

# Local Population Studies

*A Quarterly Journal of the  
Local Population Studies Society*

No. 7

Autumn 1971

LOCAL POPULATION STUDIES

No. 7 Autumn 1971

Published twice yearly in association with  
Nottingham University Department of Adult  
Education

Cover illustration reproduced from a manuscript of  
the Compton Census of 1676, by kind permission of  
the trustees of the William Salt Library, Stafford.

Reprinted by the University of Nottingham Library Photographic Unit

## EDITORIAL BOARD

DAVID AVERY  
COLIN BARHAM  
CHRISTOPHER CHARLTON  
ROGER SCHOFIELD  
RICHARD WALL

LETTERS to the Editorial Board should be addressed to:-

RICHARD WALL,  
20, SILVER STREET,  
CAMBRIDGE

COPYRIGHT of any articles published in this magazine remains  
with the authors.

## SUBSCRIPTIONS

The Annual Subscription to Local Population Studies is 50p for U.K.  
and 2 dollars for North American readers (as from 1st March, 1972  
75p for U.K. and 3 dollars North American readers). For other  
subscribers an additional postage charge has to be made.

Subscriptions should be sent to the Subscription Secretary:-

MRS. M. H. CHARLTON,  
9 LISBURNE SQUARE,  
TORQUAY,  
DEVON

Cheques should be made payable to Local Population Studies.

Individual copies and back numbers available from:-

The Subscription Secretary,  
37p each ( from 1st March 50p)

Details of advertising rates are obtainable from the:-

Advertising and Business Manager,  
Tawney House,  
Matlock,  
Derbyshire, DE4 3BT  
England

## CONTENTS

	Page
Editorial	4
News from the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure:	11
The Hearth Taxes, 1662-1689	John Patten 14
The Scribes of Villagers' Wills in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and their influence	Margaret Spufford 28
Wider Reconstitution	W. Newman Brown 44
Notes and Queries:	
The 1811 Census for Thirsk	R. Fieldhouse 58
Miscellany	
Reprinted from the Journal of the Statistical Society vol. 1 (1838).	C. Charlton 61
Some Additional Pre-1841 Census Enumerators Schedules	65
Correspondence	67
Recent Publications	70
Work in Progress	72

## EDITORIAL

The second part of a conversation recorded at the Public Record Office, between two members of the Editorial Board and Dr. N.J. Williams, Deputy Keeper of Public Records and Mr. E.K. Timings, Principal Assistant Keeper and Head of Search Department.

- Editors            Could you tell us something of the history of the census enumerators' returns? How long have you had them? How long have they been open to public inspection and recognised as documents of special importance?
- Dr. Williams      Almost 10 years ago when the office and Whitehall as well was looking at the question of preservation of records and standards of selection some thought was given to the later census returns. You will have heard the phrase, used in the Grigg Report of '54, "particular instance papers" such as case papers with a common subject matter, though each relates to a different person, body or place - returns, applications and things if you like about as common as bus tickets almost great quantities of materials such as: applications for renewal of driving licences, the sort of thing which covers vast numbers of the population and continue to do so. The question of the preservation of the census returns was also looked at carefully and then costed. It was agreed and this was something that the Advisory Council on Public Records which advises the Lord Chancellor on the work of the PRO went into also and census returns were selected for permanent preservation. The fact that you are keeping every tenth year something that covers, we hope, pretty exhaustively the entire UK, gives the details of individuals' age, occupation, address, marital status and so on, means that some other types of record which would be candidate for preservation could be treated more summarily, e.g. driving licences, etc. Not everyone drives a car or is going to, but your census return includes everybody from birth to death. And the question of access to them, this again the Advisory Committee advises the Lord Chancellor on. The first fruits of those discussions with the Lord Chancellor's office led to the release of 1861 returns at the beginning

of 1962, just 10 years ago, and every 10 years a new census will become available.

Editors This implies that the '41 and '51 returns had already appeared.

Mr. Timings They were not subject to the same rules as the later census. They were open long before they were 100 years old and have been here for a long time classified as Home Office Records. As you may know, they came here from the Registrar General in the first place for proofs of age in connection with old age pensions, for people who claimed to be entitled to an old age pension. That was the reason, and in the late twenties we had a government search room dealing with all queries of this sort for people trying to establish proof of age to get an old age pension. There was a whole team of staff officially working on this before they became used for other interests.

Editors Is there any possibility of more of the Registrar General's material finding its way here?

Dr. Williams Yes, of course there are records of the Registrar General's office - various classes of records, quite apart from census record. The administrative records of the office I suppose contain some quite interesting material hardly ever looked at, and we have it all as with any other government department.

Editors And this documentation will presumably be bound by the 30-year rule as are the papers of other government departments the 100 year ban applying only to the details of census material. Has use ever been made of census information within the 100 year rule?

Dr. Williams The only use that has been made so far as I know was based on a single column of the enumerator's return, probably place of birth, with all the personal names blocked out. Of course it is open for the Minister responsible, or an officer of his department recognised by the Lord Chancellor to grant permission. We have no locus in this, and don't want to have. Any permission is a matter for the Department. The Lord Chancellor,

as I said, has by statutory instrument closed these records till they are 100 years old as a general rule. They cannot be seen without special permission of the Registrar General.

- Mr. Timings When the records were in the Registrar General's custody he could do as he liked. It was possible for an individual to write and ask for a specific entry to be given. You had to say that it was entirely for private purposes and you paid the fee and were sent a copy.
- Editors So that for the '81, '91, etc. censuses which are still under his control, he would still be open to this sort of request?
- Dr. Williams They are his records, but if the records had been transferred to us we couldn't do anything without a chit from the Registrar General, they are his records and as is true of any department, he can requisition them back. Government departmental requisitions in 1970 were 14,600. They need them back for their own purposes. This does not to my knowledge happen with the census returns.
- Editors Of course there are a great many other records here in Chancery Lane or at Portugal Street which are of value to the population historian or genealogist. At Portugal Street, or at least produced at Portugal Street, are the non-parochial registers.
- Dr. Williams The non-parochial registers are very little used. They were called in from various non-conformist churches, Baptists, Society of Friends and others and anything that had details of burials and marriages and so forth on the same lines as anglican parish registers may have been sent on. They go back to the late 17th century. There was no obligation on them to deposit. They were deposited in the Registrar General's office under the Non-Parochial Register Act of 1840 and the Births and Deaths Registration Act, 1958, together with a number of other non-parochial records deposited from time to time in the intervening period. I said late 17th century - in fact the earliest one was 1567, and you have things like the unauthenticated registers, Fleet marriages, etc. Mayfair chapel, King's Bench prison. But the quantity is small.

- Editors Population historians are also interested in the listings of population - tax listings or whatever they may be, but we have the impression that many amateurs may be deterred by an uncertainty as to how to get access to these records.
- Dr. Williams Tell them once they go to the PRO and once they know the parish they are interested in, the records are listed quite clearly under counties to begin with, and then in hundreds or wapentakes below that; it is quite straightforward. This applies to the hearth tax, various subsidies, poll tax, and so on. Most of these records peter out at the end of the 17th century and after this you get the land and assessed tax records in the 18th century; where the return is sent to the Exchequer it does not contain the details of the local collectors. These were kept locally and where they survive are likely to be in the local record office. So we are much more useful from that point of view to the Middle Ages and 16th and 17th centuries. There is a sort of gap in the 18th century before the census records start in the 19th century.
- Mr. Timings There are also Wills! We have the records of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury up to 1857 and the ones after that of course are in the Probate Register. These were moved last year.
- Editors How are they administered? If one wants to make enquiries, how should one go about it?
- Dr. Williams The same applies to them as it does the census - we have the £5 research fee or if you provide a precise reference, we do of course provide a photostat copy. Has to be photostat - we do not xerox. There are the registered wills and the original - we have both. The normal thing is to take the registered will, of course the originals have gaps in them and so normally we provide the copies from the registers. They are large parchment volumes and unsuitable for xerox - they may be damaged as they are very heavy
- Editors And what is the difference in the content between the register and the will?



**Dr. Williams** Should be no difference at all, the register should be an exact copy of the original, but the original may not survive and the register is probably easier to read and there are of course very adequate indexes to them.

**Editors** And there are indexes to the registers?

**Mr. Timings** Yes. As you know the British Record Society has produced large numbers of printed indexes to Prerogative Court of Canterbury wills (as well as to probate records preserved locally). There are very good contemporary indexes which were made in the Doctors' Commons which are on our search room shelves. We have a special Probate search room where the wills are produced in Chancery Lane. The indexes are on the shelves, so all the means of reference are in the one room. It is a very quick operation and we have about an average of 20 or so readers a day in probate.

**Editors** All these records we have talked about are kept in Chancery Lane or Portugal Street. None of them at your country annexe at Ashridge in Hertfordshire?

**Dr. Williams** No, they are all kept either at Portugal Street or here. The probate records are produced almost on demand, other things like the hearth tax take about half an hour or so, and none of these popular classes of records are ever moved to Ashridge. They have to be seen in London.

This concludes the conversation at the Public Record Office.

## An L.P.S. Weekend Residential Conference

21st - 23rd July, 1972

L.P.S. itself grew out of a short residential conference and the editors have for some time been in favour of providing such a conference for L.P.S. subscribers. It seemed a logical and worthwhile extension to L.P.S. but no one was prepared to undertake the administrative work involved. Then the University of Nottingham Department of Adult Education generously agreed to administer a conference and so the July Residential Weekend has been arranged. It has been designed to provide for beginners and experts. Provisionally three seminar groups have been planned. In one hearth tax, poll tax, the Compton and other ecclesiastical census material and parish registers will be used to examine the various methods open to the local historian in making estimates of a local population. A second will concentrate on family reconstitution and provide an opportunity to learn from members of the Cambridge Group the use of this and other techniques of parish register analysis. For those more familiar with the subject it will offer the chance to explore the more complex statistical measures which may be derived from reconstitution. A third will be devoted to the use of local population studies in schools, colleges and adult groups and will attempt to identify the techniques suited to particular age groups and interests.

Of course the conference will also provide an opportunity to discuss the latest developments in population studies as well as the more familiar practical difficulties of local research. No doubt the role of L.P.S. will provide another topic for discussion. Conference members will be invited to bring samples of their work to form a conference exhibition.

The Conference will be held at Matlock College of Education, Matlock, Derbyshire.

Conference fee £8.

Application for conference membership (and in due course further details) should be addressed to:- Leslie Parkes, The University of Nottingham Department of Adult Education, 14-22 Shakespeare Street, Nottingham.

## An Increase in the cost of subscriptions to L.P.S.

In our editorial in L.P.S. 5 we assumed that rising production costs must sooner or later be reflected in an increase in the cost of subscriptions to L.P.S. Unfortunately, that time has now arrived. This issue of L.P.S. will cost slightly more than you have paid for it: and the inbalance, if uncorrected, could only get worse as a further increase in printing costs has been announced. This leaves us with no alternative but to increase subscriptions to 75p. The increase will take effect from 1st March.

Once again we seek your cooperation in helping to make L.P.S. better known. There is a real economy to be achieved by printing large quantities and so the larger our subscription list the greater our ability to keep down the cost of subscription.

### Meet the Editors

As announced in our last issue, on Sunday, 16th April we shall be holding our next editorial meeting at Colin Barham's home in Kent and invite you to attend. This meeting will, we hope, provide an opportunity for us to meet readers on an informal basis and discuss whatever needs discussion. Our meeting will start at 3 p.m. and will be held at Sutton Cottage, East Sutton, near Maidstone. Anyone interested in attending should contact Colin Barham.

David Avery  
Colin Barham  
Christopher Charlton  
Roger Schofield  
Richard Wall

## NEWS FROM THE CAMBRIDGE GROUP FOR THE HISTORY OF POPULATION AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE

In the last issue of L.P.S. we described how the Group was involved in teaching in the University and the kind of work which research students were doing in association with us. In this issue we shall say something about the different kinds of activity which go on in 20 Silver Street itself, and about the people who work there.

20 Silver Street is a house in the middle of a Victorian terrace which faces Queens' College and runs down to the 'Anchor' pub and the river. The terrace contains a number of university offices and departments: No. 20 houses the Classics Faculty office on the ground floor and the Group on the first and second floors. Since we have only three working rooms and one tea room on the first floor and four working rooms on the second floor, we are rather cramped for space. Visitors are therefore likely to find themselves deskless, or forced to migrate from room to room as space becomes available. Indeed the house is rather like a rabbit warren, an impression which is accentuated by our tendency to work with the doors left open.

If you were to visit us, you would enter through a door under an archway, which runs through the terrace at this point, and climb up a steep and rather dark staircase to the first floor. The first room you would encounter would be the one in which Sylvia Jacobs, the Group's secretary, works. This is the nerve centre of the Group: it is here that the correspondence with the hundreds of people who have been working with us is generated and stored. It is here too that supplies of forms and instructions are kept to be sent off to those who write to tell us that they would like to use them when working on the local population history of their parish. The next room is used by Peter Laslett and Tony Wrigley for their research projects. The third, and largest room on this floor is a general research room, containing most of our accumulated research material: xerox copies, microfilms, aggregative analyses, listings analyses, and collections of supplementary information for the thousand and odd parishes on which we are working. One wall is covered by a  $\frac{1}{4}$  inch Ordnance Survey map of the country in which we have stuck different coloured pins to show the regional distribution of these parishes, according to the kind of study we are making of their registers. Here Karla Oosterveen works at one of a myriad of tasks. Her responsibilities include our financial accounting with the University and the Social Science Research Council, and maintaining our many registers, of local population historians, of the individual characteristics

of different parish registers, and of the progress of each piece of research. She also checks the format of the aggregative analyses when they are returned to us, and goes frequently to the University Library to obtain supplementary information about new parishes on which we are working. In addition she works on research projects of her own; at the moment she is doing a family reconstitution of the Lake District parish of Hawkeshead. The second desk in this room is occupied by Richard Wall, who has recently joined the Editorial Board of L.P.S. He is the Group's editor, responsible for preparing our publications for the press, and he has had a particularly busy year working with Peter Laslett on the large volume Household and family in past time, which is to be published by the Cambridge University Press in October 1972. This will be volume No. 4 in the Group's series of publications; volume No. 3 will be Nineteenth Century Society, edited by E.A. Wrigley, and also to be published by the Cambridge University Press in April or May 1972. Richard is also our chief research historian, and he spends much of his time in the University Library discovering and assessing new sources of evidence. He too works on specific research projects: he has been investigating the effect of nonconformity on family reconstitution, and experimenting with the merging of census and parish register information both to test the mutual consistency of the two sources and study new topics such as how far neighbours were related to each other. He is also using a number of unusually detailed early nineteenth century listings of inhabitants to study migration in depth.

If you were to continue on up to the second floor, you would probably first notice the noise, for this is where we prepare our material for analysis by computer. In one room you would find Selma Berksoy operating a machine with an extended typewriter keyboard, whose only visible output is a stream of paper tape with holes punched in it. Selma is converting aggregative analysis forms and family reconstitution forms into a medium that the computer can read (in fact at about 1,300 characters a second). There is another machine in the room, which looks more like a conventional typewriter and which will produce a typewritten page as well as punch paper tape. One person who uses this machine a lot is Jane Brown, our data editor, who normally works in the next room. When a set of aggregative analysis forms is returned to us, Jane investigates whether we can obtain a copy of the parish register, and if we can she checks a sample of the forms against the register. Once a set of forms has been passed and Selma has punched them on to paper tape, Jane arranges for them to be

read into the computer to be stored on magnetic tape. She then instructs the computer to scan the punched version of the forms and to report on any errors which it finds, and armed with this report she locates the mistakes and corrects them. Jane is also responsible for editing the other material which we feed into the computer, and for arranging for the computer to tabulate the results. She too works on research projects of her own; recently she has been investigating the accuracy of age and birthplace statements in the 1851 and 1861 censuses, and studying illiteracy in Bedfordshire, using analyses of the marriage registers of every parish in the county which were done for us by the boys of Bedford Modern School.

Across the landing Ros Davies and Mike Prentice share a room which contains yet another typewriter-like object. This one however communicates directly with the computer at the University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne using the ordinary telephone. It is in this room because Ros and Mike are primarily concerned with developing computer programs. Ros used to work in the Computing Laboratory at Newcastle, and she is responsible for building a computing environment in which we can work quickly and easily with records as diverse as original parish register entries, family reconstitution forms, and aggregative analysis forms. Her main project at the moment consists in coaxing the computer into taking original parish register entries and reconstituting them into families. In order to instruct the computer how to do this correctly we have had to think hard about the rules of family reconstitution, and we have learned a lot about the strengths and weaknesses of the method as it is traditionally done by hand. Mike is a statistician by training, and when he is not being interrogated for statistical advice on a wide range of subjects, he writes computer programs to analyse the information contained on the aggregative analysis and family reconstitution forms. His own statistical research has included devising methods for detecting 'under-registration' in a set of aggregative analysis returns, and for detecting differences between groups in situations where the normal methods for doing this cannot be used. The fourth room on this floor is occupied by Roger Schofield, but he spends much of his time moving all over the house, conferring with everyone to see that all is well and that the information we receive from all parts of the country is being appraised and digested.

Peter Laslett  
Roger Schofield  
E.A. Wrigley

## THE HEARTH TAXES, 1662-1689

John Patten

John Patten is a lecturer in Geography at the University of Oxford and Fellow of Hertford College, Oxford. He is working on the occupational structure and economic importance of market towns in East Anglia in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Between the time of their granting by Parliament to an impoverished monarch, Charles II (1), and ultimate repeal (2) a year after the revolution of 1688 by the new king, William III, anxious to consolidate his position, the tax on hearths provided a fairly efficient, if supremely unpopular, instrument of revenue (3). Because of the opportunity afforded for estimating population size from the names of tax payers and sometimes those exempt from it, as well as the numbers of their hearths, these Tax Records have proved of interest since the time of Gregory King (4); they were the subject of discussion in the first issue of *Local Population Studies* (5). Interest shown recently in their evaluation and interpretation for population purposes has concentrated on the size of the multiplier (6) to be used on the sum of tax payers and exempt together, who were the theoretical heads of a household or a family, in order to achieve a population estimate. The numbers of those recorded as paying the tax are added to all those recorded as exempt from payment on grounds of poverty. The resultant total is accepted to be an approximation of the total number of households present in any society and is multiplied by a generally accepted figure of household size, such as 4.5, in order to get an estimate of population. Much of the accuracy of this estimate can depend however just as much on which of the Hearth Tax lists have been used as a basic source of information (7). Some knowledge of the administrative history of the tax is necessary in order to make the best of the available choice, and also to explain the lacunae in the records due to other than loss or damage of the documents themselves. No single comprehensive study of the levying of the Hearth Taxes in England and Wales has been published; indeed such a task would be massive considering the variations that occur in their recording, both from year to year for a single county, and between different counties even for the same year (8). This introduction to them must at best be both general, and to a certain

extent speculative and dependant on future work being carried on for those areas for which no printed edition of any of the Hearth Taxes exist; for these it is necessary to consult the enrolled Assessments amongst the Exchequer papers in the Public Record Office; others may sometimes be found in Local Record offices, usually being the duplicates of the Exchequer returns (9).

The initial act for the imposition of the Hearth Tax was passed in 1662 (10); and it was first collected at Michaelmas 1662, an annual tax of 2s. being levied, half then and half on Lady Day, though with delays and late returns, until total abolition after Lady Day, 1689. This then is the period over which Hearth Tax Records should theoretically be found. In practice, with a few rare exceptions, they only survive for Michaelmas 1662 to Lady Day 1666 and Michaelmas 1669 to Lady Day 1674, the periods when the Taxes were administered directly by the Government and the Assessments and Accounts of the Taxes returned to the Exchequer for auditing, along with evidence or actual certificates of exemption from the Tax on grounds of poverty, and lists of those in arrears. From 1666 to 1669, and between 1674 and 1684 the Tax was 'farmed' (i.e. the right of collection, and therefore its administrative burden sold into different private hands), common practice in the seventeenth century: from 1684-1689 it was controlled by salaried Commissioners. Under these, different types of administration records were kept, but were closer to private business accounts in nature, and as they were outside of the machinery of national Government were not returned to (and therefore preserved by) the Exchequer. For these two periods there are only a very few records in the Public Record Office (11), and the sole hope is of finding original collectors' books locally preserved, often the case when tax accounting procedure is altered, as Dr. Schofield pointed out for the Poll Taxes after 1689 in a comment in Local Population Studies No. 4 (12).

The Exchequer Hearth Tax Records for 1662-6 and 1669-74 vary as to their accuracy, but in most cases the best preserved and most useful types for population purposes are the Assessments, preliminary reckonings of the number of taxable hearths that should be charged for, made at different dates. These then provided the basis on which the taxes were subsequently levied. Records of actual collection, like the day to day and later the final local Accounts of revenue in fact received, the collectors' Accounts of Arrears of payment, etc. are, as working documents often not so well preserved. They also suffer from the drawback that they record only what was in practice



collected, often falling far short of that recorded in the Assessments, and are therefore lacking in cover. They may, on the other hand, contain much of detailed local interest. The Assessments listing the names of payers and their hearths, i.e. what should have been collected, are obviously in most cases going to be more full and accurate than the different lists recording what was paid, and what was not, etc. It is therefore the best surviving Assessments that should always be used when possible, and in practice are most usually found in the Public Record Office; Local Record Offices may yield various documents concerned with earlier stages of assessment, or collection, that have survived, though these are rarely comprehensive.

Although the taxes were collected twice a year they were based on assessments more infrequently made. Those that can be found for England and Wales are usually in groups of counties after 1664; before that date the county framework was used generally, though Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire were combined, but certain cities and county boroughs were treated separately. These were Bristol, Canterbury, Chester, Coventry, Exeter, Gloucester, Lichfield, Lincoln, Norwich, Worcester and York; the county boroughs being Berwick, Kingston-on-Hull, Newcastle, Poole and Southampton. In Wales <sup>(13)</sup>, Carmarthen and Haverfordwest were treated separately, as were various parts of London, the position with suburbs like Southwark being peculiarly complicated. Those Assessments that do survive should be linked to the administrative machinery by which they were made. These may be divided into 4 groups <sup>(14)</sup>, viz. a) Those of 1662 and Lady Day 1664 made under the Sheriff's administration, when assessment was done by those officials of the smallest areas of local government, variously called Petty Constables, Tithingmen, etc., acting for the Sheriff or his deputy, the final Assessment being made up by the Clerk of the Peace of each county, and signed at Quarter Sessions.

b) That made at Michaelmas 1664 by the subcollectors acting for professional Receivers appointed by the Government after the machinery of local government had proved inadequate to administer and collect the Tax, itself the subject of revising acts to alter procedure and close loopholes in 1663 and 1664.

c) The one made at Lady Day 1666 by the Farmers of the Tax. These had taken over the administration from the failed government Receivers as a private business enterprise but nonetheless had to complete as part of their contract, and acting just as the Receivers in that one instance, the assessment that the Receivers should have made at that date.

d) After the 3 years hiatus caused by the farmed tax, those taken, perhaps 4 in number for some counties, by the second administration of government Receivers between 1669 and 1674, when amidst renewed charges of maladministration and corruption the government itself for the second time put the tax into the hands of two successive administrations of Farmers, and then one of Commissioners, none of which sent returns to the Exchequer, and so into the Public Records.

It is unlikely that a complete set of all of the assessments for any one county could be made up from the duplicate copies preserved nationally or locally: this was certainly the opinion of C.A.F. Meekings, with unrivalled knowledge of this class of records. Less useful when found are those for 1662, made before the Tax had yet been taken, and at Lady Day 1666 by the Farmers acting for the outgoing administration of Receivers, both of which seem usually to be lists of taxpayers alone. Much more comprehensive are those for Lady Day 1664, which, as required by the acts, included on the enrolled Assessments those certified as exempt; as do those for Michaelmas 1664 taken by the Receivers, at least where Sir Edward Sawyer's detailed instructions as Chief Exchequer Auditor were followed. Those for the period 1669-1674 may similarly also be taken to be usable when they include the numbers of exempt. Two points must be emphasized on the use of the Hearth Taxes in this context. Firstly the assessments, just like the collections themselves, were often made in arrears, as internal evidence reveals, though they were attributed to the statutory dates: they may contain errors of arithmetic and could contain simple direct transcriptions of earlier assessments. Secondly their accuracy at the different dates varies between counties from 1662-1664, and between the groups of counties under the control of different Receivers between 1664-6 and 1669-74<sup>(15)</sup>. Some followed instructions more closely than others; Sheriffs and Receivers alike were at the mercy of their Petty Constables or Sub-Collectors as to the accuracy and up-to-date nature of the records supplied to them. The above remarks on the quality of the Hearth Tax Assessments are general; the critical editions that exist for the Assessments in the Sheriff's Administration for Surrey or Dorset<sup>(16)</sup>, in that of the first Receivers for Somerset, Staffordshire, or Newcastle-on-Tyne<sup>(17)</sup>, or in that of the second Receivers for Bedfordshire and Suffolk<sup>(18)</sup> can serve at varying levels to illustrate local problems. Only occasionally is all the information from all surviving taxes of the different years available in printed form for even a small area, as in Warwickshire<sup>(19)</sup>. Local examination is necessary for each of the records used, to ensure that they contain,

for instance, no unlikely rise or fall in the numbers of tax payers between different years (20), or omit the poor sector of the community altogether.

Undoubtedly, once the most suitable surviving assessment that meets these requirements has been decided upon, the greatest remaining problem in the evaluation of the information given in them concerns how well they recorded the poor sector of the community; whether those people who were simply below the minimum level for assessment, or the out-and-out parish paupers, actually receiving poor relief. The exempt poor, for the purposes of the Hearth Tax after the revised act of 1664, were taken to be those with two or less hearths who lived in a house worth below £1 a year, and not having any other property exceeding that value, nor an annual income of more than £10. There is as yet little comprehensive evidence to illustrate how often, in the case of the poor, the owner of rented or leased property paid the tax due from his tenants (21). This practice may have varied locally and deserves detailed investigation. These people, hovering on the 'poverty line', which is in itself such a relative and uncertain term for pre-Industrial England, were sometimes, though not invariably, recorded in the returns as exempt, and were named together with the number of their hearths in the same fashion as those actually paying the tax. They had to apply through the mechanisms of local parish government, rather than the 'Chimney-men' or Receivers to the Churchwardens and Minister for a certificate of exemption, and these certificates seemed to be under constant review. These parish officials also returned for those town- and alms-houses that were exempt and in practice certified, as were all charitable institutions worth less than £100 a year, by the terms of the 1662 act. (Town houses were dwellings provided and maintained by the parish for the destitute and aged, where often some trade, like spinning, may have been taught). Those who paid neither church nor poor rate were also exempt, but automatically; for these were usually the paupers "that doe receive collection" and who on occasion may have lived in the 'town' or 'alms house' which was certified but whose inhabitants were not invariably enumerated. Those paupers that inhabited their own hearths were actually enumerated, but very rarely named. Two distinct classes of exempt persons are found therefore, those who were certified as exempt, and usually named; and the paupers who were rarely named but for whom a total may have been recorded. Both classes are to be found on some enrolled returns, as in that for Essex in 1671: for many other counties like Norfolk the latter pauper class were completely ignored in the surviving returns (22), and only

the exempt receive mention. Obviously then in any Hearth Tax listing, where this poorest group does not seem to be accounted for, some allowance should perhaps be made, particularly in the larger towns where the number of paupers may have been high: the poor law of the time makes it uncertain, even when they are recorded in the few surviving early lists of the Overseers for this period, how far each person receiving relief represented a family or household. To this must be added the fact that the granting of certificates was in the hands of one distinct administrative body, the assessment and receiving of the tax in others: communication between them did not always necessarily result in accurate and up-to-date listing.

Some local examples can be used to illustrate such differences between the numbers of those recorded as not paying in the enrolled returns and those stated as exempt in the certificates sent to the Exchequer for the same year. Generally these survive in greatest numbers from the second administration of the Receivers, as from 1670 printed forms or certificates were supplied which were to be filled in by the Parish: stricter penalties were introduced to ensure their return. An examination of boxes of unsorted Hearth Tax exemption certificates bundled by hundreds for Norfolk<sup>(23)</sup>, and one for Suffolk<sup>(24)</sup>, revealed many differences between them and contemporary assessments for the same date. They also supplied missing figures for the poor in the most comprehensive roll for Norfolk, that of 1674<sup>(25)</sup>, figures that were needed, as the document itself is badly torn and faded, and much information on the poor class is therefore missing. Two sample Hundreds drawn from Norfolk (Table 1) illustrate such inconsistencies, which most often appeared in that county as under-estimates or under-recordings in the enrolled poor, although the reverse does occur on occasion, and no systematic relationship is revealed. The actual reasons for these differences can only be speculated upon, ranging from careless copying and addition by clerks to the simple transposition of earlier returns already in the Hearth Tax Office. Where and when they survive, the original certificates of exemption are probably more reliable, as the Parish officials reviewed the position of those claiming exemption annually as part of the administration of their community. On the other hand, the assessment of the tax on the hearths of individual payers seem sometimes to have been formalized and even the death of a taxpayer not noted for a year or so, as the later addition of a cross by some names may reveal. Annual fluctuation in the poor fraction seem to be much more readily and accurately available from the original certificates returned to the Hearth Tax Office and considerable care appears to have been taken with them,

TABLE 1

The recording of poverty in two Norfolk Hundreds, Diss and North Greenhoe

Diss Hundred in 1674

	a. Enrolled poor (from E.179.154.697)	b. Poor in the original certificates (from E.179.337)
Diss	107	133
Fersfield	18	20
Roydon	17	24
Shelfhanger	20	26
Thelveston	60	7
Thorpe Parva	-	-
Scole & Osmondeston	-	43
Burston	25	54
Gissing	19	21
Tivetshall St. Margaret	22	21
Tivetshall St. Mary	-	15
Winfarthing	37	45
Shimpling	13	12
Bressingham	-	24
Dickleburgh	-	56

North Greenhoe in 1674

	a. Enrolled poor (from E.179.154.697)	b. Poor in the original certificates (from E.179.338)
Great Walsingham	210	331
Little Walsingham	-	123
Shoring Magna	32	37
Houghton in the Pale	20	30
Wells	72	232
Stiffkey	21	20
Cocksthorpe	2	2
Field Dalling	24	23
Barney	-	14
Holkham	61	63
Wyghton	24	24
Binham	39	62
Quorles	-	-
Egmere	-	-
Hindringham	-	73
Thursford	-	34
Warham	-	34
(All Sts. and Mary Magdalene)		

as the corrections and additions indicate. There was for example no hundred in Norfolk for which completely identical results were produced in a comparison between the 1674 assessments, where they survive, and the certificates for the same year<sup>(26)</sup>, and sometimes the differences are startling, as in the case of Great Walsingham in North Greenhoe hundred.

The situation in the neighbouring county of Suffolk was similar<sup>(27)</sup>. In the village of Poslingford in 1674 for example, 34 exempt were recorded in the original certificate, but only 24 were enrolled in the return for that year. In the same year in the urban parish of St. Mary Tower, Ipswich, the figures are 18 and 14. There appears to be no significant relationship between such inaccuracies and the rural, or especially urban nature of parishes in these two counties. Certificates for 1674 and earlier years reveal the care taken in them to achieve accuracy by parish officials on the incidence of poverty in their communities, where neighbours doubtless took a close interest in the evaluation of a man's worth. In 1670 in Wickham Market an extra certificate is appended to account for three people "previously forgotten", while in the case of Thurston earlier certificates do not record the town (or alms) house containing an unknown number of the infirm poor, mentioned in 1674 for the first time. For Sternfield in 1670 eight people appear clearly named; these and two more appear in 1674, together with three more "taking collection" not previously enumerated.

Sometimes much more detail is given for towns, showing a street by street tally of the exempt, as in Wymondham in Norfolk. One certificate dated 13th May, 1672, gives 152 poor, but that for 17th June, 1674 gives 171 with separate columns for "market street", "towne ground", etc. Considerable detail is again included, even on empty houses, e.g. "cottages which before the act of fire hearths and stoves took affect were let to poor people and ever since were exempted from the payment of that duty now void of tenants in no. 11". Further research may reveal details of the internal distribution of poverty within other English towns in such certificates. Sometimes empty houses, which were exempt, are enumerated carefully in the enrolled returns, as the example above shows; and examination of them may often reveal details given for hearths of an industrial character such as Kilns and Furnaces which were exempted by the first acts.

The Hearth Tax lists, once chosen, and the treatment of the poor

fraction decided, may be used to estimate the total order of population size for one or a number of parishes. A multiplier could be applied to the number of hearths per house; this has been discussed by Bradley and Schofield in the article already cited above in Local Population Studies No. 1. There appears to be no systematic relationship between the number of hearths in a dwelling and the number of people in it. For example, an examination of the will and inventory, where surviving, compared with the number of hearths of a particular taxpayer can reveal that somebody with only 2 or 3 hearths may have been quite wealthy and may therefore be, perhaps, expected to have a number of servants that would swell the expected household size, using Gregory King's equivalents. The reverse may also sometimes be true. Detailed work can reveal something of value for socio/economic groupings using numbers of hearths however, and this may be a fruitful line of enquiry, particularly where wills or occupational information are used in conjunction; Hoskins working on the Exeter assessment of 1671 produced a fivefold classification in this way (28). There may well be a correlation on a large scale, as might be expected, between numbers of hearths, wealth, and numbers of people present in a parish; but the uncertainties in this context make the application of differential multipliers on various numbers of hearths a hazardous business in the local study without other supporting information. A change in the number of hearths does not necessarily indicate a change in household size. Perhaps not so seemingly refined, but in practice more generally applicable, is the use of a single multiplier on each of the "Hearth Tax paying units", a term adopted here to avoid the problems of the exact interpretation of "family" or "household". Indeed in dealing with just this problem Peter Laslett wrote "... the household will be taken to mean that unit or block of persons which was recognized by pre-Industrial Englishmen to be distinct from other units or blocks of persons when the inhabitants of a community are listed" (29). The "hearth paying (or exempt) unit" as recognized by receiver and parish constable alike seems to be just such a "block", and almost all the information we have on such "blocks" is on household size. There could, of course, be more than one household inhabiting a single house, and therefore more than one potentially taxable unit in it, but the Assessments seem to be more interested, from their fiscal point of view, in these 'Hearth Tax Paying Units' rather than in houses as such, and thus generally record them all. In towns in particular this may have been a problem with the numerous tenement buildings in poorer parishes, whereas in the richer parishes "house" and "household" actually were synonymous. (30) In Exeter, for example, more

assessments were made than a 1695 rate book enumerated houses. (31) But the major methodological problem is to decide on the size of the multiplier used to convert the Hearth Tax lists. Generally speaking, when applied to the household units that have been collected, it has varied between fairly close limits, most commonly  $\times 4.2$  -  $\times 4.5$ , although some estimates have been higher, of the order of  $\times 5.0$ . (32) Few have deviated far from King's earliest use of the multiplier however; be it the  $\times 4.1$  for persons per house in Eynsford Hundred in Norfolk, or the  $\times 4.5$  he found for certain hamlets in Essex. (33) Both he, and J. F. Pound, working over 250 years later, have decided on  $\times 4.2$  for Norwich. (34) Most such multipliers depended on the use of knowledge of particular local circumstances, and have varied in town and country alike. Peter Laslett has recently suggested 4.75 as the mean household size for England and Wales over the last three centuries, based on the statistical examination of a hundred lists of inhabitants, of which 31 were for between 1650-1700, in the middle of which period the Hearth Taxes were levied. Of these, 21 are drawn from the years 1695-1700, 9 of these being for urban Parishes in London and 5 for Southampton. It is possible that mean size may be found to be lower than 4.75 for country areas in particular, despite the fact that, as Mr. Laslett points out, "Although the mean and median household size were well below 5, a majority of all persons lived in households of 6 or more". (35) He goes on to state firmly that the suggested mean figure of 4.75 should not be regarded as a universal multiplier. (36) Indeed the search for a precise multiplier for individual places of interest must be very difficult if no population listing of any kind has survived near in time and space. On occasion, the Hearth Tax may be the only and indeed best evidence for a certain place, and so will need to be carefully interpreted both with regard to internal accuracy and the size of the multiplier. It must be recognized that the Taxes themselves give absolutely no information on household size and so, without useful census type listings, virtually the only approach is an application of one of the empirically derived multipliers from what is believed to be a similar place. These taxes do however, with, for example, the Compton Census or, to a lesser extent, the Poll Taxes when available, remain the only useful sources for a (relatively) rapid assessment of the magnitude of population of a regional scale for the later seventeenth century. They retain an even greater value in the local study where parish registers are deficient or lost for considerable periods of time. To the parish register, when surviving, they may add much of interest in the study of the social groups of the community, as well as its actual size. But the individual worker attempting their use and



interpretation must not expect to find this always easy. Undoubtedly many local and regional variations will be found in the Assessments, which can differ widely in accuracy and cover, according to where, when and by whom they were made.

#### NOTES

1. S. Dowell A History of Taxation and Taxes in England. Vol. II, London, 1888, pages 26-27. (Reprinted, London 1965, in two volumes with a new introduction.)
2. William Kennedy English Taxation, 1640-1799. London, 1913, p.58.
3. In 1689 the Hearth Taxes were estimated to be yielding as much as £200,000 of the total revenue of £1,800,00 from taxes.  
Dowell, op.cit., p.38-39.
4. D.V.Glass "Two papers on Gregory King", pages 159-220 in Population in History, Essays in Historical Demography, London, 1965 (ed. D.V.Glass and D.E.C.Eversley.)
5. L. Bradley and R.S. Schofield Estimates of Population Size: Hearth Tax. L.P.S. No. 1 (Autumn 1968), p. 30.4.
6. E.g. the article by D.E.C.Eversley "A survey of Population in an area of Worcestershire", Population Studies, 10, 1957, pages 253-79, discussed by Bradley and Schofield, op.cit., or that by W.G.Hoskins in chapter 4 of "Industry, Trade and People in Exeter, 1688-1800" can serve as examples. They both employed a multiplier of x 4.5.
7. Mostly to be found in the class E.179 in the Public Record Office, where there is a typescript index to them and to the location of the boxes of often unsorted original certificates of exemption, also sent to the Exchequer to be included either as a single total on the return for each township, or actually listed.
8. The scholarly introductions by C.A.F. Meekings to
  - a) "Surrey Hearth Tax 1664", Surrey Record Society Publ.No.17, 1940
  - and b) "Dorset Hearth Tax, 1662-1664", Dorchester, 1951, together with that to vol. 1 of "Hearth Tax Returns", Warwickshire County Records, 1957 by P. Styles do however provide between them a lot of detail on the actual administrative history of the Tax, besides of course being of interest to those particular counties. See also, on the City of London, C.A.F. Meekings 'City Loans on the Hearth Tax, 1664-1660', being pages 335-372 in A.E.J. Hollaender and W.Kellaway(ed) Studies in London History presented to P.E.Jones, London, 1969.

9. As for example, that very comprehensive return to be found in the Essex Record Office for 1671, Hearth Tax Q/Rth 5.
10. 14. Car. II. c.10.
11. Meekings discusses the survival of a collector's book for Worcester between 1679 and 1680, "Dorset Hearth Tax", op.cit., p.xxxii and Styles one for Coventry "Warwickshire Hearth Tax", p. xciv. Both writers felt that this later period of the farming of the Tax may have seen its greatest efficiency, and therefore most recorded names, as these books seem to reveal.
12. Contained in a comment on the Poll Taxes, p. 61. Local Population Studies, No. 4, Spring 1970.
13. Leonard Owen "The Population of Wales in the 16th and 17th Centuries", Trans.Hon.Soc.Cymmrodorion, 1959, pp. 99-113, and  
Owen Parry "The Hearth Tax of 1662 in Merioneth", Jnl. of the Merioneth Historical and Record Society, Vol. II, 1953.  
For Ireland see, e.g.  
R.A. Butlin "The population of Dublin in the late seventeenth century". Irish Geography 5(2), 1965, pp. 51-66 and  
E. Machysaght "Seventeenth Century Hearth Money Rolls will full transcript relating to Co.Sligo. Analecta Hibernica xxiv, 1967.
14. On this point see Meekings, "Dorset Hearth Taxes", p.xxxii et sq.
15. For those surviving for one county see, e.g. Meekings, "Surrey Hearth Tax", p.li-liv.
16. Meekings "Surrey" and "Dorset" op.cit.
17. For Somerset see Vol. 1. National Record Society (ed. R.Holworthy and E. Dwelly), London 1916.  
For Staffordshire William Salt Archaeological Society Transactions for 1921, 1923 and 1927, and  
For Newcastle-on-Tyne Arch.Aeliana, 3rd Series, Vol. viii.
18. For Bedfordshire see Bedfordshire Historical Record Society, Vol. XVI, and for Suffolk see the Suffolk Green Book Series, no. XI, vol. 13, 1905.
19. Styles, op.cit.

20. For a general background to some aspects of both national and local opposition to the Hearth Taxes see L. M. Marshall "The Levying of the Hearth Tax, 1662-1688", Engl. Hist. Rev. Vol. 51, 1936, pages 628-646.
21. E. J. D. Morriss "The Hearth Tax in Chester". Jnl. of the Chester and North Wales Arch. and Hist. Soc. Vol. XXXVI, 1946, p. 31.
22. As in P. R. O. E179/154/697, E179/253/42 and E179/253/45.
23. E179/336, 337 and 338.
24. E179/345. This material for Norfolk and Suffolk is roughly and often wrongly bundled in hundreds for different years: neither the hundreds nor certificates are in any way calendared or indexed, preventing more detailed references being given. The situation is the same in most other counties for which these certificates survive.
25. P. R. O. E179/154/697.
26. P. R. O. E179/154/697 compared with E179/336-8.
27. F. R. Grace "The population of East Bergholt, Suffolk, 1653-1836", an examination of Parish registers, pages 266-272, Suffolk Review, Vol. 3, No. 8, 1970, where especially, page 264, the author discusses the high proportion of exempt households, 57.4%, in the returns for this Suffolk Parish in 1674.
28. W. G. Hoskins "Industry, Trade and People in Exeter, 1688-1800" Manchester, 1935, p. 117.
29. P. Laslett "Size and Structure of the Household in England over Three Centuries". Pop. Studies, 23, no. 2, (July, 1969), 199-233 esp. p. 201.
30. D. Williams "Note on the population of Wales". Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies, vol. VIII, pt. IV, 1937, pages 359-363. Especially page 359 "... there is no means of determining whether these figures refer to houses, or tenements, or to families..."
31. "Exeter in the 17th century: Tax and rate assessments, 1602-1699", Devon and Cornwall Record Society, N. S., No. 2., 1957. Similar results were given in a detailed study of Chester, Morriss, 1964, op.cit., p. 37.
32. e.g. by E. C. K. Gonner "The Population of England in the 18th century". Jnl. of the Royal Statistical Society, LXXVI, 1913, pages 261-303.

33. D.V. Glass "Two papers ..." op.cit.
34. J.F. Pound "The Social Structure and Governing classes of Norwich, 1525-1670". Unpub. paper circulated for and read at the meeting of the Urban History Group of the Economic History Society, Norwich 1968.
35. Laslett, P. op.cit., p. 207.
36. Ibid, p. 211.

# The Scribes of Villagers' Wills in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries and their Influence

Margaret Spufford

Margaret Spufford wrote her doctoral thesis on the peasantry of East Anglia in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and is currently a Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation Fellow at Lucy Cavendish College, Cambridge.

## The Background

Wills have been used by historians interested in life at the village level perhaps less than any other single class of document. This is strange, considering the vogue of the probate inventory, which, ideally, should accompany the will. It is also strange considering the rich mine of general information on social affairs, the way the kinship network worked, inheritance customs, retirement, provision for widows, and so on, which can be worked from wills. This information goes far beyond the narrower and more immediate purposes for which genealogists frequently use wills. The normal will may be expected, in this period, to surrender any copyhold held by the testator into the hands of the lord, and to express a wish as to its disposal. Any freehold will be carefully bequeathed. If land is not left to younger sons, cash sums will be, probably with directions as to how they should be raised. Doweries in cash will be left to daughters, and a minimum age will be laid down at which they should be handed over. If there is a defective child, provision may be made for its upkeep. If a widow survives, extraordinarily detailed instructions will be made, giving her a certain amount of houseroom, and a certain amount of land and stock. Often directions will be given to the inheritor of the main holding to keep this land up, plough it and sow it for her. The moveable goods, down to the last blanket, sheet, copper pot and brass pan, and in the case of a widow, the last neckchief, will be divided up.

There is just one way in which historians have used wills more commonly and that is to establish, if possible, the religious convictions

of the ordinary villager, be he yeoman, husbandman, craftsman, or labourer, who once in his life, and once only, at the beginning of his will, made a statement which bore on his religious beliefs. The first bequest in a will was of the soul. This may appear strange to modern eyes, but the reasoning behind it is made plain in the will of a maltster of Orwell in Cambridge, Thomas Brocke, in 1597, the body of whose will began 'First as thing most precyous,<sup>(1)</sup> I Commend my soule to God the father my Creator'. So a testator with Catholic beliefs may well leave his soul to 'Almighty God, the Blessed Virgin Mary, and the whole company of Heaven', or some equivalent phrase, and a testator of puritan or Calvinistic beliefs may well leave his soul to 'Almighty God and his only Son our Lord Jesus Christ, by whose precious death and passion I hope only to be saved' or some other similar phrase. Any will which mentions the Virgin, the saints, or the angels may be suspected of Catholic tendencies. Any which stresses salvation through Christ's death and passion alone, or the company of the elect, may be thought of as Protestant. In between, lie a vast number of indeterminate neutral wills, which simply leave the soul to 'Almighty God, my Creator', or in which the stress on salvation through Christ appears so minimal, that they cannot be classified. The spectrum of these clauses is very wide; but because of their existence, historians seeking to penetrate the iron curtain which hides the religious opinion of the really humble laity, below the social level of parish priest or minister, in the upheavals of Reformation or Counter Reformation, sometimes analyse them in an attempt to establish what was going on at the parochial level. <sup>(2)</sup>

Unfortunately there is one major technical difficulty, which has not been given attention in doing this. For most purposes, the content of the will itself is all that matters: the identity of the scribe who wrote it is irrelevant. For this particular purpose, the identity of the scribe might be all-important. A very high proportion of villagers wills were made in the testator's last illness, on his death bed.<sup>(3)</sup> It is almost common form to get, at the beginning of a will, a statement that the testator is 'sick in body but thanks be to God of good sound understanding and memory' and extremely rare to get the opposite statement, which headed the will of William Griggs, a yeoman, of Orwell in 1649, that he made his will

'beinge in good healthe of body (but) considering the frailty of this life, although there is nothinge more certaine than death, yett there is nothing more uncertaine than the tyme of the coming thereof ... now intending the disposition of landes ... in this tyme of my good health and memory for

the better quieting and satisfifying my mynd and conscience whensoever it shall please God to visit me with sickness'.

A man lying on his death bed must have been much in the hands of the scribe writing his will. He must have been asked specific questions about his temporal bequests, but unless he had strong religious convictions, the clause bequeathing the soul may well have reflected the opinion of the scribe or the formulary book the latter was using, rather than those of the testator.

I have therefore considered the whole question of the identity of the scribes who wrote villagers' wills in relation to the historical points to which the identity of the scribe may have been crucial. When old Leonard Woolward of Balsham died in 1578, he wished to leave an acre or so of his free land away from his son and daughter-in-law, to each of his three daughters. His son's death followed soon on his own, and his daughter-in-law's indignation induced her to bring a case to the ecclesiastical court. <sup>(4)</sup> The details set forth in the depositions made there bring home, with extraordinary clarity, the conditions under which wills could be made in the sixteenth century. Leonard Woolward had retired: he was living in the 'low chamber' off the hall in the house of his son and daughter-in-law. He feared that his desire to provide land for his daughters would bring him discomfort, if not maltreatment in his last illness, and that 'he shoulde not be well-tended and have that he woulde have, and yf enye of his friends or aquintances .. should write his sayd will, his sayd sonne yonge Leonard ... woulde knowe of yt, and so laye on him that he shoulde not or coulde not make his wyll accordinge to his own mynde'. He therefore asked the young barber surgeon, Henry Spender, who came from Little Wilbraham several miles away and not from Balsham at all, who was trying to bring him some relief from pain in his last illness, to write his will for him 'as pryvelye as mighte be'. The barber surgeon was ill-prepared for such a task, and, as he said, 'went to the house of John Allen of Balsham and desyred (him) to bestowe him a penne, yncke and paper'. After writing the will alone in the room 'leaning upon the sayd testators bedd' and reading it aloud to him after he had attempted and failed to read it to himself, Henry Spender took the will back to John Allen's house, and read it aloud to him and to his wife, and declared it to be Leonard Woolward's true will. The will itself is duly witnessed by Henry Spender and John Allen.

It is immediately evident from this that the circle of people who could be asked to draw up a will was wide. Quite obviously

Leonard Woolward had a number of 'friends and acquaintances' whom he could have asked to write his will and he thought first of them, not instinctively of the minister, curate, or parish clerk. The implication is that as early as the 1570's, there were in a village several members of the community who could write a document at need, even in a village like Balsham, where there were only isolated references to schoolmasters at work.<sup>(5)</sup> Since he desired secrecy, his choice fell on the doctor, who came from another village altogether. There is a modern case, which shows how traditional methods of making a will persisted, although in this case, the testator's instinctive first choice was for a gentleman. Leonard Woolf<sup>(6)</sup> writes of a time in about 1918 when the farm carter of Rodmell in Sussex

'came to me and asked me to make his will for him. He had several sons and one daughter and he wanted me to write out on a sheet of paper a statement, which he would sign in the presence of his children and of me, saying that he left everything to his daughter. I told him that this would not be a legal will and that he ought to go to a solicitor and sign a proper legal will. He refused to do this and said that if I would do what he asked, his sons would carry it out after his death. So I did what he asked. I wrote out the statement and took it round to his cottage one Sunday morning. He, his sons, and his daughter were all there in their best clothes. I read aloud the document and he signed it and they all thanked me and we shook hands. When he died, everything went to the daughter without difficulty.'

It is obvious therefore that in the search to identify scribes, not only the incumbent or his curate, who may seem the obvious choice, but the local gentry and acquaintances of the testator, must be considered.

### The scribes

There is an obvious, major difficulty in identifying the hand of the scribe who wrote a particular will, for the local historian, who is not a highly trained paleographer. Any hand of the late 16th and 17 centuries, once educated beyond a certain point to write a reasonably formalised hand, has so many features in common with any other, that the non-specialist may well pause. There is one redeeming feature. A local historian working on a particular community, and on all the surviving wills for that community, is limiting himself so strictly by date and by place that only a small number of scribes are likely to be at work at any one time.



The smaller the community, for a pilot study, in some ways the better. Orwell is a small village on the clay uplands of Cambridgeshire. When it was mapped in the 1670's, there were only 55 houses there, so the Hearth Tax was not far out in taxing 52 of them. (7) Between 1543 and 1700, 99 wills of which the originals survive, were proved in the Consistory Court although until the 1580's, the 'originals' were mostly office copies, (8) and therefore useless for these purposes.

It is possible to make at least a reasonable guess at the identity of the scribes who were responsible for a surprisingly large number of these wills. Sometimes the scribe was the only witness of one or more wills who could actually sign his name; sometimes his hand was the only one even approximately of the same type in a run of wills, and he was also a witness to all of them. In order to tell whether or not the clause bequeathing a soul to Almighty God was dictated by the testator's opinions, or by the scribe's, at least two wills in the same hand are necessary, and obviously, a much longer run is desirable.

The Orwell wills include half a dozen each written by an identifiable scribe, who only appears to have written one will. They are therefore useless for comparative purposes. Often the scribe's name is unfamiliar to the historian of the parish, and he may therefore have been an outsider, and possibly a notary or ecclesiastical official. There were four pairs of wills by the same scribe, one series of three, by George Holder, a villager who held at least an acre of freehold in the defective survey of Orwell made in 1607, and two very interesting series of four. One of these was by John Martin, about whom nothing is known, and the other by Neville Butler. He had been educated at the Perse School and Christ's College, and was the grandson of a yeoman. He ended up by buying the lands of the dissolved Priory of Barnwell, becoming a gentleman, and disappearing from the Orwell scene. There were also, most usefully for comparative purposes, two longer series, overlapping in date. One of six wills was written by Nicholas Johnson between 1614 and 1626. He was one of Neville Butler's father's first cousins, was frequently a churchwarden, and was tenant of fourteen acres of copyhold land. William Barnard, M.A., Rector of Orwell from 1609 to 1644, who held a licence to teach there, wrote twelve surviving wills during his incumbency, between 1615 and 1642.

Nicholas Johnson, who was described as the 'well beloved in Christ' of Catherine Rutt of Orwell when she made him the supervisor of

her will in 1614, probably had his own religious convictions. Not only Catherine Rutt's testimony, but his career as a churchwarden bears this out. In all six of the wills he wrote, the clause concerning the soul is so nearly identical, that if there were any doubt that the scribe's hand had been identified correctly, it would be disposed of. Every one read 'I commend my soul into the hands of almighty God that gave it me ... when it shall please God to take me out of this present world'. Whatever the opinions of the testator, they did not influence Nicholas Johnson, who started off each will in his accustomed fashion, which unfortunately did not reveal much of his doctrinal position.

Each of the four men who wrote a pair of wills apiece in the seventeenth century, as well as George Holder, who wrote three at the beginning of the century, also used his own common form. Laurence Johnson one of the numerous literate Johnson clan, wrote in his horrible hand and entirely neutral phrase at the end of the 1640's 'I bequeath my soul to Almighty God'. George Holder wrote with slightly more protestant emphasis in each of his three wills 'I commend my soul to God the Father my Creator, and his son, Jesus Christ my Redeemer'. John Wicks took up a slightly stronger position again in 1640, and wrote 'I bequeath my soul to God my Maker expecting (or believing) to be saved by and through the merits of Christ Jesus my Saviour and Redeemer'. Matthew East, at about the same date, wrote more strongly still. Both his wills contain the phrase 'I commend my soul into the hands of Almighty God who gave it to me assuredly trusting through the death and passion of his son Jesus Christ to be saved'. Ambrose Benning, who appears as 'Mr. Benning' in a rental of the 1670's, and was probably a freeholder and a gentleman, again adopted his own formula. Again, if there was any doubt of the correct identification of a hand which only occurs twice, six years apart, it would be resolved by the identical wording. 'I commend my soule into the hands of god my maker, redeemer and preserver, in an assured hope of a joyful resurrection through the meritts of Jesus Christ my saviour'.

It appeared quite clearly then that each of these half dozen men adopted his own formula, and that the religious conviction of the scribe, not the testator, is apparent in the will.

This provisional conclusion can be taken further, by looking at the series of twelve wills written by the Rector, William Barnard, between 1615 and 1642. William Barnard's phraseology was not much more striking than that of his churchwarden, Nicholas Johnson.

Eight of his twelve wills bequeath the soul of the testator to 'the hands of God Almighty my Creator, (Saviour) and Redeemer ... whenever it shall please the Lord to take me to his mercy'. They were all written before 1636. In 1637, he added a new phrase which appeared in three of the remaining wills and strengthened his formula by the expectation of a 'joyful resurrection to life eternal'. But in the will of Richard Flatt, made in 1636, a strongly individual piece of phraseology was inserted within William Barnard's formula. Richard Flatt commended his soul

'Into the hands of God Almighty, my maker, my Saviour and Redeemer, trusting to be saved by the only sufficient merits of Jesus Christ my Saviour ... when it shall please the lord in mercy to take me out of this world, being fully assured that this my mortal body shall one day put on immortality, and being raised again by the virtue of Christ's resurrection, I shall live forever with him'.

Here is a piece of Pauline theological thinking, which is so far outside the scribe's usual formula that it seems for the first time that a testator feels sufficiently strongly for his opinions to come through clearly into his will. In any long series of wills for any one village, there are a large number of individual formulae which occur, and some deviants, which fit into no pattern. It looks, from the example of Richard Flatt, as if these deviants can be taken to reflect the genuine convictions of the testator; the rest reflect the opinions of the scribe, who may, of course, have been a villager also.

This suggestion is strengthened by examination of the four wills John Martin appears to have written. Two of the testators Mary Barton and Elizabeth Adams, were members of families who were strongly nonconformist.<sup>(9)</sup> Their wills were witnessed by Simon Grey who was also a nonconformist<sup>(10)</sup> as well as by John Martin. The other two wills were written for men who do not appear on the dissenting church lists, or as absentees from church in the episcopal records. Simon Grey witnessed one of the latter as well as those of the dissenters; but it had a purely neutral clause commending the soul of the testator into the hands of Almighty God, its maker, despite being drawn up and witnessed by dissenters. The last of the four was also neutral. The wills of Mary Barton and Elizabeth Adams were highly individual, however. Mary Barton bequeathed her soul into the hands of Almighty God her maker, 'hoping through the meritorious death and passion of Jesus Christ my only saviour

and redeemer to receive free pardon and forgiveness of all my sins'. She also spoke of the temporal estate that 'God in his infinite mercy has lent me in this world'. So did Elizabeth Adams, though she felt that her temporal estate had pleased 'God far above my deserts to bestow upon me'. The clause in which Elizabeth Adams bequeathed her soul had the same sense as Mary Barton's, but it was not phrased in the scribe's identical wording. She ended her will with an injunction to her son and principal heir that related worldly prosperity to prudence, which I have not seen duplicated anywhere else. As Solomon said to his son 'My son fear thou the Lord and the king, and beware that you live not above your living especially in the beginning for that will bring you to wanton necessity, both in the midst and the ending'.

This scribe then, wrote dissenters' wills, which expressed the testators' strong sense of justification by faith, but did not dictate the form when a more neutral phrase was required. Neville Butler likewise, wrote two wills which were neutral and simply bequeathed the soul to God that gave it <sup>(11)</sup> but also two in identical wording when more appeared to be called for. Richard Johnson and Robert Bird both left their souls

'With a right good will .. to god that gave it whensoever it shall please him to take it out of this transitory life hoping by his infinite mercy and the only merryt of my saviour Jesus Christ that it shall again put on this my corruptible body of flesh and that they (sic) shallbe made partakers of everlasting life'. (12)

One further interesting point emerges from the Orwell wills. The vicar, when he was present as a witness, and not as a scribe, was not necessarily deferred to over the form of the clause bequeathing the soul. Roger Davis, clerk, wrote his own will in 1580 <sup>(13)</sup> and appears to have been a protestant, for he bequeathed his soul to 'Jesus Christ in faith in whom I hope undoubtedly to be saved'. He witnessed a will couched in similar terms for John Adam, yeoman, in 1569, but the two others he witnessed for John Johnson, husbandman, in 1568, and Edmund Barnard, another husbandman, in 1595, both had neutral clauses bequeathing the soul. John Money, the vicar in 1595, witnessed Katherine Ingray's will in that year, and she also simply bequeathed her soul to Almighty God. Nicholas Butler, who had the same faith in the resurrection of his temporal body that was later expressed by his grandson Neville, as a scribe, both witnessed Katherine Ingray's will along with the vicar, and had his own will

witnessed by the vicar; but his faith in the resurrection of his earthly body seems to have been entirely his own, and was not dictated by John Money.

Willingham, on the edge of the fens, was three times the size of Orwell. It differed from Orwell, which had no school permanently established before the eighteenth century, in having a school founded by public subscription in 1593. This seems to have been based on the work of the first known schoolmaster, Laurence Milford (14) and had a continuous life thereafter. The same features found amongst the Orwell wills are also found amongst the much more numerous surviving wills from Willingham. There are nearly two hundred and fifty wills written between the 1570's and 1700 by an identifiable scribe, although fifteen of these are the only ones by that particular scribe, and are therefore useless for comparative purposes. Amongst the scribes, there are a considerable number of series by the same men.

Laurence Milford himself wrote fifty wills between 1570 and 1602, beginning before he was first licenced as a schoolmaster to 'teach young children' in 1580, and continuing after William Norton, the curate, was licenced to teach grammar in 1596. After experimenting with various formulae hoping to 'obtain everlasting joys and felicitie' for the soul in the 1570's and 80's, he went through a neutral phase before settling down in 1590 to the constant usage of one of his early experimental formulae, 'I bequeath my soul into the hands of God the father, and to Jesus Christ my saviour, by whose merits I hope to enjoy his everlasting rest'. William Norton only wrote four wills, and bequeathed the soul in an unusual Trinitarian form to 'God Almighty, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost'. This was obviously entirely his own.

Laurence Milford was succeeded as the principle Willingham scribe, not by Norton's successor as schoolmaster, John Nixon, who taught and was curate in Willingham from 1608, but by John Hammond, a local gentleman who was lessee of the sub-manor of Bourne in Willingham. He, with a relation of his, Edward, wrote over thirty wills between 1609 and 1639. He also acted as a scribe when a petition against the charges of fen drainage was drawn up. (15) His phraseology was again almost identical throughout the wills that he wrote, and he had been very heavily influenced by Milford. He strengthened the protestant element and added 'by whose only merits and mercies' to Milford's formula. Otherwise he duplicated it. There were only three wills in the Hammond series which varied from the standard opening in any way, and none of them, with the possible exception of his own, was of importance. John Gill, a labourer, who died in 1623 hoped to enjoy everlasting rest 'after this transitory life ended'. Philip Fromant,

a husbandman, trusted to obtain 'remission of all my sins'. When John Hammond himself wrote his will in 1637, it became evident that a genuine faith lay behind his standard protestant formula, for he left his soul to

'Almighty God my creator, and to Jesus Christ my redeemer, by whose only mercies and merits (Sealed unto me by their blessed Spirit) I trust to obtain forgiveness of all my sins and to enjoy their everlasting rest'.

The laity of Willingham, are known from other sources to have been particularly zealous protestants. They probably had secret conventicle meetings in Mary's time, and were anti-episcopal in the late 1630's. From these beginnings, a strong and lasting congregational church developed under the Commonwealth. Quakerism was present there too. (16) Laurence Milford, either in his work as teacher or as scribe, unfortunately seems to have made such an impact on the people of Willingham, that their individual convictions, which were undoubtedly strong in very many cases, are masked, in their wills, by his phraseology.

The early wills of the 17th century do provide ample evidence that old Leonard Woolward of Balsham was right to feel he could depend on 'friends and acquaintances' to write his will, if not to keep it secret, for enough villagers acted as scribes in Willingham to prove the point. Four men from the Greaves family, who were half-yardlanders with twenty acres or so at the turn of the century, and therefore in this fenland village were substantial yeoman, wrote twenty-two wills between 1609 and 1647. Fifteen of them were by Thomas Greaves. With the exception of one neutral one by Robert Greaves which simply bequeathed the soul to 'the hands of Almighty God', they all made use of the Milford formula, or the variant on it employed by Hammond. Henry Halliwell, who was a representative of another family which had held arable of between nine and twenty two acres in 1603, wrote five wills between 1614 and 1619. They were all neutral, and unrevealing, except for a single one which adopted Milford's terminology. John Pitts, who was described in his own will as a 'woolwinder' wrote three wills between 1617 and 1626, all using the Milford phraseology. His own will, made in 1631, was couched in stronger terms. His soul was left to the 'hands of Almighty God my Creator hoping for remission of my sins by the death and passion of Jesus Christ my redeemer'. Unfortunately John Pitts own will was an isolated one, written by Thomas Ambler, so it is impossible to tell

whether John Pitts made a fuller and more revealing assertion of his faith on his own death bed, or whether Thomas Ambler was asserting his own beliefs. Henry Bissell who wrote two wills in 1630 and 1631, was another villager who was descended from the tenant of nine and a half acres in 1603. He also used the Milford terminology. So did another six villagers in the first part of the seventeenth century, who only wrote one will apiece, but all used the Milford formula or the Hammond variant of it. There was a further series of six wills by Edward Allen, written between 1625 and 1630, and one series of fourteen by Robert Stocker between 1631 and 1639, using exactly the same wording. Neither family appears in the land survey of 1603, but both wrote distinctly village hands. The school obviously produced a large number of fully literate villagers.

The strength of protestant feeling in Willingham, combined with Laurence Milford's influence, makes the wills of the villagers so consistently Protestant, that as in any orthodox group it is impossible to tell how far individual feeling is involved, even when minor variants in the phraseology do occur, since the sense is so uniform. Occasionally individual testators do stand out, just as Robert Flatt did in Orwell. Robert Shilborn wrote the will of Thomas Lambert, who was a husbandman, in 1625, and that of Thomas Bowles, who was a fisherman in 1632. There was no doubt at all of the strength of the convictions of Thomas Lambert. Shilborn wrote for him

'I bequeath my soul to God that gave it trusting in the only merits of Jesus Christ my saviour and redeemer for the forgiveness of my sins, and that death shall be an entrance for me into a better life'.

The will ended with the desire that

'The Lord out of his never decaying or failing mercy be a husband to my wife and a father to all my children'.

Thomas Bowles' will began with an orthodox phrase, but contained the tell-tale bequest 'To my eldest son William Bowles ... my bible wishing him to use it to God's glory.

Although the influence of Laurence Milford at last declined, the Willingham scribes continued each to write their own standard formula. There was one important change. From the 1650's, the testators customary bequest of his body to the churchyard for burial, which

followed that of the soul, was replaced by a phrase leaving the burial of the body to the discretion of the executor or to 'Christian' burial. This may well reflect the growth of the nonconformist element in Willingham. But congregationalist or quaker wills cannot be picked out as such from the phraseology. They can sometimes be identified by virtue of local knowledge. Two Henry Orions wrote thirteen wills between 1634 and 1648, and 1659 to 1667. They were probably father and son, and of humble stock. There had been no Orions in Willingham in 1603, but the family held twelve acres of arable there in the 1720's. Both men wrote a roughly standardized form of will, bequeathing the soul to 'God that gave it men, and to Jesus Christ my redeemer by whose mercies and merits I hope to have forgiveness of all my sins and to have a Joyful Resurrection at the Last Day'. The emphasis on the resurrection was typical of them; the formula was their own, but some of the testators obviously had religious convictions, which were hidden behind the devout but customary formula of the scribes. John Carter, a chandler, whose will was made in 1648, left both his son and his daughter bibles. Mary Marshall, the widow whose will Henry Orion wrote in 1669 left Francis Duckins a bequest of £2. She did not appear to be related to him, and he was a leading congregationalist in whose house the conventicle met in 1669.<sup>(17)</sup> This is not proof that the Orions were writing for congregationalists, particularly since the very last will in the series, in 1667, expressed the, by now, unusual desire to be buried in the churchyard: but there is a suspicion. It is partially confirmed because the Henry Orion alive in the 1720's had his house licenced as an independent meeting place. (18)

The same suspicion applies to Edward Negus even more strongly. He wrote forty three wills in an educated hand between 1661 and 1693, mostly with a brief clause bequeathing the soul into the hand of God and the body to the ground in Christian burial. Until 1670 he usually wrote, when he came to the disposal of the testator's goods 'touching such wordly estate as God in his Mercy far above my estates has been pleased to bestow upon me'; after 1670 he dropped this additional clause also. But there was no doubt that he was writing the wills of convinced Protestants. In 1669, the will of Edward Hammond, 'yeoman' who was one of the sons of John Hammond who had acted as a scribe earlier in the century, contained the clause 'I give unto Edward Negus my book of martyrs'. Deborah Frohock, a congregationalist widow, left her son Samuel three books, incidentally bibles in 1672. Neither of the inventories of the testators concerned mentioned the four of the twelve men who were known to be



congregationalists in Willingham in 1675 <sup>(19)</sup> had their wills written by Negus; A Suspiciously large number of the witnesses appeared charged with absence from church in an ecclesiastical court of 1673. But despite this, individual conviction did not come through Edward Negus' accustomed phraseology, except in the case of two men, William Bowles, a yeoman in 1673, and John Allen a maltster, in 1686, both of whom trusted in a joyful resurrection at the last day. Neither was known from other sources to belong to a particular sect. Negus himself held the lease of a shop in 1665, and does not appear to have been involved in agriculture at all.

Robert Osborne wrote eleven wills between 1665 and 1693 in a village hand, and wrote a much more vivid clause, but one which was still in a common form peculiar to himself, bequeathing the soul 'Unto the hands of God that gave it to me trusting through the merits of Jesus Christ my redeemer, to have a joyful resurrection at the Last Day'. One of the eleven wills was written for one of the Willingham Quakers, and a second was witnessed by another Quaker.

The clauses in wills bequeathing the soul of the testator to God are therefore mainly couched in whatever phrase the particular scribe was accustomed to use and taken alone tell little, or nothing, of the testator's opinions. But just as the strength of Robert Flatt of Orwell's convictions in 1636 broke through his rector's common formula, so also did a handful of the Willingham wills reflect, in the strength of their language, what must have been the strength of the dying man's faith. John Osborne, who only wrote one will in 1668, must have been closely related to Robert, because their hands were so alike. Even though the will cannot be compared with any others written by John, it is impossible to believe that anything but the feelings of Thomas Staploe, the testator, lie behind the last and only statement of faith which he ever made.

'I ... calling to remembrance the uncertain state of this Transitory life that all flesh must yield unto death when it shall please God to call ... first being penitent and sorry from the bottom of my heart for sins past most humbly desiring forgiveness for the same, I give and commit my soul unto Almighty God my Saviour and Redeemer in whom and by the merits of Jesus Christ, I trust assuredly to be saved, and to have full remission and forgiveness of all my sins and that my soul with my body at the General Day of resurrection shall rise again with joy and receive that which Christ hath prepared for his elect and chosen'.

## Conclusion

It seems from this analysis, as if, for any village there will often be two or three scribes writing wills at any one time, and a large number over a period of a hundred years. They will range from the Lord or lessee of the manor, to the vicar, curate, church clerk or churchwarden, to the schoolmaster, a shopkeeper, or any one of the literate yeoman or even husbandmen in a village who could be called in to perform this last neighbourly office for a dying man. If the village lay near a county town, it was possible for a public notary to be called in, although this I have less evidence for.<sup>(20)</sup> Most of these scribes evolved their own slightly different formulae for bequeathing the soul, which can be traced through most or all of the wills they were responsible for. If the scribe was an identifiable villager, as he often was, of course, one is still getting irreplaceable information on the doctrinal convictions of the peasantry, since the scribe came himself of humble stock, like the Greaves, or Thomas Pitts, or Edward Negus of Willingham, or Nicholas Johnson or George Holder of Willingham. Even when the rector, like William Barnard of Orwell, or the schoolmaster, like Laurence Milford of Willingham, is the scribe, one is still getting information on whatever doctrine is generally accepted at the village level. It is a great mistake to assume the docility of the normal parishioner. If the Rector of Cottenham, which was a radically nonconformist village in the seventeenth century felt unable to let his children out to play after one of them had been attacked and scarred for life with a fork in the school yard by a 'sone to an adversary',<sup>(21)</sup> it is scarcely likely that such an 'adversary' would call on the Rector to make his will, while the choice of potential scribes was, as I have shown, wide. It is therefore safe to assume that however near death the testator was, he still exercised a choice over his scribe, as Leonard Woolward did. He probably did not influence the form of the preamble the scribe normally used, unless he had abnormally strong convictions, but he is highly unlikely to have chosen a man who did not hold the same general opinions as himself.

Wills can, therefore, be used as Professor Dickens used them, to show a swing away from the cult of the Virgin and the Saints in the 1540's continued into the 1550's, but he was entirely right when he wrote 'The results should not be presented in any spirit of statistical pedantry'. The evidence is not statistical. It is wrong for the historian to assume that if he takes a cross-section of four hundred and forty wills proved over a particular period, he is getting four hundred and forty different testators' religious opinions reflected.

## NOTES

1. This phrase is not common form. I have come across it nowhere else. The original wills of the Consistory Court of Ely, which I have used for this study, are bundled under years, by date of probate, in The Cambridge University Archives. They have no reference numbers. Wherever italics appear in this paper, they are mine.
2. The clause leaving the soul to Almighty God is never as elaborate and lengthy, in a villager's will, as those of the puritan clergy (See, for instance, the wills printed by R.A. Marchant, The Puritans and the Church Courts in the Diocese of York, 1560-1642 (1960), pp. 212-15). They none the less contain significant differences. Professor Dickens has used these differences effectively in Nottinghamshire and Yorkshire wills to illustrate the progress of the Reformation amongst the Laity. A.G. Dickens, Lollards and Protestants in the Diocese of York, 1509-1538 (1959) particularly pp. 171-2 and 215-17.
3. A comparison of the date the will was written, and the usually close, date of probate, shows this.
4. Cambridge University Library, Ely Diocesan Records, D/2/11, ff. 259-61. I am very grateful to Mrs. Owen, Ely Diocesan Archivist, who drew this revealing case to my attention.
5. Margaret Spufford, 'The Schooling of the Peasantry in Cambridgeshire, 1575-1700', Ag.Hist.Rev. 18 (1970), supplement, Map I, p. 124.
6. Leonard Woolf, Beginning Again, p. 68. Mrs. Elizabeth Key noticed this case.
7. Public Record Office E.179/244/23.
8. When the 'original' wills of the Consistory Court of Ely are indeed the originals, and not office copies kept by the court, while the true originals, signed or marked by the testator, were returned to the testators' executors. At some point in the latter 16th century, this custom changed, and the original document was retained, for registration, and presumably an office copy given to the executors.

9. G. Lyon Turner, Original Records of Early Nonconformity under Persecution and Indulgence (1911), I p. 36.
10. C.U.L. Ely Diocesan Records, B/2/6 f.51-52v.
11. Wills of Richard Kettle and Robert Adam.
12. This example is a confusing one, because the phraseology Neville Butler uses, and his emphasis on the resurrection of the body echoes almost exactly that of his grandfather Nicholas, in 1601 (P.C.C. 74, Woodhall) and his great uncle Henry in 1594 (P.C.C. 32, Dixy) although his own father, Thomas, wrote a neutral clause bequeathing his soul in 1622 (P.C.C. 18, Saville) and his own will 'all written with my own hand' only expressed his belief in justification by faith, not in the resurrection of the body (P.C.C. 1675, f.42). We may here be getting an example of the scribe's own religious beliefs, rather than the testator's, but it is interesting that he only applies it when it is called for, and does not automatically write a phrase expressing his own opinions.
13. It ends 'per me Rogerum Davys'.
14. Margaret Spufford, art.cit, pp. 139-140 and pp. 131-3.
15. B.M. Add. Ms 33466 f.190. I am indebted to Mr. Dennis Jeeps, of Willingham, for lending me his photostat of this.
16. Margaret Spufford 'The Dissenting Churches in Cambridgeshire from 1660 to 1700' Proc.Camb.Ant.Soc. LXI (1968), pp.70, 76-7.
17. G. Lyon-Turner, op.cit., p. 38.
18. This information also comes from Mr. Dennis Jeeps, who likewise kindly provided me with additional information on Negus.
19. See my forthcoming paper in Studies in Church History, 8, 197, on 'The Social Status of Some Seventeenth Century Rural Dissenters'.
20. Samuel Newton, a public notary, wrote and signed, as such, the will of Edward Daintry the elder, a husbandman of Milton, in 1665; likewise John Brayshaw, a public notary wrote the will of John Foot a husbandman of Milton in 1628.
21. Taken from an abstract by W.N. Palmer of a letter from the daughter of the Rector of Cottenham, who was ejected under the Commonwealth, in the Walker MS., Bodleian Library, C.S. fo.17.

## WIDER RECONSTITUTION

W. Newman Brown

Mr. Newman Brown has worked extensively on the local history of Aldenham, Herts. He is Chief Architect of the Livingstone New Town Corporation in West Lothian, Scotland.

The idea of family reconstitution based on the parish register came out of consideration of the material available for a parish history of Aldenham in Hertfordshire; the place chosen for no better reason - and no worse - than that we had moved there in 1957. It was undertaken without the excellent guidance and methodology set out by Dr. Wrigley in his chapter on the subject in An Introduction to English Historical Demography, but the need for similar conventions was clear, and their use alone made the undertaking possible. It must be confessed that the burden of working alone on such a project bore heavily on both mental and physical energy, as the work was undertaken 'blind', without any clear idea of what might come out of it. However, in some respects, interest was maintained and heightened by excursions into other documentary sources which, by the way in which they could be associated with the parish register material, began to present a structure which, whilst in many ways yet incomplete, presents fascinating evidence to explore.

What follows is an endeavour to 'prove' the conventions and the methodology as being sound bases, taking into account the many other sources of information which can be tapped for confirmation of some of the better documented subjects. The 'proof' of the methods in these cases may support the methods in less well documented cases and widen considerably the number of subjects for consideration in a particular field of study.

The sources available were:

The parish registers from 1560 to 1812, which had been transcribed and printed at the beginning of the century and included copies of the

Bishops Transcripts and the Overseers copies of parts of the register of burials which are missing. These printed volumes also contain the record of monumental inscriptions from the Church and graveyard, which are obviously useful to amplify the register entries and link up otherwise unconnected data.

A map of the Inclosure Award of 1803. This covered all the parish in the Cashio Hundred, with the owners and occupiers of premises and land. Accompanying this was a schedule of claims by landowners, setting out their lands and occupants before the award - a useful difference. In addition there was another schedule giving full details of copyhold properties enfranchised - occupants, number of rooms on each floor, construction and state of repair. There was also a map of the Hamlet of Theobald Street which, while within the parish, was in Dacorum Hundred. This map had no schedule, but comparison between it and those of the Tithe Award showed that there was little difference, and some estate maps of 1765 for part of the Hamlet, with schedules of crops and trees for that year, and for 1657, confirmed the view that this part of the parish had altered little for two hundred years.

The parish chest had yielded the Assessments made by the Overseers from 1638 to 1843, except for 1685-1697 and 1720-1733, and their Accounts of expenditure from 1628 to 1842, with the same gaps. There were 95 assessments between February 1638 and October 1684; there are none for 1642 and 1654, but otherwise every year is represented, usually with two assessments, sometimes with four. Each assessment consisted of a list of those assessed with the amount of the assessment. The list was always in two parts, with significant names - Fieldside and Woodside - with two overseers to each part. They covered the whole of the parish, in both Hundreds, but two volumes are missing. These gaps are covered in part by the assessments of the Constable, which were in similar form but for the part of the parish in Cashio Hundred only; these assessments cover the years 1655-1738 completely.

The Allen Index (named after its maker) at Herts. C.R.O. is a monumental piece of research work in which there is a record of every Hertfordshire marriage in alphabetical order, with cross indexing.

Another source was found in the Militia Rolls of the parish which are available from 1758-1786. As usual, some are better than others, and these are usually the earlier ones. These again give a guide to residence as, for example, in 1762, when the list is headed with the name of the settlement where each resided. The ages, too, are helpful in confirming reconstitution, and show that in Aldenham there

were very few examples where fathers and sons of the same Christian name lived in the parish as adults together. Occupations are given in the rolls, and sometimes the reason why men were considered unfit for service - "broken-bellied" and "lame".

Estate Records such as those of the Hillfield Estate in Aldenham also provided further information, and at this point family reconstitution can be seen as a platform for the restructuring of the whole life of the community. This would be possible with a parish with good registers, accounts, assessments and with a good set of court rolls and freehold estate records. Only fragments of the Aldenham rolls are available in the form of estate papers.

The task is, starting with the parish registers as a basis, to use all the available sources to reconstitute families with as much detail as possible.

From the Inclosure Maps and Schedule, the families in the register could be seen in their places in the parish, which is similar to many others in the country, consisting of a nuclear settlement in a spandril of ground lying between the common fields and adjacent to a water supply - a pond and a shallow well - with a number of settlements round it at fairly regular spacing - Batlers Green, Patchetts Green, Delrow, Hedgerow Green, High Cross, Kemprow. On the east there was Watling Street with the settlements of Radlett and Elstree-in-Aldenham, to distinguish it from Elstree proper which lay on the other side of the road and which is the extreme example for offering mobility between one parish and another. Theobald Street was of a totally different character, consisting of a dozen farms with no other settlement at all.

By making out a sheet for each assessment in turn, it was possible to follow through the occupation of land and premises, and here again the register entries were brought to life; the farmers, the small holders of land, the succession of father, son and grandson, often interspersed with the assessment of a widowed mother. Sometimes the change of surname confirmed the reconstitution as the widow married a new husband who then succeeded to the assessment; or the gap in the register of burials could be made good when the Constables' assessments which bridge this gap indicated the succession of a widow to her husband or of a son to his father. Here are two examples:-

W. Spere was assessed in 1660 for 'Marshes Farm'. On 6.12.1666 he is succeeded in the list by Widow Spere and on 24.6.1667 she is succeeded by Henry Edwards junior. The register records that Wm. Spoare of Theobald Street was buried on 21.4.1666 and that Mary Spoare widow married Henry Edwards on 24.12.1666. In this case the burial entry confirms the constitution of the assessments and eventually this can be traced to Cressalls Farm. Henry Edwards Senior was assessed for Theobald Street Farm, almost opposite, from 1638-1672. Mary Edwards seems to have survived her second husband, as Widow Edwards succeeded to the assessment by 1698 and her will of 1701 describes her as widow and her name is given as Maria. Her assessment ceases after 7.5.1701 and her will is proved 12.7.1701.

Thomas Dell widower married Eliz. Redwood 12.7.1669. There is no burial record for either. However, he was assessed continuously from 1653 to 1.6.1694. On 13.3.1695 Widow Dell is assessed. This defines the period in which he must have died. However, he left a will naming his wife Elizabeth and three children of his first marriage. The will was proved on 1.1.1695. This narrows the period for his death to only 6 months.

The assessments rarely refer to the properties by name, but towards the end of the eighteenth century a few names appear. There are problems of reconstitution of assessments lists, but these do not concern the names occurring, and the lists are highly important evidence in respect of the presence in the parish of a large number of individuals.

On 15.8.1739, at the assessment following revaluation, there are 251 assessments. Of these, 26 are out-parishioners, and these cannot be included in a residential listing. Nine names are assessed for more than one item. This leaves 210 names who can be regarded as resident occupiers of some kind of dwelling. The 1801 census records 211 houses inhabited by 213 families, with 6 uninhabited houses and a total population of 1,103.

Although this full list is the only one of its kind, the list of assessments, added to the list of those receiving relief, can be regarded as offering the most consistent listing of families from year to year over a long period of time. Of course, reconstitution benefits from a listing check, as this is invaluable in confirming presence of reconstituted



families. A subsidy of 29 March 1642 contains 243 names. This of course contains names within one family. For example, in Tibert (Theobald) Street, Edward Brisco Esq., is listed together with Jaene Brisco widow, John Brisco gentleman and Ellen Brisco "filie" ! The three latter are his mother, his brother and his sister, and these names may only represent one or two dwellings.

One part of the list appears to be the household of Henry Coghill and consists of 15 names in all, and at least half have names which do not occur in the parish register and may be suspected of being servants. On this basis similar relationships can be noted with other of the more substantial residents - the Briscoes are followed by three names which do not occur in the register and for similar small sums.

The names of wives and other relatives in the list number 17 and there are 36 names who are likely to be servants. On this basis the total number of dwellings can be reckoned as about 190. In 1644 the total of names on the assessment list is 92 and there are 45 names on the account as receiving relief or otherwise mentioned - total 137. As not everyone was in receipt of relief and as there is evidence that rates payments were not rigorously enforced on all, it appears likely that about 50% of resident occupiers supported 25% of the remainder, while 25% were held as unable to pay rates but not in need of relief.

A subsidiary roll of 1545 lists 116 names which may similarly be reduced by 5. Bearing in mind the inadequacy of these listings it can be seen that there is a reasonable consistency between the different totals.

The accounts present an even more laborious task. Firstly, they are in the form of monthly or sometimes weekly lists of expenditure. First comes the regular payment of what was called the "monthly collection" to those parishioners in need and in receipt of regular support at the will of the Vestry. Then follows the lists of those in some cases equally regularly supported with usually smaller payments at the discretion of the overseers. There was quite clearly a dividing line between casual relief and regular "collection" and frequently the death of a recipient of the collection was followed by the elevation of one from the casual list to a regular payment - always, however, subject to the will of the Vestry.

The account follows with provision in kind - shoes, clothing, repairs, food. This gives valuable information on the occupations of the suppliers - John Downer paid for a coffin, Edward Nicholls paid for

writing, and so on. In reconstitution these accounts were reduced to an annual abstract month by month against each recipient, with cross-references for other names. Where children were kept or nursed the foster parents are sometimes identified, or the nurse, midwife, doctor, and so on. With the completion of the abstract the information was reduced to reference slips and then related to the reconstituted family. This was done for the period 1628-1770, and the following is one of the most interesting sequences.

John Hilyard and his wife Jane had three children baptised between 1658 and 1666, and then on 2.3.1671 John was buried and there is noted in the register that he was "a poore man hauling a sore legge, it being incurable ye surgine cutt it of in hope there by to save his life but God was not soe pleased." The overseers' account shows that he was given casual relief starting on 4.12.1670 and lists several disbursements for his care, maintenance, surgical treatment and burial. Following this, his widow was given regular but casual relief until the record ceased in March 1694. The accounts show that all three of John Hilyard's children received relief as adults.

The order of the assessments is also enlightening in respect of the geography of the parish. Periodically - especially on the commencement of a fresh account book - more care was given to entering the assessments. Marginal reference is made to the locality. After the Lord of the Manor and the names of two others in the locality of the Manor House and Parish Church, the overseers listed in succession (and nearly always in the same basic order whether marginally annotated or not) Patchetts Green, Delrow, Letchmore Heath, Batlers Green, High Cross, Hedgegrove, Kemp Row, Radlett, Cobden Hill, the Hamlet (of Theobald Street), outparishioners, Asheymead, then in the Woodside the group of dwellings around the junction of the lanes across the common to Elstree, with the lanes south west to Bushey Heath and eastward to Watling Street. This group included the most substantial residence in the area for many years, the home of the Coghill family, now known as Aldenham House. This group was followed by Bride Street, Curricot Hill, Idlestrey (Elstree), Medbourne and more outparishioners. The outparishioners were occupants of land within the parish but not resident within it, and their names indicate residences and farms - often quite large - which lay just beyond the parish boundary.

Although not marginally annotated the assessments of 1739 are particularly interesting as they give the result of a revaluation.

The first assessment in April was not acceptable and so in August another was made and a full list of ratepayers is given. In many cases names appear on the roll for the first time - notably small sums for cottagers. Some are never assessed again and some only for short periods, but where the continuity of occupation can be established beyond reasonable doubt in succession it leads to the identity of the occupancies of 1803. Going backwards many can be traced back to 1638.

The use of wills as an assistance to reconstitution is one of the more obvious sources and frequently clears up some of the more obscure family relationships, particularly in the matter of earlier marriages. The Aldenham register contains records of nine events regarding William Eeles, Edward Eeles and John Eeles - their marriages, three baptisms, the burial of one child and those of William and his first wife, Isabel. Ffrisewide was a widow at her marriage to William, and John married a Joan Slow, and Ffrisewide's first husband was Slowe. Turning to the Allen Index, the following information is found. William Eeles married Isabel Briscoe, widow of Thomas, by Bishop of London's licence in 1591. She died in 1597 and William married Ffrisewide in 1597 - five months later - and William died in 1615 leaving a will. This described him as a yeoman and although he clearly had been living in Aldenham - for he refers to his house there - he had stronger affinities with Elstree and Harrow, the poor of the three parishes benefitting by 10s., 40s. and £5, in that order. He goes on to mention Thomas Briscoe, his son-in-law, his wife, Jone Ewer his daughter-in-law, Eliz. Fearne his daughter-in-law, son-in-law John Briscoe, the woollen draper of London, and Susan, Elizabeth and Mary, daughters of William Shrimpton. Thomas Briscoe who died in early 1591 had

a daughter Elizabeth,	baptised	March	1564
a daughter Alice	"	Sept.	1565
a son Edward	"	August	1567
a son Thomas	"	April	1572
a son John	"	June	1577

besides other children who died in infancy. Marriages can be reconstituted for Alice to William Shrimpton in 1584, Elizabeth to William Ferne in 1584, Jone to William Ewer in 1588, Edward to Elizabeth Warner in 1590, Thomas to Agnes Warner in 1596. It is not difficult to insert in the reconstitution the names of their otherwise unknown mother Isabel who married again before the year was out as this reconstitution is confirmed by the licence of her marriage as widow of Thomas.

William Eeles will goes on to mention his sons-in-law George Slowe, Hewe Slowe and daughter-in-law Agnes Weedon and her son William. These are the family of his wife Ffrisewide. An example of the way in which the estate papers can be combined with nearly all the main sources mentioned is provided by Patchetts. In 1638 Mr. John Cox was assessed and by 1639 this had settled to a steady figure representing an RV of £30 derived from the assessment and the rate. It may be mentioned in passing that the level of assessment, the number of rates collected and the totals disbursed are a study in themselves. There are no register entries for Cox. In 1648 he was succeeded by Edmund Royden, gentleman. During this period Patchetts was owned by Silvester Adams and his wife Rose, who in June 1640 made an agreement with John Edlin and he was admitted to the premises at this time. The Register shows Rose Edlin married Sylvester Adams in January 1630, her father being Roger and her elder brother John baptised in 1603, she in 1605. Her father was probably the Roger baptised in 1565, and his brother William baptised in 1568. These boys married Agnes Huddell and Jone Huddle in 1602 and 1600 respectively. Roger and his wife Agnes both died in 1625, probably of the plague of that year. Besides Patchetts a close called Huddells Field in Bushey was also surrendered by Sylvester Adams to John Edlin in 1640. Patchetts itself adjoined the Bushey parish boundary. Shortly after Edmund Royden is assessed the RV drops to £25 and this continues until 1656 when Mr. Warren and John Nicholls are assessed and in 1658 the latter alone. In 1660 John Edlin is assessed for two years and then William Roades until 1672, except for one assessment in 1665 when Edlin was assessed. This marks a marriage settlement of 1665 between John Edlin of Staple Inn, gentleman, and Thomas Gee of Isleworth, gent. in respect of the former's wedding the latter's daughter Mary. This document mentions Constance Nicholl, mother of John Edlin who is to quit claim her dower in the property. This confirms the reconstitution showing the burial of John, brother of Rose, in 1641, and must refer to John, son of John and Constance, baptised in 1637, another child John baptised in 1632 having died a month later.

The property was surrendered by John in September 1666, the quit claim by Constance is dated May 1667, and John and Mary are admitted in May 1668.

The Roades had lived in Patchetts Green for some time, possibly from the beginning of the Register entries. John and Judith Roades had a family of seven children 1596-1608. Judith, wife of John,

buried 1610. John of Patchetts Green buried 1630. Two sons, Edward and John, subsequently seem to have had families in the parish, both marrying in 1630, the year of their father's death - one earlier, one later.

John's family was practically wiped out in the plague of 1665 - he, his wife and two children, one already dead in 1658, the last dying in 1670.

Edward's third son William was baptised in 1636 and he and his wife Margaret had a son in 1663. She died in the plague of 1665, with their son William, and this visitation is reflected in items in the overseers' accounts showing several payments to the family. William and another wife, Mary, commenced their family in 1667. Another child followed in 1669. In 1673 William, farmer, was buried on the same day as their third child, Elizabeth, was baptised. Widow Roades was assessed 1673-1675 and then Mr. Edlin (later identified as John Edlin, gentleman) in 1678 when the RV dropped to £22. This continued until 1693 when it dropped to £21, and then to 1699 when it reached £20. During the whole of this period there are no register entries to indicate his presence in the parish, and the possibility is that he was an absentee landlord but remained responsible for his rates. However, the form of the assessment list suggests he was resident and he may have figured in the missing register of burials although the transcripts and copies in the overseers accounts are fairly lengthy for these years but not complete as evidence the overseers accounts show 23 burials which are not included in the burial records. He may have been buried in the parish of his birth and baptism. The copy of the court roll shows that John Edlin was survived by his wife Mary and in May 1711 after her death the property passed to John Edlin, her son, and Sarah his wife.

From 1701 to 1712 the assessment was of John Winkfill or Winkfield, RV £20. It appears that this occupation led to marriage and the commencement of his family with the first recorded baptism in 1704 and seven children spaced over the years to 1721. The Wingfield family is remarkable in having a baptism of a child Morgan in 1599 and this child having a family 1624-29. The name Morgan also occurs in the Edlin family 1574-1618. In 1712 however after John Edlin was assessed for a year and was succeeded by Mr. Henry Dancer to 1725 and John Dancer to 1731. There are no Dancer register entries for this period.

Wm. Finch succeeded John Dancer at RV £24 and in 1739 the revaluation was to £39 but dropped to £34 in 1740 when it is described as "for Esq. Tuach's." In 1729 Mary Edlin had been admitted to the property on the death of her father John and in 1751 John Edlin Tuach infant was admitted on the death of his father, Roger, who had been admitted with remainder to his first and other sons by Mary (formerly Edlin) his wife.

Wm. Finch was succeeded in occupation by Richard Nicholl who continued to 1760. In 1753 the Land Tax records him as in occupation of the farm late Mr. Tuach's for £2.6.9 tax. In 1755 John E. Tuach of Charlton, Kent, had been admitted but in 1762 had surrendered the property to Thomas Meadows. In 1761 Daniel Childs succeeded Robert Nicholl (for whom there are no register entries) and in 1764 the assessment is "for Mr. Meadows." Dan Childs had arrived in the parish (in which his surname appears in the records from 1665) in 1751 when he is first assessed at Piggots and in the same year his child Daniel was baptised. This again appears to be a coincidence of settlement at marriage - the opportunity for marriage at the lease of a farm.

Daniel had two other children Thomas and Ann. Thomas was buried in 1766 only 5 years old, but Ann baptised in 1756 married Robert Macksey in 1774. Her husband was witness at her brother Daniel's marriage 5 years later. Daniel senior figures in the militia roll in 1758 as the parish surveyor, but is given his occupation of farmer in later years and his residence as Letchmore Heath in 1762.

He didn't occupy Patchetts for long, being succeeded by Adam Redwood in 1767 until 1774. During this period the RV dropped to £31 and in 1768 the property passed to Thomas Clutterbuck the Younger of Stanmore under the will of Thomas Meadows dated 29 July 1767, the admission taking place on 26 May 1768. The Redwood family had been resident in Aldenham from the earliest register and several children called Adam are recorded. One of these boys was the last of his name to reside in the parish in the period under consideration and after marrying twice and having ten children, the last of whom was baptised in 1750, the records almost cease. The only entry after his disappearance from Patchetts is the burial of Elizabeth Redwood widow from Stanmore in July 1800. Elizabeth was the mother of his last six baptised children and almost certainly of two more buried without baptism but named in the burial register.

In 1775 Nathan Hadnutt Jun. was assessed for RV £35 until 1786 when it rose to £36 and this continued to the Inclosure award in 1803. At the award Robert Clutterbuck lodged a claim on account of one messuage and 49 acres 3r. 29p. situated at Patchetts Green occupied by Nathan Hadnutt. The award map shows the property as inclosures numbered 758-764 inclusive and 770-772 inclusive totalling 51 acres 1r. 20p. The Copyhold Valuation gives the details of the buildings. The house had 4 rooms on each of ground and first floors. There was a stable and lean-to adjoining and formerly used as a brewhouse. The construction was of brick with lath and plaster and the roofs were tiled. The condition was tenentable and the value was £200. There were in addition a barn with 3 bays and a porch, a shed for potting and wood and a shed for cows. All were of boarded walls and tiled roof. There was a shed for sheep and another for hogs. These were boarded and thatched. All these were valued at £40. There were newly erected buildings consisting of a barn with five bays and a porch, all with oak floor, a stable adjoining, two sheds for cattle adjoining the barn, total value £170.

There was another barn with 4 bays and a porch with oak floor, a lean-to for sheep, sheds for waggon, for two carts, for another cart, all were boarded walls with either tiled or thatched roofs. These buildings were considered tenantable and the value was £73 making £513 in all and unfranchised at £85. 10/-.

The Hadnutts first appear in the Aldenham registers in 1666 with the marriage of Nathan Hadnutt to Mary Amry. The Ameries figure in the register from 1560 and the Christian name Nathan occurs frequently but is only used once by a father of another Christian name. This is an interesting point for reconstitution as it appears that in some families at least the fathers name was regarded as his personal right to pass on to his sons and was not lightly used by other branches of the family.

The Nathan Hadnutts can be reconstituted as follows in the table below. The only other boy baptised Nathan was the son of Thomas in 1787 and it is considered that he is not likely to be the Nathan (6) married in 1503.

The Hadnutt assessed in 1775 described as Junior would be Nathan (4) so described because his father (by convention) was still alive and he continued at Patchetts Green until his father died in 1793. Then it appears he moved to the family property in Letchmore Heath and his

<u>Baptised</u>	<u>Married</u>	<u>Buried</u>
	Nathan (1) 26.5.1666	16.11.1681
Nathan (2) 2.9.1677	10.1.1704 at Kings Langley (Allen Index)	5.1.1716
Nathan (3) 21.3.1707	<u>First</u> 31.10.1730 <u>Second</u> before 17.6.1750 & probably about 1736 <u>Third</u> 29.9.1785	7.8.1793 Senior
Nathan (4) (b. about 1737)	20.4.1762	29.7.1813 aged 76
Nathan (5) 13.2.1763	-	29.4.1763
Nathan (6) 27.3.1769	<u>First</u> 21.2.1803 <u>Second</u> 12.4.1809	15.1.1832 of Patchetts Green
Nathan (7) 16.1.1804 (b. 28.12.1803)	-	2.8.1829 aged 26

son Nathan (6) took over at Patchetts Green. In 1803 Nathan Hadnutt Senior is listed at Letchmore Heath and Nathan Hadnutt Junior at Patchetts Green. Nathan (4) is described as the Elder of Letchmore Heath - farmer - at his burial in 1813 but Nathan (6) stayed at Patchetts from whence he was buried in 1832.

Nathan (4) had 14 children of whom Nathan (5) was the first and Nathan (6) the fifth. The latter had one son Nathan (7) by his first wife and 10 children by his second. Nathan (7) did not survive to succeed his father and one of his half brothers, Martin or William, may have inherited. His aunt, his father's youngest sister Jemima, survived to be counted in the Census of 1841 when she is described as "Independent." Two of his sisters are to be found in Watford in 1851, unmarried and occupied as school teachers living in the High Street.

While this may be regarded as no more than a very abbreviated and sketchy history of certain individual families concerned with one minute piece of a vast rural community, new possibilities in the



recording, storage and retrieval of information presents us with the opportunity of considering questions about a world we may recover in part by the use of methodical reconstitution on sufficient scale of materials which for so long have lain unrelated to each other.

Sources used for Aldenham:

Inclosure Award 1803, Claims and Valuations associated Valuation 1806.

Tithe Award 1837

Census 1841, 1851

Militia Rolls, 1758-1617

Allen Index of Hertfordshire Marriages (Herts. CRO)

Overseers assessments 1638-1808

Overseers accounts 1628-1770

Constables assessments 1655-1738

Constables accounts 1703-1729

Wills - PCC

The Parish Register of Aldenham 1560-1812 (printed)

The Parish Register of Aldenham 1813-1851 - burials

The Parish Register of Aldenham 1813-1837 - marriages

The Parish Register of Aldenham 1813-1839 - baptisms  
(by permission of the Vicar)

The Hilfield Estate papers, HCRO

Miscellaneous papers at HCRO relating to Aldenham

Acknowledgement is due to the librarians of Watford Borough Library, the former St. Marylebone Borough Library for undertaking safe custody of documents deposited with them from time to time by the County Archivists of Hertfordshire without whose co-operation little of this work would have been possible.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NOTTINGHAM

DEPARTMENT OF ADULT EDUCATION

Local History

- H. E. Meller (ed.) NOTTINGHAM IN THE 1880's: A study in social change. 1971 £0.50
- A. Rogers (ed.) BULLETIN OF LOCAL HISTORY: East Midlands Region. 1966-7, 1968, 1969 and 1970. Price £0.30 each; 1971 Price £0.35  
(This bulletin is published annually.  
Standing orders accepted)
- A. Rogers LOCAL HISTORY TUTORS OF GREAT BRITAIN: A directory. 2nd edn. 1971. £0.40
- A. Rogers THE MEDIAEVAL BUILDINGS OF STAMFORD 1970. £0.95 and £1.00 (card)
- A. Rogers (ed.) STABILITY AND CHANGE: Some aspects of North and South Rauceby in the nineteenth century. New edn. 1970. Illustrated. £0.45
- A. Rogers (ed.) REPRINT OF THREE LOCAL HISTORY BOOKLETS BASED ON RADIO NOTTINGHAM PROGRAMMES. To be published 1971. £0.75
- do- EAST MIDLANDS ARCHAEOLOGICAL BULLETIN  
1961 - £0.10; 1962 - £0.15;  
1964 - £0.25; 1965 - £0.25;  
1966 - £0.30.

All prices include postage

Publications may be obtained from:-

The Librarian,  
Department of Adult Education,  
University of Nottingham,  
14-22 Shakespeare Street,  
Nottingham

## NOTES AND QUERIES

Dear Sir,

In LPS2 you were seeking information about pre-1841 census schedules. I enclose details of an 1811 schedule for Thirsk (North Riding) which is at the County Record Office.

Yours faithfully,

R. Fieldhouse,  
The University of Leeds

### THE 1811 CENSUS FOR THIRSK

What appears to be an original enumerator's book for the 1811 census for Thirsk is deposited at the North Riding County Record Office amongst the parish records. (NRCRO/PR/TH) It shows there were 541 families living in Thirsk at that date in 528 houses. There were also 12 empty houses. The population was made up of 1,002 males and 1,156 females; 2,158 altogether.

120 of the families were recorded as being mainly engaged in agriculture; 282 families in trade etc.; and 139 families in other occupations. All this information would be obtainable from the printed report of the 1811 census: what makes this book so useful is that the enumerator has voluntarily recorded the actual occupation of the heads of households in the general occupation column. Therefore we have a much more detailed list of the occupations than is afforded from the general categories of the census report.

Unfortunately the first few pages of the book are missing, consisting of 72 houses (73 families). This represents  $13\frac{1}{2}\%$  of the households. 279 people (13% of the population) are listed on these missing pages. Therefore this is a survey of 87% of the town of Thirsk. As there is no indication of how the enumerator recorded the information we do not know what section of the community is missing, but it is almost certainly a geographical area.

Of the remaining 468 families, we have the occupation of the head of the household recorded for 371 (80%). With the exception of a couple of innkeepers and three milliners, these heads of households

were all male. The remaining 20% were female, and had no occupation recorded.

The list that follows is therefore not a complete list of occupations in the town of Thirsk. It is based on a non-random 87% sample of male heads of households: it fails to record work done by women and young people. The most obvious omission is domestic service, but there are others. However it does give some idea of the relative importance of the major occupations followed by the main breadwinners.

### Agriculture

19 farmers	
76 labourers	These were all recorded in the 'farmers etc.' column, but it is likely that they include general labourers as well as farm workers.

### Tradesmen/Shopkeepers

7 Bakers	10 Grocers
3 Barbers	1 Hawker
9 Butchers	1 Spirit Dealer
1 Chandler	1 Stationer
8 Drapers	1 Sweep
2 Flax Drapers	1 Tobacconist
2 Druggists	

---

Total	47 (12½% of the sample)
-------	-------------------------

---

### Craftsmen/Skilled Workers

	<u>Leather Trade</u>	<u>Textiles</u>
8 Blacksmiths	1 Bit maker	2 Dyers
2 Brewers	8 Bridle Cutters	15 Tailors
11 Bricklayers	5 Curriers	37 Weavers (Linen)
2 Buckle makers	9 Saddlers	6 Watchmakers
2 Coopers	1 Skinner	1 Whip maker
1 Factor	27 Shoemakers	6 Wrights
1 Glazier	5 Tanners	
2 Hatters	2 Millers	
18 Joiners	3 Milliners(female)	
	2 Painters	
	1 Potter	
	2 Printers	
	4 Ropers	
	1 Slater	
		<u>Total 185 (50% of sample)</u>

Inns & Hotels

20 innkeepers

Professional

2 Attorneys

1 Dance master

3 Ministers of Religion

2 Schoolmasters

2 Surgeons10 TotalMiscellaneous

2 Clerks

4 Gardeners

Independent Means

6 Gentlemen

2 Esquires

The most significant occupations appear to have been:-

Type of occupation	% of sample
Labourers (farm and probably general)	21
Leather workers (bridle cutters, curriers, saddlers, skimmers, shoemakers, tanners)	15
Textile workers (dyers, tailors, weavers)	15
Shopkeepers	12½
Building trade workers, bricklayers, glaziers, joiners, painters, slater)	9
Innkeepers	5½
Farmers	5

## MISCELLANY

Reprinted from The Journal of the Statistical  
Society of London vol. 1 (1838). Contributed  
by Christopher Charlton

An account of an Enquiry into the State of 275 Poor Families  
in the City of Bristol. - From the First Report of the  
Statistical Society of Bristol.

The Statistical Society of Bristol is engaged in an enquiry into the condition of the working classes in that city, and has already published one Report, containing an Abstract of the Returns obtained from the parish of Temple.

This parish, at the census of 1831, contained a population of 7,088 persons, occupying some of the poorest and most wretched dwellings in the city. The high road to Bath and London intersects it, so that it becomes a favourite resort of travelling lodgers. To this cause also may be ascribed the high proportion of families per house, as exhibited in the returns. It contains several manufactories of different kinds, but as neither in this parish, nor in the city generally, is there one leading manufacture, like the cotton trade of Manchester or the woollen trade of Leeds, the population is extremely miscellaneous.

Little reluctance on the whole was shewn to satisfy the enquiries of the agent. Out of 280 families, he met with only five absolute refusals, but some excitement was caused by the enquiry in different parts; and upon particular points, such as the condition of the sleeping-rooms, savings-bank deposits, &c., it was not always practicable to obtain information, even from an otherwise willing witness. The enquiry was at first carried on without including the queries relative to country, religious professions, and economical habits. The deficiency as to these particulars extends to about 50, out of the 275, families. No pains, however, were spared to render the investigation as complete and precise as possible - the agent returning more than once to the same house, if not able on his first visit to procure all the requisite information; and the Council expresses its belief that the results are as nearly accurate as can be expected in an investigation of this kind, and exhibit a correct view of the general condition of the labouring classes in the district.

The number of houses examined was 166; the condition of which may be inferred from the following particulars:- In 108 cases there were drains or sewers, and in 58 there either were no drains, or they were stopped; in 54 out of the 166 houses privies were wanting, or they were in a very bad condition; and in 83, or exactly half the number, there was either no water, or the supply was very bad and insufficient. In 126 instances, the apartments occupied by the families were airy, and in 149 they were close and confined.

The total number of families was 275, or 1.66 to each house. They consisted of 1049 individuals, giving an average of 3.82 to each family, and 6.32 to each house. Of the 275 heads of families, 101 were labourers, 18 charwomen, 16 shoemakers, 9 smiths, 9 carpenters, &c., 12 laundresses and sempstresses, and the remaining 110 were following various trades and occupations: 22 out of the whole number were in the receipt of parochial relief. By far the greater proportion were English: of 227 families, 215 were English, 7 Irish, 4 Welsh, and one was Dutch.

Of the heads of families, 197 were married couples; 22 were single men or widowers; and 57 were single women or widows: 205 families had children; 70 had none. The number of children was 576, or an average of 2.81 to each family. Of these, 286 were boys, and 290 were girls: 210 of the former, and 212 of the latter, were below 14 years of age.

The following were the number of persons in each family:-

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	More than 8	Total
Persons										
Families	31	54	46	50	40	28	12	8	6	275

The number of families occupying one room only was 123: 105 occupied two rooms; and 47, three or more rooms.

In 175 instances the families rented their house or apartments from the owner, and in 100 instances from tenants.

							per week		
The average rent paid by 84 families for 1 room unfurnished was	0	1	3½						
" " " " 69 " 2 rooms "	0	2	0½						
" " " " 18 " 3 " "	0	2	5¼						
" " " " 23 " 1 room furnished was	0	2	6¾						
" " " " 2 " 2 " "	0	2	9						
" " " " 61 " houses	8	14	4 p/a						
" " " " 18 not ascertained									
	<u>275</u>								

The highest annual rent of the 61 houses was £20., and the lowest was £3. 10s.

				£	s	d
The average rent of 12 houses not exceeding 5/- was				4	4	8
" " " 23 " between 5/- and 10/-				7	12	8
Average of 35				<u>6</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>4</u>
" " " 26 " of 10/- and upwards was				11	15	0
Average of 61				£8	14	4

With respect to the physical condition of the families, 182 were clean and healthy, including the middling clean; 16 were clean, but not healthy; 62 were dirty, but healthy; and 11 both dirty and unhealthy. Of the children, 545 were healthy, and 31 unhealthy: 96 families were reported to be in distress, and in great want of food, bedding or furniture.

One of the great obstacles to the maintenance of neatness and comfort in the rooms of the labouring classes is a want of sufficient cupboards or shelves. Among the 275 families, 98 were not deficient in this respect; 140 had some, but insufficient accommodation; and 37 had none whatever: 134 men asserted that they had sufficient skill in the use of carpenters' tools, to mend their own furniture; 79 acknowledged that they had not. A strong test of neatness of this class of persons is the number and nature of the prints which appear on their walls. No description is given in the present account of the pictures observed; but it is stated that 181 families possessed some, while 92 had not any. Of 207 heads of families, to whom the question was put, 35 acknowledged that they were either depositors in savings' banks, or members of benefit societies or trade clubs.

The following facts illustrate the intellectual condition of the population examined:- Among 473 heads of families, including females, 234 stated



that they could read and write with a greater or less degree of proficiency; 99 that they could only read; 137, or a proportion of 29 per cent, did not pretend to be able to do either: 213 families possessed books or tracts, or parts of some, and of this number 92 had either a Bible or Prayer Book, or both; 60 had not a book of any kind, nor a tract. Of the 576 children, 101 were stated by their parents to be able to read and write; 173 to read only; while 146 above 7 years of age, and 156 under that age, could not do either. The larger proportion of them could repeat the Lord's prayer, viz., 405 out of 576: 42 above 7 years of age could not repeat it; to whom must be added 129 who were under that age, and therefore too young, or who were not accounted for.

The total number of children at school was 182. The following particulars will shew the character of the deficiency in this respect:-

	Below 8 year of age	From 8 to 14 years	Above 14	Total
Children attending day-school	92	39	4	135
" " Sunday-schools	<u>9</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>47</u>
Total	101	70	11	182
Children not at school		251	143	394

Of the 251 children under 14 years of age, 103 were less than 3 years old, and therefore too young for school. The proportion of those between 3 and 14 who were at school is 54 per cent.

The payments made by the parents for the instruction of their children were as follows:-

Rates of payment per week	1d	2d	3d	4d	6d	7d	8d	12d
Numbers paying	28	54	13	10	1	2	2	1

Besides the above, 64 were taught gratis, chiefly in the Sunday-schools; and 7 were paid for by friends.

126 children had been brought up to trade, or to some useful occupation: 28 above the age of 14, and 422 below that age, had not been so brought up. Of the 163 girls who were of an age to sew and wash, 68 could sew, and 84 could both sew and wash.

The above returns are not only valuable in themselves, as indicating the social and intellectual condition of a numerous body of poor

families in Bristol, but as they afford the means of comparing the state of the poor in that city with their state in other towns in which similar enquiries have been prosecuted. Accounts have already appeared of such investigations in Manchester, Miles Platting, Marylebone, and Herefordshire; and enquiries of the same nature have been commenced in Liverpool by the Statistical Society of that town.

Pre-1841 Census Enumerators Schedules

Since we published our last list of pre 1841 Census Schedules in L.P.S. 5 the following additional information has been received from subscribers:-

<u>County</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Parish</u>	<u>Whereabouts of original</u>
Cambridge	1801	St. Edward	C.R.O.
	1811	Cambridge	
Cambridge	1821	St. Benedict	C.R.O.
Cambridge	1801	St. Mary the	C.R.O.
	1811	Great, Cambridge	
Cheshire	1831	Wybunbury	C.R.O.

THE UNIVERSITY OF HULL - DEPARTMENT OF ADULT EDUCATION  
in association with  
THE EAST YORKSHIRE LOCAL HISTORY SOCIETY  
invite you to a residential  
SUMMER COURSE IN HISTORY  
at Heworth Croft Hall of Residence,  
St. John's College, York  
Saturday 29th July - Saturday 5th August, 1972

The tutorial groups available are:  
The Church of England in the Nineteenth Century  
Aspects of the History of York from the Middle Ages  
Yorkshire Feudalism  
Self-Help in the Victorian Village  
Roman York and Yorkshire

The course also includes evening lectures by visiting speakers  
and coach excursions.

Further details and application forms may be obtained from:-  
The University of Hull, Department of Adult Education,  
195 Cottingham Road, HULL HU5 2EQ

DON'T FORGET

TWO L.P.S. OCCASIONS

3 p.m. Sunday 16th April EDITORS - READERS MEETING at  
Sutton Cottage, East Sutton near Maidstone, Kent. Contact  
Colin Barham at this address for further details.

AND

21st - 23rd July THE L.P.S. WEEKEND RESIDENTIAL CONFERENCE.  
In association with Nottingham University Department of Adult  
Education to be held at Matlock College of Education.  
Conference fee £8. Further details from:-

Leslie Parkes,  
The University of Nottingham  
Department of Adult Education,  
14-22 Shakespeare Street,  
Nottingham

## CORRESPONDENCE

### Access to Records

Dear Sir,

With reference to access to the registers at the General Register Office, I would point out that until approximately 1898 registers as well as indexes were open to public inspection (see the evidence of Master Arthur S. Ridsdale to the Royal Commission on Public Records, volume 2, 1914). Presumably they were then closed as a result of their growing bulk and difficulties of arranging access. There is, however, no principle forbidding their opening to the public.

Yours faithfully,

J.M. Farrer,  
County Archivist  
Cambridgeshire & Isle of Ely  
County Council

### In Search of Nonconformity

Dear Sir,

I am a member of a group engaged in Family Reconstitution. In this kind of parish register analysis it would seem to be important, for a number of reasons, to identify the extent of nonconformity in this and other nearby parishes and I am beginning to make such a study of nonconformity in this part of Derbyshire.

So far I have identified the following sources of information:-

The Compton Census Returns of 1676 and certain other ecclesiastical visitation returns for the eighteenth century.

The return made under the act of 1852 of places of public worship which had been certified by the Justices of the Peace from 1688 until 1852.

A list of Non parochial registers in the Public Record Office.

There are of course certain other late sources such as

directions. I should be grateful for suggestions as to what other records of nonconformity are alikely to be available and how they might be used.

Yours faithfully,

Marjorie Thoday

Mortality Pattern

Dear Sirs,

On p. 24 of L.P.S. No. 6 Mr. Bradley says, "The one analysis which might have been possible - the distinction between the diseases of childhood and those of later life - is frustrated because Parish Registers do not give the age at death". How true!

It occurred to me to wonder whether any kind of pattern on these lines would emerge if one used F.R.F. information alongside the Parish Registers. This is not the place to explain how the information or inferences on the F.R.Fs were arrived at. Readers will have to take my word for it that they were subjected to all the usual tests and precautions. In many cases it is impossible to arrive at an exact age, but relatively easy to distinguish between children and adults. So here, for what it's worth, are the burial entries for the decade 1721-30 for the parish of Burton Joyce.

Burton Joyce Mortality 1721-30

Month	Child	Adult	Unknown	Total
Jan.	4	4	-	8
Feb.	2	7	3	12
Mar.	2	7	1	10
April	2	3	1	6
May	1	2	-	3
June	6	3	-	9
July	9	3	3	15
Aug.	3	3	1	7
Sept.	2	6	-	8
Oct.	2	6	-	8
Nov.	3	6	-	9
Dec.	5	5	-	10
TOTAL	41	55	9	105

Does it show any significant pattern? How does it compare  
with other parishes?

Yours truly,

Margaret Massey,  
14 St. Helen's Grove,  
Burton Joyce, Nottingham

Under Registration

Dear Sir,

I learnt, by chance recently, what I ought to have realised  
by common-sense, that the death of a person who has donated his  
or her body for medical purposes goes unrecorded in burial registers.  
Clearly this can only refer to a very few individual cases,  
especially in earlier periods, but it is yet one more category of  
omissions which the local historian ought to bear in mind. Or  
can he safely ignore it?

Yours truly,

A. Rogers,

The University of Nottingham  
Department of Adult Education  
University Park  
Nottingham NG7 2RD

## Some Recent Publications

### Articles

Schofield, R.

'Historical demography; some possibilities and some limitations. Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 5th series, 21 (1971).

Discusses the relationship between social custom, economic practice, geographical mobility and changes in the birth and death rates. The latter part of the article includes an assessment of both ancient and recent attempts to chart the course of population change - from Rickman's calculations of the early 19th century based on constant baptism, burial and marriage rates in the early 19th century to the family reconstitution studies of the past decade.

Journal of Interdisciplinary History, II (Autumn 1971)

This issue contains 8 articles on various aspects of the Family in history of which the following are of particular interest to the historian:-

Coleman, E. R.

'Medieval marriage characteristics: a neglected factor in the history of medieval serfdom'.

Analyses the population by sex and status recorded in an early ninth century manorial extent of the estates dependent on the monastery of Saint Germain-des-Prés.

Laslett, P.

'Age at menarche in Europe since the 18th century'.

A preliminary exercise in the numerical study of age at maturity in England and Serbia based on censuses of Chivers Coton, Warwickshire in 1674 and Belgrade in 1733. Subtracting the age of the eldest resident child from that of his or her own mother suggests that the average age of menarche in early 18th century Serbia must have been below 15 years and that the spread of ages at which maturity was attained was wider than that observed in

contemporary women. The results for England are inconclusive because of the high average age at marriage in the late 17th century.

Shorter, E.

'Illegitimacy, sexual revolution and social change in modern Europe.'

A wide ranging article which includes data on the percentage of illegitimate births among all births for a large number of towns and villages in Europe in the 18th and 19th centuries.

Wells, R. V.

'Demographic change and the life cycle of American families'.

Examines the effect on the life cycle of the American family of the decline in fertility and mortality in the two centuries since the American Revolution. Families have become less preoccupied with child-bearing and child-rearing while at the same time the life of the parents after the children have left home has assumed a new importance.

A Pamphlet

Bradley, L.

Smallpox Inoculation: An Eighteenth Century Mathematical Controversy. Nottingham University Department of Adult Education, 1972, 75p.

The pamphlet consists of a translation of Daniel Bernoullis paper to the French Royal Academy of 1760 in which he considered smallpox inoculation mathematically, d'Alemberts' reply and an explanatory and critical commentary. It will be of interest to historical demographers, epidemiologist's and medical statisticians for the information it contains on contemporary impressions of the importance of smallpox and its effects on population.



## LOCAL RESEARCH IN PROGRESS

The following lists (continued from our last issue) contain information about work on local population history that is known to the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure. We publish it here in the hope that it will be of interest to subscribers.

We should be grateful to receive information of any other research in progress.

\* Denotes analysis completed.

COUNTY	PARISH	NAME	ADDRESSES
<u>NORFOLK</u>			
<u>Literacy</u>	Ashby St. Mary*	K. Oosterveen and R. Wall	Cambridge Group
	Aslacton*	G. A. Coulson	Yaxley Hall, Eye, Suffolk
	Attleboro*	D. A. Cressy	65 Swaynes Lane, Comberton, Cambs.
	Bawburgh *	K. Oosterveen and R. Wall	As above
	Bawdeswell	J. Rathbone	Church Farm House, Bawdeswell, Norfolk
	Clenchwarton*	K. Oosterveen and R. Wall	As above
	Cley next the Sea*	-do-	
	Crostwright*	Mrs. B. Cornford	Orchard House, Darngate, Martham, Gt. Yarmouth, Nflk.
	Fritcham*	K. Oosterveen and R. Wall	As above
	Foxley*	W. G. B. Folland	Bawdeswell Rectory Dereham, Norfolk
	Holme next the Sea*	K. Oosterveen and R. Wall	As above

Little Barningham*	K.Oosterveen and R. Wall	Cambridge Group
Norwich St. Clement*	C.A. Ellwood	74 Woodland Drive, Old Catton, Norwich NOR 73N
Norwich St. Edmund*	C.A. Ellwood	
Ormesby St. Michael*	Mrs. B. Cornford	Orchard House, Darngate, Martham, Gt. Yarmouth, Nflk.
Oxburgh*	K. Oosterveen and R. Wall	Cambridge Group
Saham Toney*	-do-	
Saxthorpe*	-do-	
South Lopham*	G.A. Coulson	Yaxley Hall, Eye, Suffolk
Sloley*	Mrs. B. Cornford	As above
E. Dereham*	Miss J. E. Grove	Beechurst Flat, Commercial Rd., Dereham, Nflk.
W. Bradenham	K.Oosterveen and R. Wall	As above

Listings

Baconsthorpe 1768\*  
Great Bircham 1811\*  
Bodham 1768\*  
Carleton Rode 1777\*  
Norwich St. Peter Mancroft 1697\*  
Thorpe next Norwich 1801\*  
Wymondham 1747\*

Reconstitution      - - - - -

## NORTHANTS

Aggregative      Aynhoe\*      Miss M.J. Kennedy      Peach Tree Cottage  
5 Golden Yard,  
London N.W. 3

Literacy      Blatherwyke\*      B. C. Morgan      Uppingham School,  
Rutland

Brafield-on-      K. Oosterveen      Cambridge Group  
the-Green\*      and R. Wall

Brington\*      -do-      Cambridge Group

Denton\*      -do-      -do-

Holdenby\*      -do-

Little Addington\*      -do-

Mears Ashby\*      -do-

Stow Nine-churches\*      -do-

Listings      Aynho 1740

Cogenhoe 1612, 1615, 1616, 1617, 1618,  
1620, 1621, 1623, 1624, 1628, 1790\*

Oxenden 1697\*

Reconstitution      - - - - -

## NORTHUMBERLAND

Aggregative      Berwick-on-      E. W. Sockett and      33 Downend Rd. ,  
Tweed      Mrs. W. J. Hodgkiss      Weterhope,  
Newcastle 5.

Earsden\*      Mrs. W. J. Hodgkiss      37 Eastfield Avenue,  
Monkseaton,  
Whitley Bay,  
Northumberland

Felton\*      Mrs. W. J. Hodgkiss

Halton      E. W. Sockett

Longhoughton      E. W. Sockett

Ponteland      E. W. Sockett

Tynemouth\* E. W. Sockett and  
Mrs. W. J. Hodgkiss

<u>Literacy</u>	Earsden*	Miss M. Nelson	Homerton College, Cambridge
	Felton	Mrs. W. J. Hodgkiss	-do-
	Ingram*	Mrs. W. J. Hodgkiss	-do-

Reconstitution

-----

NOTTINGHAMSHIRE

<u>Aggregative</u>	Arnold*	Mrs. J. D. Young	8 Pateley Rd., Mapperley, Nottm.
	Bingham	A. Bush	104 Raleigh Street, Alfreton Rd, Nottm.
	Blyth*	Mrs. R. K. Serjeant	141 Haydn Road, Sherwood, Nottm.
	Burton Joyce*	Local Population Study Group	The Library, Burton Joyce, Nottm.
	Carburton*	Mrs. J. D. Young	As above
	Cropwell Bishop*	-ditto-	
	Darlton	-ditto-	
	Edwinstowe*	Mrs. J. D. Young	
	Fledborough*	Mrs. J. D. Young	
	Gedling*	Mrs. J. D. Young	
	Ollerton*	Mrs. J. D. Young	
	Oxton*	Mrs. J. D. Young	
	Perlethorpe*	Mrs. J. D. Young	
	Sutton-in-Ashfield	W. C. Dove	Fernleigh, 87 Alfreton Road, Sutton-in-Ashfield, Notts.
	Warsop*	K. S. S. Train	34 Wimbledon Rd., Sherwood, Nottingham

<u>Literacy</u>	Arnold*	Mrs. J.D. Young	8 Pately Road, Mapperley, Nottm.
	Burton Joyce	Local Population Studies Group	The Library, Burton Joyce, Nottm.
	Clarboro*	K. Oosterveen and R. Wall	Cambridge Group
	Clayworth*	Mrs. J.D. Young	As above
	Cromwell*	K. Oosterveen and R. Wall	
	E. Drayton*	Mrs. J.D. Young	As above
	Kirkton*	Mrs. J.D. Young	As above
	Oxton*	-ditto-	-ditto-
	Radcliffe*	-ditto-	-ditto-
	Tollerton*	-ditto-	-ditto-
<u>Listings</u>	Clayworth 1676, 1688*		
<u>Reconstitution</u>	Burton Joyce	As above	As above
	Gedling	Mrs. J.D. Young	As above

(To be continued)

**PUBLICATIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NOTTINGHAM  
DEPARTMENT OF ADULT EDUCATION**

**Industrial Relations, Sociology, etc.**

T. W. Burrow et al.	SHOP STEWARDS AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS 1968. £0.30
K. Coates and R. Silburn	THE MORALE OF THE POOR. A study of poverty on a Nottingham Council housing estate. 1968. £0.30
	ADULT EDUCATION AND SOCIAL RESEARCH: A case-paper. 1968. £0.10
	POVERTY, DEPRIVATION AND MORALE IN A NOTTINGHAM COMMUNITY; St. Ann's. 1968. Paperback £0.55 Hardback £0.80
A. W. Gottschalk et al.	BRITISH INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS: An annotated bibliography. Reprint 1971. £0.75
A. W. Gottschalk and B. Towers	PRODUCTIVITY BARGAINING: A case study and simulation exercise. 1969. £0.50
B. Towers and T. G. Whittingham	THE NEW BARGAINERS: A symposium on productivity bargaining. 1970. £1.00
A. H. Thornton	THE INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS BILL: FOR AND AGAINST. 1971. £0.25

All prices include postage. Publications may be obtained from:  
The Librarian, Department of Adult Education, University of Nottingham,  
14-22 Shakespeare Street, Nottingham.

CAMBRIDGE STUDIES IN SOCIOLOGY 5

**Family Structure  
in Nineteenth  
Century Lancashire**

**MICHAEL ANDERSON**

A study of intergenerational and kinship relations among the working-classes of urban Victorian Lancashire. Dr. Anderson examines in detail the impact of early industrial life on various aspects of family behaviour and finds that family relationships generally helped to overcome the difficulties of life in the towns. Because of the extreme poverty of some of the workers, however, the maintenance of family relationships posed serious problems. £5.00 net



**CAMBRIDGE  
UNIVERSITY PRESS**

**SMALLPOX INOCULATION**

**An Eighteenth Century  
Mathematical Controversy**

**LESLIE BRADLEY**

A translation, with a critical commentary, of Daniel Bernoulli's Memoir of 1760 and the subsequent controversy with Jean d'Alembert.

Bernoulli's Memoir is perhaps the earliest attempt at the application of mathematics to the propagation of an infectious disease, and the whole controversy gives an insight into contemporary impressions of the degree of smallpox infectivity and mortality.

Price 75p (post free in United Kingdom) from the Librarian,  
Department of Adult Education,  
University of Nottingham,  
14-22 Shakespeare Street, Nottingham.