
Editorial

This issue

This issue of *Local Population Studies* marks a new departure, in that one of the contributions is published only electronically, and is not in the hard copy version. The second instalment of Chris Galley's monograph on infant mortality in England since the dawn of the parish register era is published as a supplement to this issue. It can be read only on the IngentaConnect web site, where it has been designated as Open Access, meaning that anyone can read and download it, whether or not they are members of the Local Population Studies Society or have paid for access to the journal. This second instalment deals with infant mortality in the parish register era (1538–1837), and is both a synthesis of what is known about infant mortality during this period and a summary of work that remains to be done. However, it is more than this, as it proposes an answer to a major conundrum which has taxed historians and demographers for some time. The conundrum can be expressed as two questions: why did infant mortality in towns and cities reach such punishing levels in the early eighteenth century? and what was responsible for the decline in infant mortality after 1750? Galley's answers to these questions are not definitive but, as he shows, they are consistent with much of what is known about the processes surrounding childbirth and the care of infants. The article also includes a research agenda for future studies of infant mortality in the parish register era. It will be essential reading for anyone interested in the history of infant mortality in England, and of interest to those working on the history of infant mortality in general.

The rest of the journal is published under the same arrangements as previous issues, being available electronically to subscribers through IngentaConnect and in hard copy to those who have paid for hard copies to be delivered. It consists of two articles, a research note describing a proposed Local Population Studies Society Parish Register Project, and the latest contribution to our occasional 'Sources and Methods' series.

In the first of the two articles, Tiffany Shumaker presents a re-assessment of the population of the town of Ipswich in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Using a range of ingenious methods, she analyses the town's parish registers to obtain a better understanding of the town's demographic trends in this period. In addition, her article proposes new methods to estimate population size. These methods combine data from the town's communicant returns, parish poor rates, poor relief payments, and similar sources in order to determine the social structure of the town, the relative wealth of the town's parishes, and the approximate population sizes of the town's main socio-economic groups. Tiffany's article is an excellent example of what can be achieved by the thoughtful use of multiple sources.

We know that thousands of people moved from the countryside to the towns and cities in nineteenth century England. Many of these people benefited economically from the

move in that they found greater opportunities for employment and social mobility. But how much did the towns and cities gain from the fact that they attracted migrants? This is a challenging question, and some historians have argued that the pace of migration in the middle years of the century overwhelmed the administrators of some cities and put pressure on their infrastructure, such that environmental conditions deteriorated. In his contribution to this issue of *Local Population Studies*, Daniel Gooch attempts to quantify the economic benefit that net in-migration between 1851–1871 brought to one English town, Reading in Berkshire. The method he uses to achieve this quantification is complex and involves many assumptions, but it relies mainly on methods which are standard among demographers and in the world of financial mathematics. The outcome should probably be regarded as an order of magnitude estimate rather than as an accurate figure, but his conclusion is that net migration to the town during these 20 years essentially ‘paid for’ several large urban infrastructure projects.

The research note by Andrew Hinde and Paul Tomblin discusses a proposed project to make parish register data available electronically, in the form of Excel files or Access databases, to both amateur and professional historians through the Local Population Studies Society.

We have another contribution to our ‘Sources and Methods’ series in this issue. Colin and Marilyn Pooley have written an introduction to the use of diaries in local population history research. Several of the papers presented at the recent Local Population Studies Society conference in Oxford (a report of which will appear in the next issue of *Local Population Studies*) made use of evidence from diaries, so Pooley and Pooley’s summary of the advantages and limitations of diaries as sources is timely.

Local Population Studies Society Conference, April 2020

The next Local Population Studies Society Conference will be held on 4 April 2020 at the Department of Geography, University of Cambridge and will be a memorial conference for the late Dr Roger Schofield, the founding Editor of *Local Population Studies*. To recognise Roger’s work, the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure and the Local Population Studies Society have put together a programme to reflect the legacy that Roger left for future generations of researchers. The conference will bring together a number of international scholars who as students or colleagues benefited from his inspiration, encouragement and support or who enjoyed grants from the Roger Schofield Research Fund.

We hope the speakers will include David Cressy (Ohio State University), Rosemary Leadbeater (Oxford Brookes University), David Levine (University of Toronto), Jim Oeppen (University of Southern Denmark), Richard Smith (University of Cambridge), Simon Szreter (University of Cambridge) and Samantha Williams (University of Cambridge). Full details will appear in the next issue of the Local Population Studies Society *Newsletter*, or can be obtained by contacting the LPSS conference organiser, Karen Rothery (conferences@localpopulationstudies.org.uk).

Back issues of *Local Population Studies*

I am pleased to say that digitised back issues (1968–2008) of *Local Population Studies* are now available in the Hathi Trust Digital Library: <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/mb?a=listis;c=1140287046>. Our thanks are due to William Farrell for facilitating this. This provides another platform for readers to access *LPS*, in addition to our own website.

Analysis of articles published in *Local Population Studies* 81–100

Just over ten years ago, on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the foundation of *Local Population Studies* Nigel Goose and Chris Galley wrote a short piece in which they analysed the articles published in the journal according to their subject matter, region and period.¹ I thought it might be interesting to bring this analysis up to date by examining the characteristics of articles published in *Local Population Studies* issues 81–100. This is done in Tables 1–3, which extend the corresponding tables in Goose and Galley’s survey.

The distribution of articles in issues 81–100 by subject matter is similar to that of the articles in issues 61–80 (Table 1). We published fewer articles devoted to sources and

Table 1 Local Population Studies articles classified by subject

Volumes	Population size	Population structure	Mortality and morbidity	Fertility	Nuptiality	Migration
1–20	5	5	13	7	4	9
21–40	3	10	8	3	1	12
41–60	12	6	9	3	1	9
61–80	2	3	13	1	1	8
81–100	8	6	10	3	1	8
Total	30	30	53	17	8	46

Volumes	Sources and methods	Occupations	Literacy and education	Naming practices	Poverty and Poor Law	Other social history topics
1–20	17	2	4	2	0	1
21–40	19	2	4	2	0	6
41–60	18	1	1	2	1	7
61–80	13	8	0	1	7	3
81–100	6	9	1	1	8	6
Total	73	22	10	8	16	23

Sources: N. Goose and C. Galley, ‘*Local Population Studies—forty years on*’, *Local Population Studies*, 81 (2008), p. 13. *Local Population Studies*, 81–100 (2008–2018).

¹ N. Goose and C. Galley, ‘*Local Population Studies forty years on*’, *Local Population Studies*, 81 (2008), pp. 11–17.

Table 2 Local Population Studies articles classified by region

Volumes	England						Scotland	Wales	Ireland	Non-UK
	North-east	North-west	South-east	South-west	Midlands	East Anglia				
1–20	5	5	10	5	9	5	3	0	1	2
21–40	8	4	15	3	8	3	7	0	1	2
41–60	12	6	11	7	9	1	2	2	0	2
61–80	8	6	12	6	4	4	5	0	0	0
81–100	1	9	20	4	9	4	1	2	1	5
Total	34	30	68	25	39	17	18	4	3	11

Note: Two articles in *Local Population Studies* 89, one in *Local Population Studies* 95, two in *Local Population Studies* 99 and all six articles in *Local Population Studies* 100 dealt with the whole of England (and in some cases the whole of Britain) and have been excluded from this table.

Sources: N. Goose and C. Galley, 'Local Population Studies forty years on', *Local Population Studies*, 81 (2008), p. 15. *Local Population Studies*, 81–100 (2008–2018).

methods, but more on population size. The range of topics covered in *Local Population Studies* has also continued to broaden. The interest in the poor laws which began in issues 61–80 has continued, culminating in a special issue (issue 99) on the New Poor Law. So far as regional patterns are concerned, there has been a relative increase in articles about the South-East of England and the Midlands, at the expense of articles focused on the North-East (which includes Yorkshire) and Scotland (Table 2). We have also seen an increase in the number of papers about regions outside the United Kingdom, including articles on migration and settlement in Canada and New South Wales.

Table 3 Local Population Studies articles classified by date (in centuries)

Volumes	Before sixteenth	Sixteenth	Seventeenth	Eighteenth	Nineteenth	Twentieth
1–20	0	18	16	12	12	0
21–40	3	7	15	15	20	0
41–60	7	9	13	7	25	3
61–80	3	3	12	8	33	3
81–100	3	8	6	11	34	4
Total	16	45	62	53	124	10

Note: Where an article spans several centuries, only the earliest is recorded in the table. Thus, an article concerned with the period 1650–1871 would be allocated to the seventeenth century.

Sources: N. Goose and C. Galley, 'Local Population Studies forty years on', *Local Population Studies*, 81 (2008), p. 16. *Local Population Studies*, 81–100 (2008–2018).

Just over half the articles published in issues 81–100 deal with the nineteenth century, a dominance which began in the previous ten years of the journal's life (Table 3). The only significant change since the previous ten years has been an increase in articles about the sixteenth century at the expense of articles about the seventeenth century. The medieval period and the twentieth century continue to be poorly represented.

Thanks and acknowledgements

My thanks are due to the members of the Editorial Board for their contribution to this issue, especially Chris Galley and William Farrell, who copy-edited and proof-read several sections. As ever, Viv Williams at Cambrian Typesetters and Malcolm George at Argent Litho have played their part with their customary goodwill and efficiency.

Andrew Hinde