born with. What might the impact on the surname pool have been if women had retained their maiden name? Although it is impossible to measure this with accuracy, at a national level the impact was probably minimal since the chances are that as many men named Smith, for example, married women names Jones, and vice versa, thus cancelling one another out.

Linguistic regions?

So, what can a database covering some 26 million people with some 41,000 different surnames reveal about regional diversity? In order to explore the geography of surnames in mid to late nineteenth-century England and Wales, it is appropriate to start by investigating the density of local surname pools across the country, or in other words the average number of persons per surname. This simple measure is shown for the parishes of England and Wales.
Table 1  Distribution of the population by number of surnames, 1881.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accumulated percentage of the population</th>
<th>Number of surnames accounting for percentage population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>2,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>4,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>10,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>17,385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1881 CEBs.

in Figure 1. Immediately, regional patterns begin to emerge with quite large variations in the density of surnames across the country. These are not just mirrors of urban and rural differences, indeed, the geography of surname density completely cuts across urban-rural divides. Not surprisingly Wales stands out as having a low surname density (or a high number of people per surname) but the same is also true of the south-west tip of Cornwall, the Kent and East Sussex Weald, a large grouping of parishes running across the east Midlands and East Anglia, taking in a large part of Cambridgeshire, west Essex, Bedfordshire, north Hertfordshire and part of Buckinghamshire. Further north other areas of low surname density are found in north Durham and an area consisting of south Lancashire and the south-western parts of the West Riding of Yorkshire. This last area stands in stark contrast to a fairly large area of high surname density running from south Durham through North Yorkshire to Nottinghamshire, Lincolnshire and the Wash. At first glance it looks as if the south Lancashire area of low surname density is separated by the area of high density in Yorkshire by the Pennines, but on closer inspection the reality is not as straightforward as this with part of the low density area cutting across the hills in a belt approximately between Barnsley and Sheffield.

To a large extent the regional diversity shown in Figure 1 will reflect different customs relating to the origin of surnames. This is perhaps most clearly illustrated in the case of Wales (although note differences in south Wales, especially Monmouthshire) where surnames were adopted relatively later and
very often consisted of a narrow set of elided patronyms with a genitival –s, such as Davies, Williams, Jones. Equally, the low density of surnames in south Lancashire and the West Riding of Yorkshire is most probably associated with a propensity towards toponymic originating surnames. However, two points of observation must be made. First, although some overlaps can be seen, the map of surname densities in 1881 does not follow physical geography. Second, surname densities when mapped at parish level do not correspond to the geography of administrative counties, a unit which is often used to aggregate and plot demographic, social and economic information.

Plotting broad typologies or categories of surnames can also illustrate striking regional contrasts, as shown in Figures 2 and 3. The first of these plots the geographical distribution, by parish, of the percentage of the population enumerated in the 1881 census with patronymic and metronymic surnames (those ending in –son, for example, Johnson, Richardson, Moulson). Such surnames have been claimed to be of Scandinavian origin, although Reaney claims that they are more widely distributed and originated later than generally thought. Whatever the origin, the geographical distribution is striking. Such surnames were heavily concentrated in the counties of Cumberland, Northumberland, Lancashire north of the Ribble, Durham, the North and East Ridings of Yorkshire and eastern Lincolnshire. Conversely, the areas of low surname density in south Lancashire and the western part of the West Riding of Yorkshire identified in relation to Figure 1, seem to correspond with relatively low proportions of patronymic and metronymic surnames. Overall, patronymic and metronymic surnames are relatively rare in proportional terms south of a V-shape formed by a line running from the mouths of the Mersey to the Thames and another running from the Wash to the Severn. It is particularly interesting to note that this nineteenth-century distribution of patronymic and metronymic surnames is very similar to that depicted by the Lay Subsidy Rolls some 500 to 600 years earlier. The processes of industrialisation and migration, even over half a millennium, had not fundamentally changed where families with this particular form of surname were located.

Turning to a different form of patronym, those surnames ending with a genitival –s, Figure 3 again illustrates how this form of surname has a distinct geographical distribution. Such names are predictably very heavily concentrated in Wales, with the proportion of the population with such surnames declining quite sharply moving eastwards. Yet it is also true that very few incidences of such surnames are found north and east of a line running diagonally from the Mersey and the Thames. Thus, comparing Figures 2 and 3, it can be seen that there is minimal overlap between surnames of the –son and –s forms.

Moving to surnames of a different typology, those which are formed from occupational titles, it is instructive to examine the geographical distribution of three occupational surnames—Fuller, Tucker and Walker. Each of these surnames essentially refers to the same occupation, someone who works in the
preparation of textiles scouring or beating the cloth as a means finishing or cleansing the fabric. Yet the terms are dialectic and traditionally thought to have distinct regional roots: Tucker mainly being used in the west country, Fuller in the east of the country and Walker in the Midlands and north. Turning to the 1881 census the first point that needs to be made in relation to these three names is that they are of unequal distribution in terms of absolute frequency. Walker was a very common surname nationally, being ranked 18th in England and Wales as a whole, with a total of 83,001 individuals with the surname. By contrast Tucker accounts for less than a quarter of this number, there being 16,430 Tuckers in 1881, with the surname being ranked 194th overall, while there were only 12,042 Fullers, making it ranked 303rd. Despite these differences in frequency, turning to the geographical distribution of the three surnames, although there is a degree of dislocation, Figure 4 largely confirms the general dialectic divide for these occupational titles outlined above. Walkers, despite the national importance of the surname predominate in the area north of the Wash-Severn line. Fullers occur in the south and east and Tuckers in the west. Those parishes in which only Fullers are found are located around the South Downs, western Suffolk and south west Norfolk, while those parishes where only Tuckers are found are situated in north and south Devon, Somerset, west Dorset and scattered across Cornwall. It is also interesting to note that with the exception of two areas, one south of the Wash and the other in the Weald, where Walkers and Fullers both occur, there is not much mixing of the surnames in what might be considered to be transition zones. Again, as with patronymic and metronymic surnames, there is evidence to suggest that this broad regional distribution of the three surnames is similar to that of the early fourteenth century.

Taken together, these four examples, to which others could be added, would seem to indicate that cultural linguistic and dialectal variations might, predictably, have strong regional associations. However, what is more surprising is the fact that these variations had not broken down significantly by the late nineteenth century. Can this be taken as evidence of the strength and durability of regional cultures?

Economic regions?

Taking a different methodological approach it is possible to examine the extent to which the surnames in a particular place overlap or correspond with those of another place. This is an approach, using surname distributions, that has previously been undertaken by human biologists interested in gene frequency distributions and assortative mating for genes of polymorphic systems. In studying levels of in-breeding within populations human biologists have examined differences in surname distribution to measure the degree of biological kinship between communities by observing the frequency of shared surnames. Taking a similar approach, it is possible to measure the proportional correspondence in terms of the shared surname pool between not only one place and another but between a particular place and all others in the country. This is illustrated in Figures 5 and 6 which plot the degree of
overlap between the surnames in each parish in England and Wales with those enumerated, respectively, in Lancaster and York. For both of these figures only those surnames ranked nationally in the top 10,000 are considered. In the case of Lancaster (Figure 5) there is a high degree of correspondence with the parishes close by. But correspondence is also high with parishes extending through the North and East Ridings of Yorkshire, Lincolnshire and also parts of north Wales. Conversely, the degree of correspondence is relatively weak with much of the southern part of the county and the West Riding of Yorkshire. It would appear that there are echoes here of the regional pattern displayed in patronymic and metronymic surnames. Turning to the white rose city of York (Figure 6), the parishes with the highest degree of surname correspondence are located in the North and East Ridings of the county, but relatively high levels of correspondence are also displayed by parishes in Cumberland, and to a lesser degree Lincolnshire, Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire and Leicestershire. Equally, most parishes in the west of the country (except Cumbria) record relatively low levels of surname correspondence with York. It may be cold comfort to Yorkshire loyalists to learn that the North and East Ridings of ‘God’s own county’ have more in common, using this measure, with north Lancashire and Cumberland than they do with the West Riding, which, in turn, seems bound at the hip with south Lancashire.35

The fact that the surname correspondence between places is not a straightforward function of distance is clearly illustrated in the case of Ely. Figure 7 shows how the surnames in the East Anglian parishes to the east of Ely share a high degree of correspondence with the city, yet this is not matched by parishes to the west. The links between East Anglia and Ely are vividly illustrated when rarer surnames, those with a national ranking over 10,000 are considered (Figure 8). It is also important to note that when considering the correspondence of surnames between places, the relationship is not necessary reciprocal. Unlike geographical distances in which the distance between X and Y is the same as between Y and X, the same is not true with surname pools. Thus if two places, X and Y, share twenty surnames in common, if X has a population of 1,000 and Y a population of 500, then it could be argued that the degree of correspondence between Y and X is twice that between X and Y. The fact that the geographical distribution of correspondence need not be reciprocal can again be illustrated by the case of Ely. While Figures 7 and 8 both measure the extent to with the pool of surnames in each parish of England and Wales overlap with the surnames of those living in Ely, Figure 9 turns the relationship around and measures, for those surnames nationally ranked over 10,000, the level of correspondence with the surnames found in Ely with other parishes in England and Wales. While East Anglian parishes are quite well represented, by comparison London stands out as having a high degree of correspondence, as does too, but to a lesser degree, the urban and manufacturing centres of the Black Country. Putting both sides of the Ely coin together it seems plausible to suggest that while individuals from the parishes of west Norfolk and Suffolk in particular were drawn to Ely, those from Ely were more likely be attracted to the golden pavements of London and the black smoke of Birmingham.
Turning attention to London, surname correspondence reveals, in quite dramatic fashion, the importance of the capital, which by 1881 was not only the most populous urban settlement in England and Wales but also the world. Aggregating the various parishes of metropolitan London together, in 1881 there was not a single parish in the whole of England and Wales that was home to a surname ranked in the top 10,000 that was not also present in London. At this level every parish in the country reached out to London. Such a finding would seem to support the estimate by Wrigley that in the century 1650 to 1750 of all those born and surviving childhood, one in six of the country’s population, maybe even more, lived at some stage of their live in London. Even for rarer surnames, those ranked over 10,000, Figure 10 shows that many of these surnames were also found in London. Yet here, a potential north-south divide begins to emerge, with the level of correspondence falling quite sharply northwards of a line running approximately from the Mersey to the Wash, but with Cornwall and parts of Wales, in this sense, being ‘northern’.

**The importance of distance?**

The previous section examined the extent to which the pool of surnames in one place correspond or overlap with those of other places. In addition, it is possible, of course, to measure geographical distances between places: how far one place is from another. Putting these two pieces of information together, this section examines the degree to which individuals with the same surname were separated by distance.

Using the parish-based GIS for the 1881 census, ‘as the crow flies’ distances can be calculated from the centroid point of a parish to those of all other parishes. Using this measure it is then possible to calculate a mean distance separating all individuals with the same surname. This was done in the following way. For a given surname, starting with the place which records the highest frequency of the surname, the number of individuals with the surname is termed the ‘total of separated persons’. Then the distance between this place and the place with the next highest frequency is multiplied by the number of individuals in the second place. This is called the ‘total separation distance’ and the number of individuals with the surname in the second place is added to the total of separated persons. Then the distance between the first place and the place with the third highest frequency is multiplied by the number of individuals in the third place. This is added to the total separation distance and the number of individuals with the surname in the third place is added to the total of separated persons. This sequence is repeated until all pairs of places have been considered. The mean separation distance then equals the total separation distance divided by the total of separated persons. Thus if a given surname occurs in four places, A to D, and A has 100 occurrences of the surname, B 50, C 20 and D 10, and the
The distances between the four places are A-B 15 km, A-C 25 km, A-D 30 km, B-C 10 km, B-D 7 km, C-D 5 km, the mean separation distance would be calculated as follows:

\[
= \frac{((50\times15)+(20\times25)+(10\times30)+(20\times10)+(10\times7)+(10\times5))}{(100+50+20+10+20+10+10)}
\]

\[
= 1870/220
\]

\[
= 8.5 \text{ km.}
\]

Taking those surnames with a national frequency of 25 or more, the mean separation distance across all surnames was 183.9 kilometres. It may have been expected that a relationship might exist between size of the surname group and mean separation distance for that surname, the two being positively correlated, but this is not the case. Indeed, interestingly a standard distribution-type relationship exists in which the mean, mode and modal separation distances all occur close to one another, with most high frequency surnames falling around the mean separation distance point and with lower frequency surnames having mean separation distances both below and above the average.

Feeding these mean separation distances for each surname back into the places in which the surname occurs, a mean separation for each place was calculated. Thus if a given place had a population of 1,000, consisting of three surnames with frequencies of 500, 300 and 200, with mean separation distances respectively of 150, 100 and 50 kilometres, the mean separation distance for the place would be calculated as: \( \frac{((500\times150)+(300\times100)+(200\times50))}{1,000} = 115 \) kilometres.

Figure 12 plots these mean separation distances for parishes. This measure reveals a number of fairly distinct regional divisions. Amongst those regions with the lowest separation distances (with the darkest shading in the map) south Lancashire and the southern parts of the West Riding of Yorkshire again stand out as a common area. A second belt of low separation distances takes in Cheshire, north Staffordshire and north-east Derbyshire, while a third joins much of Sussex with south-west Kent. Four main belts of ‘middling’ separation distances can be identified: a group including Middlesex, Surrey, south Hertfordshire, south Buckinghamshire and east Berkshire; a large belt consisting of Shropshire, south Staffordshire, south Derbyshire, stretching over to east Nottinghamshire and Leicestershire; Lincolnshire being joined by Cambridgeshire; lastly Essex, being separated from its East Anglian neighbours of Suffolk and Norfolk. Three main areas of high separation distances include Cornwall, Devon, Somerset and Dorset; north Wales and Northumberland coupled with west Cumberland. In some respects these areas of high separation distance are a result of being furthest from London, which as been mentioned, was the home to surnames drawn from all over the country, but clearly urbanisation and distance from London are not the only factors in influencing the geographical pattern shown in Figure 12.
A patchwork quilt?

The final approach taken is to attempt to group together parishes with similar pools of surnames. This was done by applying a statistical technique termed cluster analysis. The results are shown in Figures 13 and 14. The first of these maps the outcome of a cluster analysis on Registration Districts considering just the top 1,000 surnames ranked nationally. Again, one of the features to arise from this exercise is a general diagonal divide running from the mouth of the Mersey to the Thames, evident in other surname distributions presented previously, and perhaps not that dissimilar from the line demarcating the southern limit of Danelaw in the ninth century. An enlarged East Anglia stands out as a distinct cluster, including Norfolk, Suffolk, south Lincolnshire (Holland), much of Cambridgeshire, Huntingdonshire, Bedfordshire, and north Hertfordshire and Essex, while a third stretches from Glamorganshire, westward across Monmouthshire into parts of Gloucestershire, Wiltshire, Somerset and Devon, and over to Oxfordshire and Berkshire. This exercise does not, however, form south Lancashire and the southern West Riding of Yorkshire into a discrete cluster, these being grouped with parts of London, Durham and the south coast in a residual cluster.

Figure 13 maps the resulting clusters considering instead the surnames ranked from 2,000 to 7,500. East Anglia stands out again, yet this time does not extend as far north and west, and instead extends down in Kent. Two main midland clusters stand out. The east midlands group comprises south Lincolnshire, Nottinghamshire, Leicestershire, Rutland and parts of Northamptonshire, Huntingdonshire and Derbyshire, while the west midlands group includes Cheshire and parts of several counties to the south - Shropshire, Staffordshire and Worcestershire. A northern cluster brings together the counties of Cumbria, and parts of Northumberland, the North Riding of Yorkshire and Durham. Lastly, Cornwall and Devon joint to form a distinct South West cluster.

Conclusions

This article set out as a tentative and speculative exploration to identify historical cultural regions via an examination of the surnames of individuals as records in the 1881 CEBs. It would be naïve to claim that a clear set of regional boundaries have been determined, however, a number of regional groupings have been identified. It is also clear that the search for distinct regional divisions may prove elusive, if only because regions will be nested and overlapping depending on the point of focus adopted. Yet, equally, this is just the start of the journey. Further analysis is required to both examine the stability of surname geographies over time and compare the evidence offered by the surname distributions to other factors such as physical divides, geographies of religion, demographic variation, agricultural regions and political territories. Equally, more robust and appropriate statistical procedures can be applied to the data. One can only hope that the search to identify historic regions does not turn into a quest for the Holy Grail.
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Figure 1  Surname density, by parish, 1881.

Note: The shading on the map denotes the number of persons per surname, with the lighter areas having the lowest surname density and the darker areas the highest. The grey shading equates to 10 or more persons per surname.

Source: 1881 CEBs.
Figure 2  Distribution of patronymic and metronymic surnames by parish, 1881.

Notes: The key denotes the percentage of the population in each parish with patronymic and metronymic surnames ending in -son. The number in brackets indicates the number of parishes within the given category.

Source: 1881 CEBs.
Figure 3  Distribution of patronymic and metronymic surnames ending with a genitival –s, by parish, 1881.

Notes:  The key denotes the percentage of the population in each parish with patronymic and metronymic surnames ending with a genitival –s. The number in brackets indicates the number of parishes within the given category.

Source:  1881 CEBs.
Figure 4  Distribution of Tuckers, Fullers and Walkers, by parish, 1881.

Note:  The shading on the map is colour coded as follows:
Blue = parishes in which only Fullers occur;
Red = parishes in which only Walkers occur;
Yellow = parishes in which only Tuckers occur;
Purple = parishes in which Walkers and Fullers occur;
Orange = parishes in which Walkers and Tuckers occur;
Green = parishes in which Tuckers and Fullers occur;
Grey = parishes in which either Walkers, Tuckers and Fullers all occur or none occur.

Source:  1881 CEBs.
Figure 5  The proportion of surnames ranked <10,000 matching those present in Lancaster, 1881.

Note: For this map, and those in Figures 6 to 9, the darker the shading the greater the degree of correspondence in the surname pool, and vice versa.

Source: 1881 CEBs.
Figure 6  The proportion of surnames ranked <10,000 matching those present in York, 1881.

Source: 1881 CEBs.
Figure 7  The proportion of surnames ranked <10,000 matching those present in Ely, 1881.

Source: 1881 CEBS.

Figure 8  The proportion of surnames ranked >10,000 matching those present in Ely, 1881.

Source: 1881 CEBS.
Figure 9  The proportion of surnames ranked >10,000 found in Ely matching those in other parishes, 1881.

Source:  1881 CEBs.
Figure 10  The proportion of surnames ranked >10,000 matching those present in London, 1881.

Source: 1881 CEBs.
Figure 11  Mean separation distance of surnames, by parish, 1881.

Source: 1881 CEBs.
Figure 12  Results of cluster analysis on surnames ranked <1000, 1881.

Source: 1881 CEBs.
Figure 13  Results of cluster analysis on surnames ranked between 2,000 and 7,500, 1881

Source: 1881 CEBs.
RESEARCH IN PROGRESS

FARM SERVICE IN SOUTHERN ENGLAND IN THE MID-NINETEENTH CENTURY

Nigel Goose

There can be no doubt that farm service was in decline between the middle of the eighteenth and the middle of the nineteenth centuries, for contemporary testimony to this fact is deafening and historical opinion categorical. The regional pattern to this phenomenon was clear cut: farm servants survived in much greater numbers for far longer in the north and south-west of England, where pasture farming predominated, settlements were more dispersed, farms were generally smaller and alternative employment in rural industries more readily available. In the southern half of the country, however, excluding only Cornwall and Devon, farm service was in rapid decline. Some contemporaries appear to have believed the process to be complete by the 1820s and 1830s, but the agricultural labour force in the several southern counties still comprised between 15 per cent and 38 per cent farm servants as late as 1831, these figures perhaps erring on the generous side. Despite a recent reassessment of the 1831 census data which concludes that the contrast between the north and west and the south and east has been exaggerated, a clear contrast remains. By mid-century, ‘few servants in husbandry were hired in the south and east’. Although a couple of reports to the Poor Law Board on the Law of Settlement in 1847 and 1851 do suggest that the removal of the hiring head of settlement in 1834 had produced a slight revival of farm service, this does not appear to be supported by the published census reports for 1851. Across nearly the whole of the south and east by this date, the proportion of the labour force (male and female) who were farm servants stood between 4 and 14 per cent according to Kussmaul, whilst the more reliable figures relating to males only presented by Snell stand in single figures for the great majority of southern counties.

Hertfordshire was no exception, and again contemporaries were well aware of the process. The Hertfordshire responses to the rural queries framed by the Poor Law Commissioners in 1834 are particularly revealing, the key question being number 38, ‘Do the labourers in your neighbourhood change their services more frequently than formerly and how do you account for that circumstance?’, to which 16 of the 18 Hertfordshire parishes responded. Only
one of these, Stanstead Abbotts, answered in the negative, a qualified ‘not
generally’; all of the rest agreed that this was indeed the case. The evidence
of the published report on the 1851 census is no less categorical, for in
Hertfordshire at this date a mere 7.9 per cent of the male labour force were
recorded as farm servants, just 1,861 out of a total of 23,476.7 As in 1831 the
figure stood within the range 20-25 per cent,10 farm service in Hertfordshire
would appear to have been very quickly on its way to extinction at mid-
century. How paradoxical, therefore, to find Edwin Grey, in his reminiscences
of Harpenden in the later 1860s, clearly reporting the continuation of the
practice of farm service, both in Harpenden itself and elsewhere in the county,
both lads and men presenting themselves at the annual hiring fairs held at St
Albans or Luton, agreeing weekly wages, a lump sum of £2 at the end of the
year’s contract plus one shilling in binding money.11 Farm service, this account
suggests, may indeed have been changing, but some 15 years or so after the
1851 census it still appears to have been in active operation.

In an attempt to resolve this paradox the census enumerators’ books (hereafter
CEBs) for the St Albans district, which included Grey’s Harpenden, were
examined in detail. The St Albans Superintendent Registrar’s District in 1851
incorporated the Borough and Liberty of St Albans, and the surrounding
villages of Harpenden, Redbourn, Sandridge and Wheathampstead. The
population of the Liberty of St Albans was 11,160 (including the workhouse),
but the borough proper encompassed only some 6,985. Hence there was a
substantial rural area lying within the Liberty amounting to approximately
4,000 individuals, besides a further 6,831 rural inhabitants living in the four
villages near to the town.12 For the St Albans region, farm servants appear to
be reasonably well recorded in the CEBs and distinguished from house
servants in all but the area designated as the Out-hamlets (on the fringes of St
Albans) and, to a lesser extent, in Sandridge. The returns for the Out-hamlets
are particularly suspicious, for a number of entries occur here where young
male servants living on farms are recorded either as ‘servant’ under
occupation as well as under relationship to head of household or, more
commonly, the occupation column is left blank, and it is probable that these
were in fact farm, rather than domestic, servants. This is true of the farms of
Henry Kerley, William George, George Longstaff and William Wise, among
others, and the net effect is quite considerable. If all of the suspect cases are
counted, then a total of 19 farm servants have been omitted, against a recorded
total of just 27.13 In Sandridge the enumerator appears to have made a very
clear distinction between farm and house servants, until the phrase ‘general
servant’ begins to appear towards the end of the enumeration, always against
the names of male residents, which might indicate that the 11 individuals so
described on the farms of Jonathan Cox, Robert Smith, William Holloway and
Elizabeth Booth were both farm and household servants, and hence should be
added to the 48 farm servants proper identified here. In the tabulations which
follow, therefore, adjusted figures are presented for both of these districts.

The CEBs identify farm servants and farm labourers in three ways: through
description of the relationship of a living-in labourer to the head of household,
through the designation given under occupation, and through the details
under farmers’ occupations of the size of their farm and the number of labourers they employed—the latter only occasionally distinguishing living-in from living-out labourers. Two approaches were adopted to determine the proportion of the agricultural labour force that were farm servants. First, the information regarding number of labourers that each farmer employed contained in the occupation column, where this was given, was compared with the number of labourers identified as living-in with their employer. The results of this exercise are presented in Table 1. The proportion found to be living-in, just over 23 per cent, is remarkably high given the evidence of the published census report. The percentages are fairly consistent between parishes, only Wheathampstead and the town of St Albans exhibiting notably lower proportions, but even here the figures remain double the county average. The situation could, however, vary considerably from one farm to the next. In Harpenden, for example, Robert Sibley of Annobles Farm employed 22 labourers, none of whom lived-in at the farm, while of the 15 employed by Joseph Willmott at Cooters End six did so.

In St Michaels (rural) all six of Thomas Hollingshead’s labourers at Kettlewell Farm lived in, whilst all other farms in this part of St Michaels parish included only between one and three live-in labourers, regardless of the size of the total labour force. In all, however, of the 149 farms suitable for analysis, 111 or fully 75 per cent included at least one living-in labourer. On the other hand, over 60 per cent of farm servants were under the age of 20, and the majority of the remainder were in their twenties, confirming farm service as predominantly a feature of a particular life-cycle stage.

Table 1  Male Living-in Farm Servants (1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. Labourers</th>
<th>No. Living-in</th>
<th>%Living-in</th>
<th>No. Under 20*</th>
<th>%Under 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>URBAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Albans (town)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Michaels (rural)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Stephens</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-hamlets</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harpenden</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbourn</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandridge</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheathampstead</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,257</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:  * Excludes the one labourer who lived-in with Arthur Timperon, for whom no age is given.
The second approach adopted conformed to that apparently employed by the General Register Office in processing the returns for publication; that is, all the labourers listed under ‘occupation’ were counted, and the number living in with their employer identified. This method produced very different results, as shown in Table 2.\(^1\) Now the number of labourers identified is substantially larger, 2,160 as compared to 1,257, and in consequence the proportion living-in is considerably lower, standing at a little over 15 per cent overall. Differences between parishes are now considerably exaggerated. The low percentage among those found in the borough comes as no surprise, given the fact that so few farmers lived here, but even between the rural areas there are marked differences, with only just over 9 per cent living-in in Wheathampstead and fully 37 per cent in Sandridge. Indeed, there were fewer labourers living in the village of Sandridge than the farmers reported they employed, 173 as compared with 255, the obverse of the situation found in all other parishes. Clearly, some parishes were exporters of labour to work on farms situated in others, most clearly those lying within the borough of St Albans, while the village of Sandridge was importing labour from elsewhere in the district. It is also likely that some of the labourers listed here were actually employed in surrounding parishes which bordered the St Albans district, while others living outside the district may well have found employment within it. These are, of course, imponderables, but if our data shows nothing else it does indicate that any analysis based upon the individual parish could well be entirely misleading.

\(^1\) Table 2    Male Living-in Farm Servants (2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. Labourers</th>
<th>No. Living-in</th>
<th>%Living-in</th>
<th>No. Under 20*</th>
<th>%Under 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>URBAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Albans (town)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Michaels (rural)</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Stephens</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-hamlets</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harpenden</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbourn</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandridge</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheathampstead</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2160</strong></td>
<td><strong>334</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>198</strong></td>
<td><strong>59.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**  * Excludes the one labourer who lived-in with Arthur Timperon, for whom no age is given.
There are a number of possible conclusions that can be drawn from this analysis. Whatever method is employed to calculate the proportion of labourers who were farm servants in the St Albans district in 1851, the figures stand substantially above the county figures given in the printed census reports, either double or treble the level shown there. Alongside the fact that the majority of farmers continued to keep at least one live-in labourer, this appears to indicate much stronger survival of farm service at mid-century than has often been assumed, and helps us to understand Grey’s testimony concerning the situation in the 1860s. How do we explain the discrepancy between the local evidence of the CEBs and the published county figures? It possible that the totals given in the printed census report are wrong, and that occupational designations have been relied upon to determine the number of farm servants rather than careful identification of labourers’ living arrangements. It is also possible that the St Albans district was exceptional in its retention of farm service at mid-century, although this would inevitably imply that levels were very much lower elsewhere in Hertfordshire: the 334 live-in labourers listed in Table 2 represents fully 18 per cent of the county total given in the report while the district contained only 11 per cent of the county’s population and was also relatively highly urbanised. Furthermore, the labourer to farm ratio was high in this district, a feature commonly associated with low rather than high levels of farm service. On the other hand, there is a respect in which the St Albans district was exceptional, and this is in the remarkable opportunities for additional earnings from the straw plait and straw and Brazilian hat trades. If one reason for the retention of farm service in the pastoral regions of the country was the existence of competing forms of industrial by-employment, the existence of these thriving industries in south and south-west Hertfordshire may have exerted a similar impact here too. Whatever the explanation, our data would seem to indicate at the very least that considerable variation could be found within as well as between counties and that in some southern areas farm service declined far more slowly than is often assumed and was certainly not close to extinction at mid-century.

Recent studies of groups of parishes in other southern counties have similarly identified surprisingly high numbers of farm servants at mid-century in comparison with what contemporary testimony and the evidence of the published census reports would have us believe, and the growing weight of evidence supports the view that the chronology and scale of changes to the agrarian social structure in this period requires re-evaluation. To do this effectively, however, and to determine whether it is local variation that is being detected or serious under-recording of farm service in the published census reports, examination of an entire county is required. Full analysis of farms and farm service throughout Hertfordshire, paying particular attention to the quality of recording in each enumeration district, is currently underway. Once this analysis is complete, it will not only be possible to determine whether or not the published reports are indeed defective, but we will also be able to relate such variations as are identified to differences in soil conditions, proximity to London, and to the local availability of alternative employment in cottage and small factory industry.
NOTES

1. The original research for this pilot survey was conducted in 1998/9, and the results partially presented in N. Goose, *Population, economy and family structure in Hertfordshire in 1851: Vol. 2 St Albans and its region* (Hatfield, 2000), 110-13.


8. *Report of the Royal Commission on the Poor Law 1834, Appendix (B.1) IV*, British Parliamentary Papers, 1834, XXXIII, 217-27. There were 18 responses from 16 parishes, as Shenley and Westmill each provided two.

9. *Census of England and Wales 1851, Population Tables II. Ages, Civil Condition, Occupations and Birthplaces of the People*, 163. This tallies exactly with the figure given by Snell, and of necessity excludes shepherds: *Annals of the labouring poor*, Table 2.1, 96.

10. Kussmaul, *Servants in husbandry*, Figure 7.1, 127.

11. Grey indicates that teenage boys would earn 3s. 6d. to 5s. per week, adult general farm hands 11s. to 13s weekly in summer and 9s. or even less in winter, whilst head ploughmen, cowmen or shepherds would earn 15s per week, although it was also possible to earn an extra 7-10s weekly at harvest time: *Cottage Life in a Hertfordshire Village* (St Albans, 1935), 57, 59-62.

12. For a full description of the topography of the area see Goose, *St Albans and its region*, 27-33.


15. Unlike in the published census reports, the few shepherds, cowmen etc. were included in this exercise.


17. Goose, *St Albans and its region*, 70-4, 82-106.

WHEN WERE BABIES BAPTISED? SOME WELSH EVIDENCE

Sally Brush

The Book of Common Prayer states:

The people are to be admonished, that it is most convenient that baptism should not be administered but upon Sundays, and other Holy-days, when the most number of people come together; as well for that the congregation there present may testify the receiving of them that be newly baptised into the number of Christ’s church; as also because in the Baptism of infants every man present may be put in remembrance of his own profession made to God in his baptism for which cause also it is expedient that Baptism be ministered in the vulgar tongue. Nevertheless (if necessity so require) children may be baptised on any other day.

This was clearly the ideal laid down by the church, but during the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries the majority of parents brought their children to be baptised within a day or two of birth. The registers in Cerrigydrudion record both the date of birth and the date of baptism between 24 November 1685 and 14 November 1697. The baptism of 266 individuals were recorded during this time, of which 62 were baptised on the day they were born, 88 were baptised the next day and 63 were baptised the following day. This means that 213 children were baptised within two days of their birth – almost 80 per cent of the babies born. 25 more were baptised on the third day, leaving 28 who were baptised up to ten days later.

This small group sub-divides into four smaller groups. The first group are babies born in the winter, whose families lived a considerable distance from the church and may have had difficulty travelling if the weather was bad. David son of Hugh Davies and Mary who lived over five miles from the church in Llyn y Cymmer was baptised seven days after he was born on 16 November 1690. Margaret the daughter of Maurice Jones and Lowry who lived at least four miles away from the church in Cwmpennaer, was baptised on 2 January 1691, five days after she was born. Secondly, of the seven illegitimate babies born during this period, two were baptised four days after their birth and one 13 days later. Generally, the father of the baby and the
godparents made arrangements for the baptism and this may well have been the reason for the delay in these cases. The most obvious example is that of John, base son of William John and Alice John, who was born on 2 April 1694 and baptised 13 days later on 15 April. Thirdly, there were a smaller number of people who were less concerned about having their child baptised or whose family circumstances were difficult. We can only surmise that this was the case but it is a reasonable assumption. Lastly, 11 babies were definitely the children of local gentry and it is clear that such families delayed public baptism for a variety of reasons. Peter Morris, a gentleman of Hafod y Maidd, and his wife Gwen delayed the baptism of both their children: Margaret was born on 27 October 1690 and baptised four days later; Peter was born on 4 June 1693 and baptised a week later. John son of Evan Wynne and Barbara of Cwmein was born on 7 August 1696 and baptised aged nine days. Some may have had a preliminary baptism in the house before public baptism.

David Cressy, reminds us that “Higher status families often delayed their infants’ baptisms in order to complete necessary social arrangements, and delays between birth and baptism generally stretched longer towards the end of the seventeenth century”. Other registers from the area indicate this same pattern: In Ysbyty Ifan we see recorded the baptism of Jane Wynne, daughter of Watkin Wynne, Honourable Esquire, of Voelas on 7 November 1747 almost a month after her birth on 11 October. The records from Hanmer on the English/Welsh border indicate that gentry families also delayed the baptism of their children. During the years 1730-40 the vicar, John Langford, baptised his own five children between the ages of two days and one month. Towards the end of the eighteenth century this was even more noticeable. Sir Thomas Hanmer, Bart. and Dame Margaret of Bettisfield Park, had five children between the years 1780 and 1786. All five had a private baptism at home within a few days of birth and then a public baptism some time later: John was born on 28 February 1784, privately baptised on 2 March and then publicly baptised on 28 April; George Edward was born on 28 August 1786, baptised five days later and then publicly on 3 October. The same pattern can be seen with the children of Rt. Hon. Lord George Kenyon and Lady Margaret Emma who had six children between 1803 and 1810. Stephen Friar describes how the priest, godparents and guests would be summoned when labour was under way and the child ‘half-baptised’ at home and taken to church at a later date. This might explain the baptism records of the children of James Price, rector of Cerrigydrudion 1784-1800. He was the son of James Price of Bedwas, Monmouthshire, Gentleman, and appears to have owned land in north Wales as well as building the elegant Georgian rectory in Cerrigydrudion. He had five daughters, four of whom were baptised some time after their birth. Frances was born on 23 February 1785 and baptised eighteen months later on 24 October 1786. Emma was born on 19 November 1786 and Mariann on 9 September 1788 – both were baptised on 3 August 1795 aged eight and nearly seven respectively. Harriet was born on 15 November 1795 and baptised almost a year later on 27 September 1796. No date of birth is given for Lydia Sophie who was baptised on 18 February 1797. It may well be that all his daughters were baptised at home when they were babies and a long time
elapsed before a public baptism. James Price had a number of domestic problems, his first wife died sometime after in 1788 and it is not clear what happened to his children. It is only after his second marriage to Margaretta Bowry in 1793 that the children from his first marriage were publicly baptised.

The Cerrigydrudion records give no other indication of the number of days between birth and baptism but the neighbouring parish of Llangwm records the date of birth for a short period at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and these are presented in Table 1. The parish of Bettws Gwerfyl Goch also records both birth and baptism dates for two periods in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and these are presented in Table 2. These figures show a shift in pattern from baptism within two days of birth still being the norm in 1791, to a slight trend to wait three or more days by the early nineteenth century. Most of those who were baptised after six or seven days were described as the children of ‘gentlemen’. These ‘gentry’ would have been lesser gentry than those mentioned in the Hanmer records and so less elaborate preparations would have been required.

Over two-thirds of children were baptised on the day of their birth or one day later between 1782 and 1791, with one-sixth baptised between three and fourteen days. By 1803 a quarter were baptised in the first three days of life, another quarter on the third day after birth, and the other half tapering off towards ten days or more. This may indicate a confidence that children were more likely to survive and so immediate baptism became less crucial. It may show the desire by the family to have some sort of celebration which needed a day or two to prepare and it may be that the clergy had a different approach to baptism: John Morgan became rector in 1800 and may have had a slightly different policy. This is a very small sample but would seem to indicate that by the beginning of the nineteenth century people were moving towards having their babies baptised on the Sunday or holy day after the birth. It may well be that this pattern was also true in neighbouring parishes although there is no written record to prove this.

Research done on a number of parishes in England over this period shows that the movement towards baptisms on ‘Sundays and Holy Days’ took place much earlier than in Cerrigydrudion and the neighbouring parishes. Berry and Schofield found that “…in the late sixteenth century children appear to have been baptised very soon after birth, but the interval had lengthened to an average of eight days in the late seventeenth century and 26 days in the late eighteenth century”. There are probably a number of reasons to explain why this area was only moving slowly towards the practice of baptism on ‘Sundays and Holy Days’. People may have begun to feel more confident that their children were going to survive and so the urgency began to fade away slowly. Secondly, with the arrival of James Price as rector in 1784 and John Morgan in 1800 the clergy were more ‘gentrified’ and were probably more influenced by trends in England. Earlier clergy had employed numbers of curates who had not attended University and would have tended to emphasise the need for early baptism because it was the practice they knew. The influence of visitors
### Table 1  Date of Birth and Baptism in Llangwm 15 July 1804 to 22 June 1806.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age baptised</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Age baptised (continued)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same day</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8 days</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9 days</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11 days</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12 days</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13 days</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 days</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14 days</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 days</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2  Dates of Birth and Baptism in Bettws Gwerfyl 1783–1791; 1803–1810 and 1812.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age baptised</th>
<th>1782–1791 N</th>
<th>Age baptised</th>
<th>1803–1810 and 1812 N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same day</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Same day</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 days</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6 days</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 days</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 days</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 days</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8 days</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 days</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9 days</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 days</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11 days</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 days</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12 days</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 days</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13 days</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 days</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14 days</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 days</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 days</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No.</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Total No.</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and more incomers to the community as the eighteenth century progressed probably also changed people’s attitudes. As nonconformity began to put down roots, people’s attitudes to baptism too would have been questioned and may have changed in consequence. Whatever the reasons, the evidence available from the registers of Cerrigydrudion and the surrounding area again indicate the variability of local practice with regard to baptism, as well as confirming the existence of differences by social class.

NOTES

This is a small section from my PhD which details information about baptisms in Cerrigydrudion and the surrounding area 1662-1812. These are small Welsh speaking parishes situated between Llangollen and Betws y Coed in North Wales and show an enormous contrast to those described in the article by A Wright, ‘Birth-baptism intervals in Wickham Parish, Co. Durham c.1770-1820’ published in LPS, 71 (2003), 81-7.

2. For evidence for growth in the interval between birth and baptism, however, see E.A. Wrigley, ‘Births and baptisms: the use of Anglican baptism registers as a source of information about the numbers of births in England before the beginning of civil registration’, Population Studies, 31 (1977), 281-312.
NEWS FROM THE UNIVERSITIES

University of Essex Centre for Local and Regional History

The aim of the Centre is to provide a forum for research and teaching in local and regional history in Essex and Suffolk. To this end it supports work in the microhistory of these two counties; the elaboration of methods and concepts for the study of local and regional history; and the creation of relevant research tools. The Centre provides high quality taught courses for the local community on the history of our region, as well as exploring the locale as a site for studying social change and national trends.

The Centre involves members of the University’s academic staff whose expertise cuts across a broad range of local, cultural, social, political and economic histories. It offers several teaching schemes. The Certificate in Local History is a one-year, part-time course for those interested in or already working on, Local History. No formal qualifications are required. Topic studied include Essex local history 1500-1950; sources for local history; landscape, seaside and urban development; poverty, crime and the law; agriculture and the wool trade.

The Diploma/MA in Local and Regional History can be taken over one year full-time or two years part-time; it can also be taken by credit accumulation over three, four, or five years. Applicants for the taught MA should normally hold, or expect to obtain, an upper second-class honours degree in History or an associated discipline, or an equivalent international qualification. Sometimes it is possible to admit someone without such a qualification, particularly to the Postgraduate Diploma schemes.

MA students take four modules and write a Dissertation. Diploma students take the same modules as the MA students but do not write a Dissertation.

Modules available include:
- Concepts and Approaches in Local/Regional Research
- Sources and Topics in Local and Regional History
- Trends and Themes in English Local History, 1500-1700
- Trends and Themes in English Local History, 1700-1914
- Landscape and Society in Essex and Suffolk

Members of Centre staff also supervise students for an MA by Dissertation (MAD), Master of Philosophy (MPhil) or Doctor of Philosophy (PhD). The following examples of completed research theses in Local and Regional History provide an indication of the wide range of topics and approaches studied by students based in the Centre:
‘The local origins of national identity’ (PhD, 2002); ‘The development and failure of Dovercourt Bay, Essex as a seaside resort during the 19th century’ (MA, 2000);

The Centre is also the home of the Victoria County History of Essex, part of a national project named after Queen Victoria and popularly known as the VCH. The project has an international reputation as a standard work of reference for English local history. It aims to write the history of the towns, villages and other communities in every English county from the earliest times to the present day through meticulous research on original sources. VCH Essex has already published ten volumes, as well as three of county bibliography. It is funded by Essex County Council, Essex University, and an Appeal Fund. It currently employs three staff, who are researching the history of the NE Essex coast including the seaside resorts of Clacton, Walton and Frinton.

Essex University and the Centre for Local and Regional History organise several public lectures each year on the theme of local history with specially invited speakers. In 2003 these included The Burrows Lecture by John Tusa, ‘Shoemakers to the World: the Bata Estate at East Tilbury’; The Dudley White Lecture by Dr Herbert Eiden, ‘To have no other law in England but those laws they themselves made’: the Peasants’ Revolt of 1381 in Essex; and the Local History Day where the keynote speaker was Dr Peter Razzell, ‘Essex and Smallpox—a new view of 18th century demography’.

Members of the Centre also participate in an informal Local History Workshop. This is a friendly group which welcomes any local historian, whether ‘amateur’ or ‘professional’, to share his or her historical and local knowledge, research experience, ideas and computer expertise, so that members can support and encourage each other’s local historical research and writing.

The Centre has close links with the Essex Record Office, and other professional and voluntary organisations in Essex concerned with the discovery, display and dissemination of the region’s history. It collaborates with the Essex Society for Archaeology and History (Reg. Char. 213218) and the History Data Service over an important local research project, the Essex Place-Name Project. This seeks to record and explain the minor place- and field-names recorded in historic documents such as tithe and enclosure awards and manorial surveys. The library of ESAH is also now housed in the University’s Albert Sloman Library. It has an extensive collection of books and pamphlets on the county and one of the best collections of local history and archaeological journals in the East of England.

Two other societies encourage study in the Centre through annual competitions for prizes or fellowships worth £500 each. The Friends of Historic
Essex support an annual fellowship for one MA, MPhil or PhD student using substantial Essex sources for his/her dissertation. The Essex Society for Family History similarly provides funding for an annual award of £500 to one postgraduate student working on an Essex-related subject in the field of Local or Family History.

For enquiries about:

- The Centre and its general activities
- Certificate in Local History
- Diploma/MA in Local and Regional History
- Higher research degrees

Please contact the Graduate Secretary, Department of History, University of Essex, Wivenhoe Park, Colchester, Essex, CO4 3SQ. Tel.: 01206 872302. Email: gsechist@essex.ac.uk

---

**Oxford Brookes University**

Population history at Oxford Brookes is thriving. From the start of the next academic year, undergraduate students will be able to do one half of their degree in population studies, taking courses such as ‘Population, family and kinship in Europe, 1600-1900’, ‘Ageing, old age and old people in historical and current perspectives’, ‘Studying population history’, ‘Twentieth-century Eugenics’, and ‘Dearth, death and disease in early modern Europe’.

Such courses build upon diverse research interests in historical demography (broadly defined) amongst the staff. Steve King is head of department and is currently writing articles on ‘Making a Methodist marriage’, ‘Death, disease and suffering amongst the English poor 1800-1840’ and ‘The bastardy-prone sub society revisited’. Alysa Levene is a Leverhulme Trust Early Career Fellow and former member of the Cambridge Group. She is currently editing a volume on bastardy in the English past, the first systematic treatment of the topic for some years. Her Leverhulme project will investigate the life experiences of foundling children and their nurses in early modern England and Italy. Andrew Spicer, a specialist on the European reformation, has just published a book on the experiences of Plague in Europe and is completing a second on the migration experience of social outcasts in early modern Europe. Paul Weindling is a Wellcome Trust research professor and author of numerous works on public health and epidemics. He is currently working on the History of twentieth century Eugenics, co-ordinating a network of European historians who hope to trace systematically the development of Eugenic policies, languages and sentiments in different European states. Tim McHugh is another Early Career Fellow with research interests in medicine and health in rural France. His most recent book, on hospitals in Paris in the eighteenth century, is just about to be published by Toronto University Press and he has articles on the subject in the most recent issues of *French History*.
and Bulletin of the History of Medicine. Anne-Marie Kilday is a specialist in the History of crime and she has just contracted a book with Oxford University Press on the issue of famous infanticide cases in eighteenth and nineteenth century Britain. Professor Anne Digby has just completed her Cambridge University Press monograph on health, disease, death and healing in modern South Africa and is now embarking on a project to write the history of the hospitals of Cape Town. Professor Andreas Gestrich has wide-ranging research interests in European population policies, dealing initially with issues such as migration but now moving more firmly into issues of household size, structure and functionality in the lives of the poor. His most recent volume is (with Steve King) Being Poor in Modern Europe (Peter Lang, 2004). Vivianne Quirk is a Wellcome trust postdoctoral fellow working on the history of drug development in the twentieth century, looking particularly at the demographic influences on the development of antibiotics.

The Department has a long-term commitment to population and local population studies. With 18 PhD students and three postdoctoral fellows working in the area, we hope to build upon strong foundations in the future.

Steve King

Oxford Brookes
Centre for English Local History, University of Leicester, *An introduction to paleography* CD-ROM. Available from pot@le.ac.uk or Dave Postles, Centre for English Local History, University of Leicester, 5 Salisbury Road, Leicester LE1 7QR. Individuals £10; institutions £15.

This *Introduction to Palaeography* is a curious mixture. In many ways it delivers much more than its modest title suggest – the authors have used the immense capacity of the CD medium to include in it much that one would not expect to find except in a very large and expensive printed book, and have made interesting and innovative use of the technical facilities that a CD can provide – but in others it does not live up to its own billing.

The CD grew out of a palaeography module for the English Local History MA course at the University of Leicester, with examples of documents provided primarily by the West Sussex Record Office, and it bears the heavy imprint of that origin. There are sections of the CD guiding students through their assessment process, and the bibliographies are clearly geared to this and other elements of the MA course. As a long time teacher of palaeography at undergraduate and postgraduate level, I found the course information fascinating – though I would take issue with some of the ways in which it approaches its subject – but would members of the public be quite so interested? Many purchasers of this CD will not be historians, some will have had no formal education after the age of 15, and many will have no educational qualifications after 16. So one major question for a reviewer to answer, is ‘does this MA structure translate into the general market?’.

My own answer is that it does in part. This CD represents one aspect of the independent learning that archive repositories are so good at, and have been doing, quietly and successfully, for years before the main educational sector hit on the idea of lifelong learning. It’s clearly useful for people to have lists of further reading so that they can go on from this CD to other areas. But the lists here are geared to this particular MA (at one point we are told to go to ‘the bibliography of Dr Fox’ rather than having a list of books on the subject in question, and we are directed to books which can be found ‘in the Fitch Library’ at the University of Leicester) and have not been constructed with a view to the CD’s more general use. Some books, of course, would appear on any list, but others here (interesting and useful books, but not necessarily the ones one would choose in constructing a specific bibliography for a palaeography tutorial) are clearly related to the MA course. More importantly, there are books missing from the bibliography – there are, in the early modern bibliography, only two books with examples of handwriting that students can use to extend their practice.

If the bibliographies are geared towards the needs of the MA course, do the palaeography examples themselves compensate for this deficiency by catering for the needs of amateurs? Sadly the answer to this question is that they do...
not. The documents chosen are, frankly, rather dull, and neither do they represent the major sources used by amateur local and family historians in their researches. The medieval section is entirely dependant on charters, and even the early modern section depends heavily on deeds – there is one early eighteenth century will, but there is no inventory, no parish register and no bastardy bond. This is disappointing. There is an opportunity in palaeography teaching to represent something of the great range of documents that exists in national and local repositories, but the examples in this CD do not give beginners a way in to the sources they start with, nor are they calculated to retain people’s interest in the exercise. There are many interesting documents out there – why not use them?

But there are plenty of good things here, too. The CD contains an enormous amount of material. Far from being simply a palaeography tutor, it includes masses amount of information on the diplomatic of the documents discussed in it, extensive bibliographies, test papers, an essay on the relationship between archives and history and much, much more. The images are excellent and very easy to read on screen either in their cut down or expanded versions.

The major tutorial sections contain an interesting innovation, only possible because of the computer. As you move your mouse pointer over each word a printed transcription of that word appears. In the medieval section this is supplemented by a translation from the Latin, a note of the Latin root of the word and the grammatical formation represented by the particular example, and from here it’s possible to move on to see whole conjugations and declensions. This is really useful, and a clever way to use the technology. But I’m not sure that there is enough contextual information, especially in the medieval section in relation to Latin, to allow novices to understand what they are being told. A specific introduction on Latin would help immeasurably, and allow amateurs to get the most out of the excellent things on offer here.

One or two technical glitches could also be sorted out. For example, navigation is heavily dependant on the back button, which is awkward and cumbersome, and in some cases the palaeography examples have not been completed – the pop up box transcriptions are missing in quite a few cases, and some links do not work.

These problems show, I suspect, that this CD is a work in progress. A new improved version should have the technical problems sorted out. The most important thing for the compilers to do, however, is to focus on their market. Is this a CD for their MA course, or is it meant to have a wider appeal? If the latter, then they should focus more closely on the ‘public’ market, which has its own needs and problems, and move the CD away from its origins. But there’s plenty of potential, and the compilers should persist.

Chris Webb
Borthwick Institute of Historical Research,
University of York
Margaret Crawford’s guide to the Irish censuses is a partial hybrid of Higgs’s *Making sense of the census* and the official *Guide to census reports, Great Britain, 1801–1966*. It is pitched at the local historian, though the casual historical demographer will find it of interest.

Her survey contains four sections. The first describes the history of the census in Ireland up to 1911. Crawford’s dissection is precise and to the point; explaining the causes of the underenumeration in the early years, the massive impact of Thomas Larcom and the unwarranted intervention of the English Registrar-General for the 1861 and 1871 censuses. The later censuses are covered in less detail owing to the relative lack of changes in administration in those years.

Chapter Two guides the reader skilfully through the different geographical units used for reporting the census. The third chapter discusses, sometimes in detail, sometimes rather thinly, some of the questions asked at these various censuses. Crawford’s own particular interest in occupational reporting and classification shines through here. The fourth chapter, which covers some of the uses to which historians have used the census reports is certainly the weakest. The emphasis here is on the uses to which the reports have been used, as the enumerators’ returns for Ireland for the period pre-1901 were almost entirely destroyed. However, there is no mention made of Royle’s analysis of the surviving returns (S.A. Royle, ‘Irish manuscript census returns: a neglected source of information’, *Irish Geography*, 11 (1978), 118–25), and the potential for analysis of the surviving enumerators’ returns for the 1901 and 1911 censuses has been glossed over. Of particular interest to LPS readers may be the fertility questions asked in 1911, which were analysed only cursorily at the time, and, in the *General Report*, at least, not broken down by occupation.

The main text covers only the first 86 pages of the book. The next 39 pages contain listings of various geographic units used in the census of Ireland. This is followed by a useful table of 21 pages outlining the various geographic reporting of types of questions in the published volumes from 1821 through 1911. Finally, there is a bibliography which lists (almost) all of the parliamentary papers for the Irish census reports (the missing reports are generally superfluous, being in the most part the preliminary returns) and some, though again, not all, of the relevant secondary literature. (It’s high time that someone started a bibliography for the Irish census enumerators’ returns.)

It is perhaps also a shame that the Irish local historian is not pointed directly towards their British counterparts, who have led the way in this form of analysis. The census reports in England and Wales, and Scotland, have led to some fascinating analytical works; likewise the enumerators’ books, but none is mentioned here. The lack of comparative element is unfortunate, but does not detract from the overall emphasis.
Despite the lacunae mentioned above, this is a succinct and highly useful guide to the Irish censuses. It is neither as detailed as Higgs in its administrative history, nor as voluminous as the Guide to census reports in its discussions of the information collected, but it certainly fills a considerable gap.

Matthew Woollard
AHDS History
University of Essex


This book is about the investigated (the rural poor) and their investigators (often a middle class urban elite). It is an exhaustive study that is based upon the analysis of a wide range of sources on the spectrum between literary investigation and statistical enquiry. This eclectic approach is a real delight and historians of late Victorian Britain, and all those interested in the methodology of social investigation, will want to read this book. Freeman adopts an essentially chronological structure, though the later chapters take a more thematic approach. After briefly reviewing important rural investigations carried out prior to 1870 (Young, Eden and Davies), Freeman analyses the creation of the ‘Hodge stereotype’. He shows how that there was a growing interest in gathering ‘scientific’ data about the countryside in late Victorian England, primarily by urban investigators, including Board of Trade statisticians, who often relied upon rural clergy to assist their investigations. While well placed to provide a fuller cultural understanding of the rural poor, parish clergy typically presented ‘an optimistic alternative to the debasement of urban life.’ Thus Freeman argues that, on the one hand, the desire for statistical analysis ‘divorced social investigation from an understanding of rural culture’ and on the other depicted rural life as quaint or rustic, in contrast to the degradations of urban slums, thus obscuring rural poverty with pastoral conceptions of the English countryside.

The ‘Revolt of the Field’ (following the creation of the National Agricultural Labourer’s Union and the 1872 Warwickshire strike) gave impetus to social investigations of material poverty by newspaper special correspondents, which were based on direct contact between investigators and investigated. This face-to-face enquiry method failed to provide an accurate assessment of material deprivation, as agricultural labourers and their families would often provide partial information on earnings, to enlist sympathy from the investigator. As the excitement over agricultural unionisation abated, a more reflective form of social investigation emerged in the 1880s, as the most prominent issue in rural politics became franchise reform. As such, social enquiry shifted away from investigations of material well being towards investigations of rural political culture. Coupled with fears of urban deterioration and imperial decay, contemporaries looked to the countryside for salvation of the English race and of imperial fortunes. Because of suspicion
of outsiders, gathering information on agricultural labourers inner beliefs was more likely to be achieved by residents than visitors, and ‘all kinds of literate residents of rural England also found their way into print on the subject of their poorer neighbours.’ Freeman moves on to show how a ‘new Hodge stereotype’ was created, due to the encroachment of urban culture into the countryside, which affected rural speech with a ‘townsman gabble’ and led to the demise of traditional countryside lore.

In the late 1880s and 1890s social investigation was dominated by two themes: economic depression and rural depopulation. These two concerns gave impetus to a new enthusiasm for official enquiry, most notably the Royal Commission on the Agricultural Depression and more generally to a renaissance in rural investigation – what Freeman refers to as the ‘Passion for Inquiry’. This profusion of investigation and of technique did not create a consensual view of the countryside, however. Freeman concludes that the results were contested as the inquiries were shaped by the agenda of the investigator. So great were regional differences in material conditions and rural culture that Freeman argues that only the very localised study could be safe from being challenged with contradictory evidence. And because nothing could be agreed, little was done to arrest rural depopulation.

This somewhat nihilistic interpretive trend strengthens as the analysis moves on to consider poverty surveys of the early twentieth century. Booth and Rowntree’s less well-know rural inquiries are examined, along with investigations by Mann and Davies. The latter, in particular, was heavily influenced by Rowntree’s methodology. Freeman echoes a trend in the recent historiography of urban poverty surveys of this period of exposing the scientific pretensions of these statistical inquiries as impressionistic and concludes that even the least objectionable (Mann) was ‘unable to operate outside either the cultural framework that surrounded the English countryside or the moral structures that conditioned middle-class responses to working-class behavioural norms.’ This anti-positivism continues with a description of the survey method, which ‘reduced the complexities of the lives of individuals under investigation to a mass of economic and statistical aggregations.’ Not only did the proponents of this method work with an ‘inherently contestable concept of poverty’, but, for Freeman, their studies failed to illuminate complex social relations which conditioned the problems of the rural poor.

The failure of the survey method investigators to understand the social process is contrasted with the investigations of a parallel genre of resident investigators of working class life, exemplified by Sturt and Reynolds, who derived their inspiration from the literary tradition. Unlike the survey method investigations, which ‘did not deal with many of the things that really mattered to those under investigation’, this literary approach to social inquiry worked with a cultural conception of poverty and focused on issues of choice and the social transmission of behaviour patterns. As such, for Freeman, they provide a ‘human corrective’ for the reductionism of the social survey method inquiries.
The final chapter deals with housing, wages and the land, in what Freeman describes as 'Continuing Contests'. Here the essentially chronological structure of the book gives way to a thematic analysis, but Freeman’s imposed abstention from describing in any detail the results of the enquires remains. For example, while the method adopted by Wilson Fox in his 1905 wage survey is considered in detail, his findings are summarised in a paragraph. Generally, readers interested in the results of the social inquiries discussed, will, at times, be disappointed by Freeman’s book. It treats the reader to a great deal of intelligent epistemological discussion, but will frustrate those interested in what the plethora of social investigations tell us about agricultural labourers living standards, and how they changed over time or how they differed between regions. I sincerely hope that some readers will also be unsympathetic to the argument that material conditions, as defined by social survey method investigators, did not really matter to the poor or that concern with such issues formed part of a uniquely middle-class agenda. Nevertheless, this book fills an obvious gap in the literature on social investigation, which has tended to concentrate on urban enquiries, often ignoring the wealth of evidence relating to rural England.

Ian Gazeley
University of Sussex


Levisham is a small village situated some six miles north of Pickering on the edge of the North York Moors. In 1891 it had a population of 108 living in 21 households and it has been subjected to an indepth study by the local history group, the products of which are published in this modest volume. As the book’s title suggests rather than simply describing the results of the group’s endeavours the author presents them by means of a case study of the sorts of investigations which any similar group could readily undertake. Thus, each chapter begins with a list of the types of sources that should be available to most local researchers. A short discussion of the historical background is then given followed by what has been discovered in Levisham. The book is organised chronologically starting with how the landscape influenced settlement patterns and it ends with a discussion of mining in the nineteenth century. Other chapters are devoted to Levisham’s archaeology, its organisation in the post-Conquest period, parish priests and constables, farming, enclosure, education and poverty. It is unfortunate that little is said about Levisham’s population history. The parish registers have only survived in a fragmentary form before the eighteenth century, but with such a small population much more could have been done after this date and the nineteenth-century population sources are hardly mentioned.

While little of great significance appears to have happened in Levisham, for the more general reader the book’s main interest will lie in some of the
characters who lived in the village. Thus, it is interesting to learn of the lengths to which the parish helped the Morley and Garnet families to emigrate to Canada in 1830. Halse’s book provides a clear guide to undertaking this type of study and whilst it is by no means comprehensive it can be recommended to any local history group thinking of undertaking a similar project.

Chris Galley
Barnsley College


This publication by Hertfordshire Archives and Local Studies (HALS), ‘the joint county record office and local studies library’, is extraordinarily comprehensive. It should be of interest to any local historian, not only to family historians, and not only to Hertfordshire historians. Any family or local historian for whose locality there is no similar available publication will find this Hertfordshire example useful because the range and variety of sources described is remarkable. While particulars differ in each county the main categories are the same. The chapter headings make clear the scope: administrative background; births, marriages and deaths; household and property records; professions and occupations; crime and punishment; the poor and the sick; schools and education; military ancestors; and printed sources. There are six appendices: two list registers held at HALS; the others cover cemeteries and crematoria; the whereabouts of wills; local library holdings of filmed copies of parish registers, censuses and the IGI, the Mormon International Genealogical Index; and lastly useful addresses. The first appendix is a most helpful list of all parish registers, bishops’ transcripts, and hearth tax returns with their HALS references and dates.

Under all headings there is not only the information one might expect to find, but much helpful information and guidance. For example we are told that W. B. Gerish collected no fewer than 70,000 local names from inscriptions, now in boxes in HALS, and a name index to local settlement certificates from the late seventeenth century has been published by the county Family History Society. These certificates contain potted biographies of paupers. For these and many other records described the advice given about manorial court records is applicable: ‘you will need to be confident in your reading of period handwriting. They can be very rewarding for those who take the time.’

Indeed local and family history has never been for those who look for a sensation round every corner, but it can give clothing to the sometimes naked statistics of population studies. The 1918 registers of absent voters which lists not only members of the armed forces but also anyone whose work was of national importance and who could therefore vote by post or proxy gives information about them; the rank, service number and regiment of soldiers, for example. In a quite different source, School Attendance Committee
records, all the children not attending school in Hertfordshire in 1877 are named. Early poor law records are familiar to historians but as this guide points out, ‘the records of the poor in the 1930s and 1940s are often overlooked but can be of great help to family historians’. These are those of the Public Assistance Committees which replaced the Board of Guardians in the 1930s.

A more unusual aspect of life is transportation. ‘When an ancestor is found to have been transported, a wealth of information can sometimes be found on him or her’ in Court records. An explanation of how transportation developed and what it entailed followed which includes the sentence: ‘the majority were men who were taken to prison hulks moored either on the Thames or at Portsmouth. It is surprising in a Hertfordshire publication that there is no mention of W. Branch Johnson’s The English Prison Hulks or of his The French Prisoner, both of 1957, for Branch Johnson was a notable Hertfordshire historian. Another unusual group of people whose records are described is gypsies. ‘Most gypsy children were baptised but often did not have their births registered and so the IGI is valuable for tracking a family across the county using baptisms.’

Military records are well covered from sixteenth century muster rolls to twentieth century world war records. Hertfordshire has an ‘unusually comprehensive set of militia ballot lists’ from 1758 to 1804. There are useful warnings about printed sources the availability of which is described. ‘Not everything that appears in print is correct, and family historians should still use primary sources’. ‘Local newspapers can be a mine of information; unless there is an index of names using them can be time consuming and there is no guarantee of finding anything relevant.’

Such a wide ranging guide to sources should be in every family and local historian’s possession; it will be endlessly consulted.

Lionel M. Munby


In medieval times, life for the people of England may well have been ‘nasty, brutish, and short’: birth and death rates were both high and more or less cancelled each other out, yielding negligible population growth rates. In the early years of the twenty-first century the population growth rate of England is once again around zero, but with expectation of life between 75 and 80 years and fertility lower than two children per woman, the demographic regime is very different. Andrew Hinde’s book starts with the Domesday Survey and charts the course of the population of England in the ensuing millennium, in terms of both population numbers and the components of population change (fertility, mortality and migration).

The book is divided into three, roughly equal, sections; the Medieval Period (1086-1541), the Early Modern Period (1541-1750), and the English
Demographic Transition (1750-2000). These divisions are dictated partly by the nature of the demographic regime (mortality driven, fertility driven, transition), but also by the nature of the available data: the types of evidence this can produce and the sorts of questions that it can shed light on. For the medieval period sources are scarce and limited in scope. The Domesday Survey and the fourteenth century Poll Taxes, which are the main sources, are counts of only certain adult sections of the population, and rely on assumptions about household size and coverage to derive estimates of population size. The early modern period is blessed with richer data in the form of parish registration of baptisms, burials, and marriages, which can provide fertility, mortality, and nuptiality rates as well as population estimates, and what is known about this period is dominated by this material. Parish registers continue to provide the bulk of the data for the last section of the book, although other sources (notably censuses and civil registration) provide important data from the mid-nineteenth century onwards.

The fairly rudimentary data of the medieval period mean that the first section is dominated by the calculation of population totals and the role of plague. More robust knowledge of the components of population change in later periods mean that ‘hows’ and ‘whys’ of population change can be addressed in relation to conceptual ideas such as the Malthusian framework of positive (mortality) and preventive (marriage) checks on population growth in response to pressure on resources; classic demographic transition models, which postulate a temporal sequence from economic development, through mortality decline, to fertility decline; the role of increasing standards of living in influencing mortality decline; and whether fertility decline was an innovation involving previously inconceivable or unacceptable modes of behaviour or an adjustment to new social and economic circumstances. Such theories are discussed and assessed in the light of empirical evidence. Inadequate data on migration mean that it rarely receives its share of attention and this volume is no exception, although there is a chapter devoted to it in each of the latter two sections. Both international and internal migration are covered and related to the poor law, urbanisation and push and pull factors.

Despite the rather disappointing lack of a consolidated bibliography (I am always frustrated at having to leaf backwards to find the first reference), the dominance of some scholars in the arena of historical demography is clearly revealed: Woods and his collaborators with relation to late nineteenth century demography is one example and Wrigley and colleagues’ work on the parish registers is another. Although Hinde feels that our knowledge of early modern fertility relies ‘probably too heavily’ (p. 146) on the work of Wrigley et al., the disproportionate output of some may be a reflection of the fact that historical demography is a relatively young discipline, with many of the techniques for organising and manipulating data having been developed in only the last few decades. In this context the path-breaking work of some individuals is bound to shine (and in a field where the quality of data can make a big difference, the serendipitous access to particular sources might also help to achieve prominence).
This is a book addressed not only to those who want to know what happened to population, but also how we know what happened to population, and as such it admirably describes sources and methods, all without assuming any prior knowledge. The tripartite approach has the advantage that it does not show favouritism to particular eras, but it is inescapably true that much more is known about later periods, and it is a shame to have to omit so much of the detail of more recent demography. The period since the second world war receives only a handful of pages, and the source appendix does not even mention any of the excellent longitudinal sources available for the more recent past.

While a relatively slim volume covering a whole millenium could not be expected to include every reference, there are a few notable omissions (for example Simon Szreter’s seminal article on the role of public health is not mentioned in the discussion of the causes of nineteenth century mortality (S. Szreter, ‘The importance of social intervention in Britain’s mortality decline c. 1850-1914: a re-interpretation of the role of public health’, Social History of Medicine, 1 (1988) 1-37); and the evidence from individual level data that residential segregation by social class can explain a large part of observed social class differentials in infant mortality in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries is ignored (E. Garrett et al. Changing family size in England and Wales: place, class and demography, 1891-1911 (Cambridge University Press, 2001)). Nevertheless, the work provides a fairly coherent overview of the characteristics of population change since the Norman conquest, filling in several hazy areas for me. One of its aims was to provide a work which refers purely and unambiguously to England, and although it is therefore primarily concerned to describe national figures and trends, it does frequently refer to regional and local differences, and does not diminish the importance of heterogeneity in England’s demographic history. It would therefore provide excellent general background reading for a local population historian, and maybe also a key to more geographically differentiated patterns and processes.

Alice Reid
The Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure
University of Cambridge


Names, Time and Place consists of essays submitted in memory of the renowned anthroponymist, Richard McKinley. It is prefaced by a moving appreciation of the man and his work together with a list of his published works. It has been produced jointly by the two organisations with which McKinley was deeply involved – the Department of English Local History, Leicester University and the Society for Name Studies.
Cecily Clark uses a single document, an eleventh/twelfth-century fiscal roll listing free tenants on manors held by the Abbey of Bury St. Edmunds, in her study of Suffolk bynames. She found that only about half the names contained a byname element; the rest were sufficiently identified by their baptismal name. The baptismal names were still predominantly Old English in origin. John Dodgson applies recent work for the Phillimore edition of *Domesday Book* to add to or correct some of the details found in Gosta Tengvik’s classic work, *Old English Bynames*. He cites some interesting, and amusing, examples.

Gillian Fellows-Jensen searched the Register of Freemen of the City of York between 1272 and 1759 for examples of surnames of Scandinavian origin. She found relatively few surnames formed from Scandinavian forenames, nicknames, occupational names and adjectives. The majority are topographical or locative names. Interestingly, she relates the early names to modern surnames found in the telephone directory.

Margaret Gelling’s essay on habitation surnames is supplemental to Hanks’ and Hodges’ *Dictionary of Surnames*, and offers suggestions for some habitation surnames which were not identified in the 1981 *Dictionary*. Della Hooke gives a description of the Arden area, and some of the personal and place names found there. Many local bynames were associated with woodland – Hurst, Holte, Wodeward. Also typical were locational names to do with hill, marsh, brook, etc.

Prys Morgan and Oliver Padell both look at surnames in Wales. Morgan found an uneven distribution of locative names in Wales, which, since the use of such names is common in England, might indicate areas of English influence or resistance to it. Padell examines the origins and usage of names ending in -kin, which are sometimes used as personal names, sometimes as patronymic surnames.

Harold Fox discusses the different accommodation patterns of farm labourers in three areas of Devon. These include the independent cottager as found in Sidbury, who had a choice of employment on farms or in local industry or the service sector, the dependent, living-in farm servant as found in Ashwater, and the even more dependent farm labourer living in a tied cottage possibly with wife and family as in the South Hams. Each reflects a particular economic climate.

The next three essays all deal with the possible connection between the continuity of surnames and the stability of a community. David Hey demonstrates the persistence of core families during the early modern period, not only in rural areas but also in industrial rural and urban communities, including even London. This is contrary to the findings of some earlier demographic studies. Evelyn Lord looks at names as a measurement of the stability of a community by calculating the turnover of names across two centuries and also surname distribution in relation to administrative and natural boundaries. In the context of the Downland, Greensand and Wealden areas where Kent, Surrey and Sussex meet, the natural divisions proved more
significant as an obstacle to the migration of surnames than the administrative boundaries. Suella and David Postles combine family reconstitution and isonymy in a detailed study of a single parish, Barkby in Leicestershire.

Margery Tranter has spent many years studying the county boundary between Leicestershire and Derbyshire. This is unusual in that it leaves the obvious line of the river Trent for no apparent reason, and takes a generally south-westerly route following no specific topographical features. She uses the evidence of archaeology, geology and place names in an attempt to relate early racial groups to the area.

Unfortunately this book is badly let down by the poor proof-reading and editing. There are obvious inaccuracies in some of the tables (pp. 188, 202-3), and Figures 1 and 2 referred to in the text (pp. 198 & 201) seem to be missing. Despite this, the book provides something for everyone with an interest in the study of personal names, and it offers a new perspective on the wide range of subjects that can be investigated using naming data.

Jean Wright


This book focuses on infant and early age mortality decline during the period 1780-1920 in a number of northern European countries. Not surprisingly, given that all the contributors are members of a research group at The Norwegian Academy of Science and Letters, special emphasis is placed on Norway, in part reflecting that country’s pioneering role in the demographic transition. The articles are best thought of as work in progress and versions have subsequently appeared in journals such as Continuity and Change. While some may question the volume’s relevance to readers of LPS, a cursory inspection of most of the essays reveals that their themes reflect the lively interest in this field of research in Britain and other European countries (for other examples see Hygiea Internationalis, 3(1) (2002); History of the Family, 7(4) (2002); Ö. Garðarsdóttir, Saving the child. Regional, cultural and social aspects of the infant mortality decline in Iceland, 1770-1920 (Umeå, 2002)).

Dealing with each of the papers in turn. First, Pitkänen compares Norway’s mortality decline with that in other Nordic countries and finds that there were many regional and national similarities throughout these countries and that decreasing infant mortality was responsible for much of the early decline. Hubbard then examines death and disease in nineteenth-century urban Norway. He notes that the three large towns of Kristiana, Bergen and Trondheim all experienced substantial decreases in mortality during the period 1861-1915 with the reduction in childhood diseases playing a prominent role. However, the detailed course of the transition varied between the three towns and Hubbard ends by noting that many questions remain unanswered. In the longest contribution Thorvaldsen provides an extensive analysis of rural
infant mortality in nineteenth-century Norway. Interesting colour maps are provided for various periods between 1856 and 1920 and these highlight the wide variations in infant mortality rates throughout the country. These variations were reduced once the good child rearing techniques (in particular maternal breastfeeding) employed in many rural parishes were spread by local health officials to the high mortality areas, although in some instances this did not occur until the early twentieth century. Sogner and colleagues take up this theme by examining infant mortality together with maternal mortality and stillbirths in the rural parish of Rendalen between 1735 and 1900. The overall halving of infant mortality during this period is largely explained by the ‘general improvement in the situation of women’ (p. 81). Interestingly though, stillbirths and maternal mortality were not affected.

On a different theme Schlumbohm asks the question, ‘Did the medicalisation of childbirth reduce maternal mortality?’ While hospital and home delivery data from a wide variety of countries are used to investigate this topic, they remain difficult to interpret and no definitive answer to the question is forthcoming. Finally, van Poppel and Beekink discuss the difficulties of mapping infant mortality in the Netherlands.

As with similar collections the contributions in *Historical studies in mortality decline* are of variable quality; there is also no attempt to provide any editorial overview to link these diverse essays together. Despite these drawbacks the volume is well worth consulting by anyone with an interest in the causes of the European mortality transition.

Chris Galley
Barnsley College


Studies of taxation in the seventeenth century demonstrate how separate Scotland then was from England and Wales. The hearth tax, for example, was introduced north of the border in 1690, only after it had been abandoned in the south, and then for just one collection because of the opposition it encountered in Scotland. The story of the poll tax is much more complex. Again, unlike England and Wales, it was not imposed on the Scots by Charles II, but only during the 1690s when it virtually coincided with the last three collections from the English and Welsh, although on quite different terms.

Captain James Irvine provides a clear and comprehensive introduction to the history and details of Scotland’s poll taxes of the 1690s. The first, which was approved by the Scottish parliament in June 1693, was due to be collected by October 1694 and paid over to the government in November. But this proved so difficult that parliament twice changed the method of collection and the Privy Council extended the deadline for payment to October 1696. By then parliament had already approved a second poll tax for October 1695, but not
surprisingly the Privy Council still faced collection problems in May 1696. Finally, parliament enacted two further poll tax payments in 1698 that were confined to the more affluent. Reports presented to parliament in 1704 on all these poll taxes found that ‘a considerable part of the money remained in the rapacious hands of those who had collected it’. Disappointingly few of the 1690s poll tax lists have survived and only those from Aberdeenshire, Midlothian and Renfrewshire are relatively complete as well as these from 1693 for all but three of Orkney’s 25 parishes, which are here transcribed and carefully analysed, together with two later ones for Kirkwall. Fortunately, all these lists are returns of those who were liable to pay and so are more comprehensive than rolls which recorded those who had actually paid. Indeed, lack of the latter has led Irvine to speculate that because collecting the poll tax was so difficult in Orkney it may perhaps have never been attempted.

‘All persons of whatsoever age, sex or quality except poor persons who live upon charity and children under the age of sixteen years’ were liable in 1693 to pay the basic rate of six shillings scots. Since £12 scots was worth £1 sterling, the basic poll in Scotland equated to 6d in England and Wales, where it had just been made quarterly and raised to four shillings and so was effectively eight times higher than in Scotland. (Further details of the eight poll taxes in England and Wales can be found in K. Schürer and T. Arkell eds, Surveying the people (LPS, 1992), 142-63.) A complex raft of graduated surcharges was also imposed upon the Scots, deriving from diverse income, property, occupational and status factors that differed from any applied in England and Wales. Thus cottars with a trade were liable for 12 shillings scots, gentlemen £3, ministers with benefices £12, servants for 5 per cent of their annual fee and tenants for one hundreth of their annual rents, all inclusive of the basic poll. In addition, a graduated tax was imposed on the rentable value of proprietors’ heritable lands and on the free stock of merchants and tradesmen. This complexity combined with the confusion that stemmed from inadequate guidance to the enumerators on interpreting certain definitions provided ample opportunities for evasion, especially of some surcharges. This applied in particular to the valuations of individuals’ wealth, which was often ignored or reduced to ‘net’ valuations by ignoring their debts. In addition, since many rents were paid in kind, such as malt, grain and barrels of butter, they often varied from year to year and were difficult to convert to monetary equivalents.

Estimating a likely population total from these data for Orkney is a nigh impossible task because of the complete lack of any information on the number, names or definition of those living on charity. Altogether these poll tax lists recorded 5,932 persons by name or number in 2,275 households, which Irvine deduced omitted just over one fifth of those liable to pay. He also argued that the missing children formed one third of the population and the poor who lived upon charity about another quarter, which gives an approximate total of 14,300. But Irvine abandoned this tack and instead used estimates based on the numbers of communicants in 1627 and of those eligible to be examined on the catechism in 1748 to conclude that Orkney’s population in the mid 1690s was about 18,500 to 19,000. This crude calculation reduced
the proportion of ‘pollable’ persons from about 50 per cent of the population
to under 40 per cent without explaining the composition of this floating 10 per
cent.

By contrast, Irvine’s treatment of the data that has survived is much more
convincing and benefits from his detailed knowledge of Orcadian history. It
provides a coherent, if somewhat approximate, analysis of Orcadian society
related to comparable data from elsewhere in Scotland, but unfortunately not
from England and Wales. The two ports of Kirkwall and Innerton, Stromness
were the only urban areas and together contained some 350 pollable
households with a sex ratio of 81 males to 100 females compared with a
107:100 ratio in rural Orkney. However, these figures were skewed towards
the males by the omission of any reference to the gender of six per cent of the
recorded persons, who were servants and so probably mostly female. From a
mean number of 2.7 pollable persons per household overall, Irvine suggested
a rather low mean household size of 4.0 throughout the islands. The very high
proportion of pollable households headed by married men at over 85 per cent
is explained by the omission of the pauper households, many of which would
have been headed by widows.

In the rural communities tenant farmers predominated with a low mean rental
of £10 scots p.a., which was similar to the average value of the holdings of the
small landowners or uddallers and heritors. Weavers were the most common
rural trade, with a mean of two in each parish, while most also had a tailor,
shoemaker, a smith and a minister. In Kirkwall and Innerton, Stromness there
were also substantial numbers of seamen, carpenters, barrelmakers and
merchants together with many more shoemakers, weavers and tailors, while
Kirkwall also had many butchers and public notaries. The mean number of
servants per pollable household in Orkney was 0.4, with a somewhat higher
0.6 in Kirkwall. Detailed information concerning their annual wages is
contained in the returns for only three parishes, which give a median of about
£3 scots p.a. for males and £2 for females, in addition to board and lodging.
Irvine further demonstrates the relative backwardness of Orkney with his
study of surnames which suggests that an appreciable proportion of pollable
householders had recently adopted their surnames and that for many these
poll tax returns may have been the first occasion on which they had needed
one. Later in the 1690s Orkney was devastated by famine, but Irvine concludes
that the poll tax lists show most Orcadian tenants living in ‘extreme poverty’
even before then, while ‘life was much less prosperous there than in many
other parts of Scotland’.

Tom Arkell

Thomas E. Jordan, An imaginative empiricist. Thomas Aiskew Larcom (1801-1879)
X. $99.95 (h/b).

Jordan’s concise biography of Thomas Aiskew Larcom, Ireland’s pioneering
census-taker, is predominantly concerned with placing Larcom in his
historical context. The result is that we learn more about the context than the
man, which is not problematic, but causes some disappointment when one is
interested in the empiricist himself, and not the politics or society of
nineteenth-century Ireland.

Larcom’s life can be told in a few sentences: born 1801, graduated from the
Royal Military Academy in 1820 and joined the Royal Engineers. In 1826 he
joined the Ordnance Survey of Ireland, a position which led to him becoming
one of the three census commissioners for the 1841 census. He was not directly
involved with its successor, as between 1845 and 1853 he held various posts
within the Board of Works, assisting in famine relief projects (According to T.
Linehan, ‘The development of official Irish statistics’, *Journal of the Statistical
and Social Inquiry Society of Ireland*, 27 (1998) he declined the role of chief
commissioner for the 1851 census due to ill health). His further rise came in
1853 (not 1851 as stated on p. 95) when he became Under Secretary of Ireland
(a sinecure, giving him responsibility for routine working of the Irish
Administration). In this role, Larcom ensured that responsibility for the Irish
census from 1861 onwards remained in the hands of the Registrar-General,
and also that Ireland’s registration system covered births and deaths as well as
marriages. Amongst other achievements, Larcom was one of the founders of
the Statistical and Social Inquiry Society of Ireland (SSISI) (consistently
described by Jordan in this volume as the Dublin Statistical Society).

Readers of this journal (and others interested in the development of the census
in Ireland) will almost certainly not need this volume on their shelves.
However, the work shines further light on the role of the administrator in
census taking, and thus the intellectual processes which guided the legacy
which historians now have use of. While at the Ordnance Survey, Larcom was
editorially responsible for the so-called memoirs, which were to provide
statistical, social, geological and topographical guides for Ireland. Only one
was published; as a result, Larcom used the census to carry out the surveys for
which he had previously been responsible. The oft quoted comment in the
1841 report: ‘We felt, in fact, that a Census ought to be a Social Survey, not a
bare Enumeration’ is made more understandable by a knowledge of Larcom’s
earlier work for the Ordnance Survey. We also learn from Jordan that Larcom,
an Englishman, learned Gaelic. His interest, thus, in settling the place names
of Ireland, to a standard nomenclature, may not have been wholly
necessitated by the needs of the Ordnance Survey. Furthermore, Larcom
introduced three important innovations to the census of Ireland, none of
which had been carried out in other British censuses before. The first was the
classification of dwellings, by rooms, windows and durability, which
underpinned later comparisions in housing improvements; the second was the
design of an occupational classification which Jordan describes as a
‘theoretical model of “social economy”’. A third innovation was in the use of
maps and diagrams. The 1841 census contains a number of national
choropleth maps, and diagrams showing the age structure of different
provinces.

Larcom’s role in the 1841 census was of vital importance for census taking in
Ireland for the remainder of the century. His housing classification was
Jordan’s narrative accounts for the main elements of Larcom’s life, and his various roles within Irish society and government. The work, primarily based on secondary sources, is patchy and disjointed; two sections in particular fall into this category – the first summarizing Jordan’s earlier articles on social and economic progress in Ireland, the second presenting a model of migration. Neither section fits well with the remainder of the text. However, these do not detract from the readability of the volume. Where this is problematic is probably down to the publisher. Once again Edwin Mellen Press spoil things by their usual under-production. The word-processed, and what looks like unedited, text is ghastly to read. (There are also some inconsistencies, e.g., Larcom’s retirement is stated on page 97 as taking place in 1879, while on the following page the census of 1871 is described as having been taken less than two years after his retirement.) The critical apparatus is slightly better than shoddy. The bibliography only approximates to alphabetical order, some items are omitted and others are repeated (e.g., Larcom’s address to the SSISI in 1850 is unreferenced and an article by T. W. Grimshaw in the JSSISI has the incorrect date in one entry and the wrong session number in the other). This is a shame, for with some professional copy editing, this would be a useful work.

Matthew Woollard
AHDS History
University of Essex


The poor struggled to survive in the ‘long eighteenth century’ and many came uncomfortably close to the knife-edge of subsistence. The ‘economy of makeshifts’, a term first coined by Olwen Hufton in 1974 to describe the behaviour of the poor in France, refers to the strategies used to make ends meet and has become an increasingly important idea for historians of eighteenth-century poverty in general. This collection of essays, edited by Steven King and Alannah Tomkins, examines various ways in which the eighteenth-century English poor coped as they pursued lives of intense insecurity. The essays aim to create a new theoretical and empirical framework for advancing our understanding of ‘makeshift’, showing how access to common land, kinship support, voluntary charity and crime helped to sustain families under pressure.

The introduction summarizes the historiography of parochial poor relief and describes how over the last twenty years historians have come to recognize the significance of ‘life-cycle’ poverty and the variety of sources and benefits used by the poor. It also records the consequent shift of focus in the history of social policy from a preoccupation with the ‘system’ and formal relief, to a concern with the behaviour of the poor. The essays that follow employ a range of both
traditional and more unusual primary sources and are based on the experiences of urban and rural poor in a variety of geographical regions and communities. Material and cultural aspects of makeshift are considered, providing insight into how strategies might change over time and over the course of a single life. The conclusion stresses the importance of location and regionality in any approach to the concept of an economy of makeshift and poses a series of questions, some of which contributing historians have begun to answer, as a basis for further research.

One of the most interesting essays in this collection is Sarah Lloyd’s study of the Welsh Charity School in London, which explores the roles of formal voluntary charity bestowed on the poor by the more affluent. It examines the material benefits of charity education (mainly in the form of school clothing) as part of a significant two-way bargaining process between parents and school governors. The essay also examines the more subtle, cultural implications of participating in charity as a survival strategy. Heather Shore has written extensively on crime, and in her contribution here, she skillfully melds court records and eighteenth-century pamphlet literature to examine the complicated relationship between poverty and social crime in London. She emphasizes the nature of the criminal fraternity, the significance of vulnerable periods in the life cycle for initiation into crime and the role played by women as receivers within a partially protective community. Perhaps the most significant article in the collection, based as it is on an unique pawnbroker’s pledge book, is by Alannah Tomkins. In it, she uses a detailed analysis of pledges to suggest that as the poor slid into destitution, the pawnshop preceded parochial relief as an all-important component of a makeshift economy.

Early nineteenth-century Lancashire censuses of the poor and record books of Quaker women who dispensed charity are linked together by Margaret Hanley in her investigation of survival strategies without parochial relief, where kinship support, work and charity combine to provide the basis of family economy. Sam Barrett uses a similar technique, linking records of poor-relief payments with reconstitution data, to show kinship support in the West Riding of Yorkshire. Steve Hindle’s essay deals with the rural agricultural poor, illustrating how the changing balance between the parish dole, voluntary charity and access to common land gave rise to a predictable but precarious economy of makeshift. Finally, in his survey of welfare in the rural industrial north-west, Steve King demonstrates how proceeds from charity and work outstripped parish relief, using a micro-study of the township of Cowpe to illustrate the complexity of a makeshift economy where parochial relief played a minority role.

In general, this is a well-researched collection of essays, using an imaginative range of primary sources and presenting the notion of an economy of makeshift from a variety of angles. It is fluently written, valuable and innovative. As a whole, it will be of interest to historians of poverty and the poor, and those engaged in regional research. Individual essays will also
appeal to social historians concerned with family and kinship, the education of
the poor and criminal networks. There is a good range of explanatory
footnotes supporting the text and clear, functional maps, tables and bar charts
illustrating aspects of the research, although a few carefully chosen images,
even facsimiles from the more unusual sources, would be welcome. It is also a
pity that the vibrancy of the image of the Charity Ball on the cover has not
spilled over into the text. Undergraduates and readers new to the study of
poverty may find the presentation lacks that light touch and flair so necessary
to help them get closer to the experiences of the poor and make the topic of
economy of makeshifts stimulating.

Dianne Payne
University of Hertfordshire

Peter Leese, Beata Piatek and Izabela Curyllo-Klag, The British migrant
033399986. £60 (h/b).

This volume consists of 263 short extracts from a variety of sources on the
topic of migration to and within Britain in the eighteenth, nineteenth and
twentieth centuries. These are organised into three sections: the period 1700-
1900; the twentieth century, and writings about place. The extracts are
previewed by a brief foreword by C. K. Steedman, an introductory essay by P.
J. Leese, and short introductions by the editors to each of the three sections
into which the book is divided. A bibliography lists the sources used and
provides some additional references.

The foreword is in some ways the most original part of the book. Steedman
sets both autobiographical writing and the experience of migration within a
literary and cultural context, linking it to the process of modernity, and
critically assessing the genre of writing about travel and movement. In
particular, she rightly emphasises the ways in which most such writing rarely
provides narratives of journeys, concentrating instead on what travel brings
and how it changes migrants’ lives. In contrast, the overview of migration to
and within Britain provided by Leese seems superficial and simplified. He
draws on a limited range of sources and presents a sketchy and sometimes
misleading introduction to a complex topic.

The rest of the book is similarly disappointing. The introductions to each
section are short and there is little attempt to either provide a critical
evaluation of the sources, or to bring out the similarities and differences
between them. The material presented raises many important questions but
the editors do not take the opportunity to explore these. For instance: how did
the experiences of migrants vary over time; to what extent were the
experiences of poverty cited in the sources different from the lives of non-
migrants; how did the experiences of immigrants and internal migrants differ?
For much of the book the material is used uncritically and there is little
evaluation of the evidence presented. Even the division into sections is
problematic in that it is not clear how the material included in the last section on ‘place’ is substantially different from the extracts in earlier sections. Indeed, many are from the same sources.

The extracts that form the core of the book, though often of interest in themselves, could be organised and presented much more effectively. Each section combines extracts from a variety of different types of source including autobiographies, contemporary accounts, oral histories and the interpretations of later historians. However, these different perspectives are intermingled, and there is no attempt to assess the positionality of each of the authors. Many of the extracts are also very short and are disembodied from their context. It is thus hard to evaluate the significance of what they are saying. In addition, most of the extracts are from well-known sources that are already available in published form. The added value of grouping them together without critical evaluation is thus relatively small.

Overall, it is hard to see the purpose of this book. Some students might find the collection of original comments on the experience of migration useful, but without more interpretation and critical assessment this utility is limited. Moreover, anyone genuinely interested in migration studies can easily go to the original sources and place the material in its broader context. Finally, the book is marred by a number of small errors, one of the more persistent and annoying being the incorrect citation of the *Family Records of Benjamin Shaw* that are used on at least nine separate occasions during the book.

Colin G. Pooley

*Department of Geography*

*Lancaster University*


*Naming, Society and Regional Identity* consists of ten papers, under five subject headings, presented at a symposium held at the Department of English Local History, University of Leicester in July 1990. The authors represent a wide range of expertise – local history, demography, social history, historical geography, anthropology. They demonstrate how the study of naming patterns can help research in a variety of disciplines.

The first two papers, under the heading isonomy and community, are by anthropologists Gabriel Lasker and Malcolm Smith, who show how surnames can be used to investigate the degree of inbreeding between regions, between villages within a region, between neighbouring villages and within occupations, giving insights into genetic structure, human biology and migration. Both Smith and Lasker make the point that surname data can be used in the analysis of many factors, are easy and cheap to collect, are widely available and are easy to analyze. They are ‘a reasonable first step in a genetic and perhaps even an historical study of population structure.’ (p. 23.)
Papers by Roger Thompson and Daniel Scott Smith relate to social structure in Colonial North America and tell of the families who emigrated from Eastern England to America in the seventeenth century. It seems that the majority of these were well-settled in their former lives, moving no more than 10 miles from their birthplaces before emigration, and that people did not emigrate as individuals, but rather in large, extended family groups.

The next session refers to early influences on British naming practices. Cecily Clark discusses the various ways in which personal names can be used to research a variety of disciplines – genetics, lexicography, sociology, settlement geography, dialectology, as well as the more obvious local and family history. Their aims are all very different and she warns that it is important to establish the central purpose of one’s investigation before deciding on the methods which will best serve that purpose (p. 102). Locational research can throw light on settlement, trading and migrational patterns and dialect variations. Social stratification of English bynames can be investigated using names in tax assessments to differentiate groups of differing economic status.

Gillian Fellows-Jensen uses British place names based on Scandinavian personal names (Norwegian and Danish) to plot the progress of Viking settlement in the British Isles. Her study suggests that Norsemen colonised the Orkneys and Shetlands, northern Scotland, the Hebrides, Isle of Man and the Irish Sea coasts, while the Danes migrated down the North Sea coasts to eastern England (avoiding the inhospitable Pennines and North Yorkshire moors, the marshy Vale of York and the Fens). By contrast, the Swedes went towards the Baltic, Black Sea and Caspian Sea and so were not relevant to Britain.

In the section on influences on personal naming in early modern England, Jeremy Boulton looks at the question of whether naming practices can provide a measure of changes in attitudes of communities. During the seventeenth century, the influence of godparents became less and parents began to have more control over choice of name. The baptismal register of St. Pancras between 1538 and 1643 was analyzed and it was found that there was a significant increase in those not named for either godparent or parent, giving scope for an increase in biblical and ‘fashionable’ names.

Evelyn Lord shows how the study of given names can give insight into many different aspects of local history. She has found that the numbers of children named-for-kin were in inverse proportion to the percentage of landless labourers in a community, so stability of society can be measured by naming customs. Religious inclinations can be studied through chosen names – Protestants favoured biblical names, Catholics preferred saints’ names. By the eighteenth century, literature had become an influence, so names can be a cultural indicator from then onwards (p. 178).

The final section examines how nominal record linkage can be used to study regional identity in the past. In the context of three Essex parishes adjoining Hertfordshire, Kevin Schürer examines the criteria that can define and identify communities — kin, region, social standing, profession, etc. In 1861 and 1871,
non-natives, including exogamous marriage partners, were largely from surrounding Essex parishes; few had crossed the county boundary, which coincides with the river Stort for much of its length. Either the regional boundary or the physical feature could have posed the obstacle to migration. He concludes that migration and mobility may be inhibited by a variety of obstacles, some physical, others economic, social or cultural and, although perceived rather than real, mental barriers are just as important as physical. We cannot afford to ignore regional identity either now or when studying the past. John Langton & Goran Hoppe finally present a similar study of an area in nineteenth-century Sweden.

A useful short index lists individuals and places mentioned in the text, but unfortunately, as with the complementary volume edited by Hooke and Postles reviewed above, the book is let down by the poor standard of proof-reading and editing. There are far too many mis-spellings, many of which should have been picked up by a computer spellchecker. Three instances of ‘proprinquity’ on p. xviii serve as a striking example.

Jean Wright


This small pocket dictionary is the latest edition in a series of genealogy and family history texts written or compiled by this author. Over the past decade the popularity of this genre of historical research is evident by the numerous publications and the growth of the subject on Internet web sites. Accordingly the range of resources for the family historian is rapidly increasing and thus creating the need for an update in fresh description and explanation. In this respect Raymond’s *Pocket dictionary* could prove to be a most useful asset to both the amateur and professional genealogical researcher. Arguably Raymond has achieved his main objective by providing a ready reference source for the genealogist in England and Wales, to access definitions of terms and pointers of information in their chosen fields of research. In compiling this *Dictionary* Raymond readily acknowledges the work of the renowned genealogy and family historians Fitzhuch, Hey and Saul and in particular his indebtedness to Herber and Bevin. Clearly these sources provide an independent and in depth guide to the researcher.

The *Dictionary* by definition has omissions and limitations. The entries are brief, but they offer an adequate introduction to the subject matter, which in many instances have received book length treatment. In respect to omissions this edition excludes specific entries to other countries; Raymond extends cover only to those countries that are relevant to the tracing of English migrants. An assessment of the genealogical – historical balance shows that Raymond clearly favours genealogy. Furthermore, Raymond places much emphasis on the use of books and to a lesser extent the Internet, pointing out the need to verify Internet information with original sources. Nevertheless
under the Internet subject heading the Dictionary provides some of the more useful web sites together with hints on how to access them. Indeed throughout the text many prominent web sites including the International Genealogy Index, UK Genealogy www.genuk.org.uk and Raymond’s web dictionaries series are indicated. In keeping with tradition the pocket dictionary entries are in alphabetical order, but this sequential form is ignored where a significant relationship between subjects exists. Consequentially within many entries an asterisk signifies related subjects under a separate heading, which is a distinct aide to efficient research. Other key entries include the advice given under the subject heading bibliography, this is not only vital to efficient research, but can avoid needless handling of unique and often irreplaceable manuscripts.

In terms of methodology and efficiency of research The pocket dictionary provides a useful starting point in the preparation and planning of a programme of study. It’s readily accessible useful information and guidance can avoid unnecessary trawling through archives, CD ROMs and microfiche and thus it could prove to be an invaluable companion to the family historian.

Barrie H. Sykes


Why did Europeans begin to count births and deaths? This simple question forms the basis of Rusnock’s interesting and compelling study. Vital Accounts charts the work of a variety of individuals who founded the disciplines of political and medical arithmetic in England and France over the course of the ‘long eighteenth century’. It presents a social history of the counting of vital events and a discussion of the development and use of tables as a means of comparison. In a series of case studies it then focuses on how these techniques were used in eighteenth-century debates about smallpox inoculation, environmental medicine and depopulation.

Throughout the ‘long eighteenth century’ both ‘quantification and numerical tables were controversial techniques for producing new knowledge’ (p.14). Their genesis lies in John Graunt’s justly famous Natural and Political Observations Made upon the Bills of Mortality (London, 1662) and while Rusnock is unable to add much to our knowledge concerning precisely why Graunt wrote this book, the fact that vital events had been compiled for London from as early as the fifteenth century provided the necessary raw data for such a study to take place. Amongst the many innovations contained in this groundbreaking work were the ideas of the life table and a rudimentary system of disease classification. Graunt did much to establish demography as an academic discipline and while Petty was inspired to publish a similar study of the Dublin Bills of Mortality (London, 1683) there was hardly a rush to follow up on these studies.
Quantification only came to the fore when it was used as a tool in the debate over the safety of smallpox inoculation, the dangerous procedure whereby a healthy patient was given a controlled dose of live smallpox in order to confer immunity. In England Arbuthnot and Jurin attempted to calculate smallpox mortality rates as a means of assessing the effectiveness of inoculation. After the 1750s the network of those interested in this subject widened to include eminent doctors such as John Haygarth who published in periodicals such as the *Philosophical Transactions* and the debate eventually became focused on whether or not inoculations should be carried out on the urban poor. In France similar debates were conducted, often based on numerical data derived from the work of Jurin, although both Condamine and Bernoulli constructed tables to assess the impact of inoculation.

While the impact of weather on disease had been discussed frequently it was only when accurate devices for recording temperature and pressure were perfected in the late seventeenth century that quantification became feasible. Systems for the accurate recording of weather were developed and gradually links began to be made with disease. Most notable of the English environmentalists was Thomas Short who produced a series of tables which analysed various series of vital events. Short's overall analysis was however often confused, but it did herald significant advances such as Heberden's study of maternal deaths in London and Haygarth's examination of mortality in Chester which included sophisticated tables that broke down deaths by age, sex and marital status.

By the mid-eighteenth century concerns began to be expressed in both England and France that the national population was declining. In the absence of any national censuses political arithmeticians developed and refined a number of techniques for estimating the total population. These often involved the search for universal multipliers to convert series of vital events and numbers of households into a total population. Largely as a consequence of institutional differences in how the data was collected there was no explicit exchange between the countries as to which multipliers should be used. In England analyses were undertaken by a wide range of individuals mainly using local data while in France, with its more centralised system of recording information, government officers carried out this work, often employing considerable mathematical expertise.

Overall Rusnock's book provides interesting insights to many aspects of demographic analysis in the eighteenth century. Its main weakness is that except in the short conclusion it tends to treat events in England and France separately rather than providing a truly comparative perspective (roughly 75 per cent of the book deals with England). Nevertheless, *Vital Accounts* demonstrates how quantification in the form of numerical tables gradually became accepted as the means by which public health and welfare could be measured and social debates on the nature and cause of disease eventually resolved. It should be read by anyone with a serious interest in demography's history.

Chris Galley
*Barnsley College*

Two complementary items were reviewed. The first was a 54 page A4 paper, *Buckinghamshire in 1851: The evidence of the population census* by David Thorpe and published by Buckinghamshire Archaeological Society. The second was *Buckinghamshire 1851 census transcription with index*, a CD-ROM published by Buckinghamshire Family History Society.

The stated purpose of the paper is to provide ‘a commentary on the 1851 population Census and the ways in which it can provide information to illustrate the state of the County,’ and the purpose of the CD is to provide the raw material on which the paper is based, in a form suitable for comparative parish and other studies. The paper also draws on over thirty notes that are published on the CD. The author describes these notes as reports of survey rather than rounded academic essays, and confesses to making little attempt to relate their content to the academic literature.

The Introduction to the paper describes the CD, although the paper can be read as an independent work. The next section assesses the reliability and structure of the data and highlights a number of problems encountered by those working with the census, such as inaccuracies in ages, and occupational classification. Analysis starts in the next section, which deals with the county as a whole and with such issues as population change, population density, and migration. Presentation is enhanced by the use of maps/diagrams.

Later sections deal with the upper echelons of county society (gentry and professionals), the economic base, birthplaces, and services and trades. The section ‘Local Case Studies’ lists a number of studies that have been conducted using data from the Bucks Census Enumerators’ Books (CEB). A section on Parish Summary Statistics illustrates the use of the tabulated data on the CD for comparison of two parishes, and the final section deals with longitudinal studies.

Installation of the software was without problems on a PC running Windows 98 (The stated requirements are Windows 95 or later, 16Mb RAM, 10Mb free disc space and a SVGA monitor). The installation routine put a shortcut on the desktop. Adobe Acrobat is required to view some of the files and was provided on the CD. Some files are in Excel format, so this program is required to obtain maximum benefit from the CD. The database of the 1851 Bucks CEB is searched using the software provided on the CD.

Some years ago the reviewer identified some ancestors resident in Bucks in 1851, by a manual search of the CEB. These people were easily found by using the search facility on the CD. The Simple Search facility was indeed simple to use. Surname is the only mandatory field, but forename, parish and lower and
upper ages may be optionally specified. The results window is clear, with all
data from the CEB being shown. Inclusion of piece, folio and schedule
numbers facilitates checking the data against the CEB. (The data on the CD is
a transcript; there are no scanned images). Households of identified
individuals can be displayed, as can neighbours, and results can be exported
as CSV, SDF or DBF files, or printed. A map and table showing distribution of
the located individuals can be displayed, and the table can be printed. The
Name Search facility allows searching for several surnames and forenames,
with the option to select one or more parishes and an age range. An attractive
feature is the ability to search for several variants of a surname simply by
clicking on Variants. Results are shown in the same way as for Simple Search.

Clicking the Analysis tab gives access to a very powerful search tool, allowing
searches of all fields in the database. Limited use is made of Boolean
operators, and some fields can be searched for the presence of a selected text
string. No special knowledge is needed to use this facility. An advanced
search facility is available for users with a good understanding of Dbase
Syntax.

The Parish Analysis facility (not to be confused with the Analysis facility
described above) displays extensive data for the selected parish. Map
reference, area, hundred, registration district and sub-district, and population
figures from the 1801–1851 censuses are presented, with the 1851 CEB listing
for the parish. Graphic displays are available of age/gender, population
trends, strays (by birth county), place of birth, and household size. A map
showing the location of the parish is also available, and the CEB list can be
exported, either as transcribed from the CEB or as extended data, which
includes additional classifications of households, occupations, age groups etc.
A series of Excel spreadsheets gives a detailed summary of Bucks by parish.
Data extracted from the Census Abstracts for 1801–1851 is followed by 1851
CEB data on age and gender structure. Also analysed for 1851 are household
structure, birthplace and occupation. A simple map shows the distribution of
the population within the county, and a map of the British Isles shows
birthplaces of those born outside Bucks.

An extensive selection of over 30 documents is available on the CD.
Reproductions of instructions to registrars and enumerators, with an extract
from the Census Report contribute greatly to the understanding of the census
process. Contemporary extracts from The Times and The Illustrated London
News indicate a positive attitude to the census. Other topics covered include
occupations, households (subdivided by social status), the professions, the
education census, agriculture, various trades, institutions, and a brief
description of a study of Marlow based on the CEB. The religious census is not
the subject of a separate document, but is mentioned in the document on the
clergy.

The paper and CD are not without faults. In the paper, the section on the
economic base starts at paragraph 67, and not 71 as stated in the contents. The
meaning of the figures on the axes on some of the Figures (for example, Figure
1) was not immediately apparent. A number of typographic errors are evident in the paper and on the CD, but these rarely detract from the sense of what has been written.

Overall, this is an extremely useful package. The paper is a free-standing document, but reference to the data and documents on the CD can be selectively used in conjunction with sections of the paper. The documents on the CD also stand in their own right, but many of them are, in the reviewer's opinion, better read after using the paper as an introduction. The paper and CD provide an excellent integrated view of the census and of Buckinghamshire in 1851, and the CD provides detail at the parish level that is lacking from the Census Report. The search facilities for individuals and households will be of great value to family historians, and the search and analysis features allow advanced searches for genealogical and demographic purposes. This package will be of great value to anyone studying the population of Buckinghamshire. Family historians wishing to expand their interest from family history to population studies will benefit greatly from the integrated approach, whatever their county of interest. The Excel spreadsheets are an invaluable source of summary data on Bucks parishes, and provide a firm foundation for further work. The documents on the CD provide much food for thought, and Dr Thorpe and his colleagues are to be complimented on making available such a rich source of material.

David G. Jackson
THE CONSTITUTION OF THE LOCAL POPULATION STUDIES SOCIETY

1. The name of the organisation shall be the Local Population Studies Society (hereafter the ‘Society’).

AIMS OF THE SOCIETY
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MEMBERSHIP OF THE SOCIETY
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12. The Annual General Meeting decides the forthcoming year’s subscription rates and elects the Society’s Officers, with the sole exception of the Editor of the Society’s journal.
13. Items for the agenda of the Annual General Meeting must be received in writing by the Honorary Secretary within two weeks of the date of the meeting.
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CONTINGENCY

27. All surpluses derived from the activities of the Society and all interest deriving from investments which the Society shall from time to time make shall be devoted to the furtherance of the aims of the Society as set out in clause 2 of this Constitution.

28. In the event of the dissolution of the Society, its assets shall be given or transferred to some other charitable institution or institutions, or charitable object or objects, with aims similar to those of the Society.
CORRESPONDENCE

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

Editor’s note

Readers are reminded that the Editorial Board is always prepared to offer advice on subjects within the scope of Local Population Studies, so if you think we might be able to help please do not hesitate to contact us.

Christening customs

Dear Sir

As an old campaigner on the trail of christening customs, I was naturally interested to read the latest contribution to the long-running debate (Alan Wright in LPS 71) and would like to make two points.

Although it is difficult to get data on ‘private’ baptisms, their existence is an important reminder that they were seen as a temporary alternative to ‘publick’ baptisms. One supposes that they were especially important as an insurance policy against the risk to its soul of an infant dying without benefit of any kind of baptism by a clergyman (as distinct from ‘emergency’ baptisms by midwives or family). The Presbyterian ministers studied by Wright were more or less providing parents with private baptisms, which unlike Anglican private baptisms do not seem to have been followed up by public baptisms in the chapel. This frustrates straightforward comparison of Anglican and Presbyterian practices in Whickham. Private baptisms are also especially relevant when considering upper class households, particularly perhaps the clergy, since it would be easier for privileged families to arrange private baptisms by clergy. At least this is the impression I gained from a study of the registers of Chester Cathedral, reported in my article in LPS 11, reprinted in M. Drake, ed., Population Studies from Parish Registers (Matlock, 1982). Private baptism was very soon after birth, public baptism following leisurely after several months in most cases, and occasionally after a year.

Wright unluckily missed the use I made in this article of nonconformist registers for the Cambridgeshire parish of Melbourn. The Congregational (Independent) Chapel registers showed a similar median birth-baptism interval (6.33 months) to that for the Anglican registers (6.8 months). However, straightforward comparison was not possible, since the Congregational chapel served an area comprising several Anglican parishes, involving journeys of several miles for the baptism of children from outlying areas. Very large numbers of children were baptised on a few dates, with seasonality perhaps even more marked than in the Anglican registers. During
the years 1825-37 only 25 children were baptised in the cold months of December to April, out of a total of 176 baptisms.

Yours sincerely,

Dennis Mills

17 Rectory Lane
Branston
Lincoln, LN4 1NA
Tel. 01522 791764
Email: dennis@millshistorical.co.uk

The parish of Hartland, North Devon

Dear Sir,

We are writing to bring to the attention of your readers the ongoing research into the parish of Hartland and its digital archive. We have been fortunate in gaining an award from the Millennium Lottery Fund. This is to allow archive materials to be digitally recorded for preservation and to enhance access. The Hartland archive now extends to more than 14,000 picture images and 80,000 pages of document images.

The material cover the period from 1400 until the present day and include the archives of the old Borough of Harton, St Nectan’s Church, the parish council, the Harton Town Trust, the Prust and Gregory papers, MSS of Richard Pearse Chope (the local historian) and many public and private papers of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The work is ongoing and we are presently looking for further funding.

The Register of the parish of Hartland, which is complete from 1558, was used by the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure as one of its primary resources, and the accounts of St Nectan’s Church, complete from 1597, have been published. Hartland material from the Lay Subsidies of 1331 and 1524, the Muster Roll of 1569, the Protestation Roll of 1643 and Hearth Tax of 1674 have been used by recent researchers, while individual documents were studies by R.P. Chope.

A substantial body of documents dating from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries has come to light as a result of our programme. This includes complete rate and tithe books with details of persons and holdings from the sixteenth century onwards, poor relief books, an Overseers’ Book, numerous settlement and bastardy papers and land conveyances. It seems to us that the amount of material now available from this exceptionally large parish warrants a substantial investigation, especially, perhaps, in the general area of the social history of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The history of Hartland Abbey and the complexities of the transmission of the post-reformation Abbey estates, together with that of the Manor of Hartland, also merit attention.
The materials are available on CD-ROM at the North Devon Records Office and will shortly also be available at the West Country Studies Library in Exeter. Copies may be purchased on request, and a basic index is also available on request. We should be interested to hear from anyone who has materials related to Hartland in their own archives and would be happy to offer our materials for such related studies.

Yours faithfully,

Stephen Hobbs
Holder of the Hartland Digital Archive
Email: hartonarchives@btinternet.com

Brian H. Warmington
formerly Reader in Ancient History, University of Bristol and Hon. Fellow in Classics, University of Exeter
Email: b.warmington@ukonline.co.uk

Local Population Studies in the Portsmouth/Chichester areas

Dear Sir,

I am a new member of the Local Population Studies Society and am seeking information on population research in the Portsmouth/Chichester areas, past and present. I am also seeking to join a local studies group to further my interests, and am especially interested in the coastal hinterland between these two cities. Should you have any information on prior research, be involved currently in such research or interested in starting a new project, I would be very pleased indeed to hear from you.

Yours sincerely

Malcolm Walford
23 Esher Grove
Waterlooville
Hants PO7 6HJ
Tel.: 023 9242 7164