

Local

Population

Studies

*© Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Department of Sociology*

LOCAL POPULATION STUDIES

No. 8 Spring 1972

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.

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 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,
50p each.

Details of advertising rates are obtainable from the:-

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

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Editorial. A conversation at Somerset House (part one)	4
News from the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure	13
Visitors to Margate in the 1841 Census Returns John Whyman	19
Gloucestershire Village Populations: Alicia Percival	39
Notes and Queries:	
Seasonality, some further thoughts: Margaret Massey	48
Wills and their Scribes: Matlock Population Studies Group	55
Miscellany:	
More Midland Midwifery: Christopher Charlton	58
Correspondence	62
Work in Progress	71

EDITORIAL

THE OFFICE OF POPULATION CENSUSES AND SURVEYS

A conversation at Somerset House between two members of the Editorial Board and Mr. R. Schueller, the Departmental Training Officer (Part 1)

Editors: Let us begin with the history of the Registrar General's Department. How did it come to be established ?

Mr. Schueller: It was set up under two Acts of Parliament of 1836 which inaugurated the modern system of birth and death registration and of marriage registration. There were several influences which led to the passing of these Acts. Firstly, during the 17th and 18th centuries the evil of clandestine marriages so roused public opinion that in 1753 a marriage act (known as Lord Hardwicke's Act) was passed which required all marriages to be solemnised in the parish church and registered in the parish register. This led to pressure for a system of marriage before a secular registrar, either in a non-conformist church or in a civil register office, attended by full publicity and regular registration by the civil authority. Secondly, the registers maintained by the non-conformist bodies were not accepted as public documents and the absence of acceptable evidence of vital events began to be keenly felt; in addition, reformers pressed the advantages for legal and administrative purposes of a uniform system of registration and a central repository and also foresaw the uses of such records for insight into social conditions and public and industrial health. In 1833 a Select Committee of the House of Commons was set up and reported in favour of a civil registration system (linked with a central national office) which came into operation on the 1st July 1837.

Editors: But the first census had been held in 1801. How did that come about ?

Mr. Schueller: In 1753 a Mr. Potter had introduced a Bill in Parliament suggesting that a census should be taken - that was defeated in the House of Lords. Then Malthus's book on Population of 1798 created quite an upheaval and led to the Census Act of 1800 and the first census. This first census was carried out by means of returns made to Justices of the Peace (and by parish clergy to their Bishops) but responsibility for preparing abstracts of the returns was placed upon John Rickman, the Clerk of the House of Commons. He discharged this function for four censuses up to and including 1831. He also extended the parish register enquiry right back to 1570, and calculated a population estimate for each county at intervals from 1570 to 1750 using as his

starting figure the enumerated county population of 1801. He died in 1840 before these were published, but the material was included in the 1841 Census Report. That census was the first one run by this department, then called The General Register Office.

Editors: So it was Rickman who really set up this department?

Mr. Schueller: No, the first Registrar General was Thomas Henry Lister. He was appointed in 1836. He had not previously been a civil servant. He was quick to enlist the co-operation of the medical profession and in 1839 the work of analysing and developing the new sources of statistical information was entrusted by him to Dr. William Farr who had already shown marked interest in the uses of vital statistics. Dr. Farr was what we would now call a medical statistician. When Lister died in 1842, Farr continued to have the full support of the succeeding Registrar General, George Graham, and they continued in harness together until 1880.

Editors: From the time when the department began its work and civil registration was established, what legal obligation was placed on the citizen in the registration of births, marriages and deaths?

Mr. Schueller: Birth and death on one side are quite separate from marriage on the other. To start with marriage. The established church, under the original Acts, retained control of the method of solemnisation of marriages in its churches and of the preliminaries to those marriages but they had to be registered in the standard marriage registers supplied by the General Register Office. For all other religious organisations and for civil marriages there was a legal procedure laid down which brought in the Superintendent Registrar; the parties to be married had to satisfy him that they were free to marry before he issued a certificate. So far as birth and death registration were concerned there was a legal requirement to give the necessary information right from the beginning but there was no provision for this to be enforced until 1874. It is only since then that we can say registration has been as complete as human beings can make anything complete.

Editors: In making any sort of count, is there any need to make allowance for under-registration?

Mr. Schueller: There can be no precise figure for the under-registration of births in the nineteenth century but we have some idea because people of pensionable age who failed to find a record of their birth had to approach the General Register Office to see if a late registration

were possible. Death registration is less likely to be incomplete; the disposal of a body cannot take place until a registrar (or a coroner) has issued his authority for burial or cremation.

Editors: How did the institution of this system affect the medical profession?

Mr. Schueller: The initial instructions to registrars coincided with letters to the members of the various medical professional bodies, which right from the beginning co-operated very well [see below]. It is the cause of death statement made by the doctor and entered in the death register which has enabled this Office to play a really vital part in the improvement of public health. I ought to explain that the local registrar retains the register but sends us copies at the end of three months of all entries made in that time. The information obtained from the registrars (including the cause of death statements) form the basis of all vital statistics compiled by the Office.

Editors: When were mortality statistics based on the entries in the death registers first made available?

Mr. Schueller: In the First Report of the Registrar-General, published in 1839. It contained abstracts relating to the year 1837-1838.

Editors: And how detailed were they in those early days? For instance, how early is there reliable information available about cause of death or about infant mortality?

Mr. Schueller: You will find statistics on both these subjects in the first report. In the beginning the abstracts were comparatively straightforward, but very quickly Dr. Farr developed a very complex system of report. There were weaknesses in the cause-of-death information in the early years because it was not obligatory for doctors to state it in writing to registrars until 1874; also there were varying descriptions used by different practitioners but steps were taken to improve this quite early on.

Editors: I suppose the census grew in complexity in just the same sort of way?

Mr. Schueller: Yes, the details of this growth are shown in the booklet "Census Reports of Great Britain 1801-1931" which was published in 1951 as number 2 in the series "Guides to Official Sources".

Editors: The booklet is now out of print, isn't it?

Mr. Schueller: Yes, but we are working on a new booklet which will cover the same ground but extending it to 1966.

Editors: You have a very fine library here. Would any of its facilities be available to L.P.S. readers?

Mr. Schueller: The library is open to the public by appointment, but we would restrict it to reasonable research problems. If somebody wants to undertake research and writes to us, explaining the purpose of the study, whether it is public or private, provided we are sure it is a genuine enquiry, that person will be able to come here and use the library facilities.

[The library is situated in the Strand wing of Somerset House and is open from 9.30 to 4.30 Mondays to Fridays, but not on Saturdays nor of course public holidays.]

Editors: In this library people will find the Registrar General's reports and all the other documents issued by the department since it began.

Mr. Schueller: Yes, and quite a lot of older items and census reports from every country in the world in all sorts of languages.

Reprinted from the 1st Report of the Registrar General

(Appendix M)

We, the undersigned, President of the Royal College of Physicians, President of the Royal College of Surgeons, and Master of the Worshipful Society of Apothecaries, having authority from the several bodies whom we represent, do resolve to fulfil the intentions of the Legislature in procuring a better Registration of the causes of Death, being convinced that such an improved Registration cannot fail to lead to a more accurate statistical account of the prevalence of particular diseases from time to time.

We pledge ourselves, therefore, to give, in every instance which may fall under our care, an authentic name of the fatal disease.

And we entreat all authorized practitioners throughout the country to follow our example, and adopt the same practice, and so assist in establishing a better Registration, in future, throughout England; for

which purpose we invite them to attend to the subjoined explanatory statement, in which they will see set forth the provisions of the recent statute, and the means whereby the important object we have recommended, may most effectually be attained.

(Signed) HENRY HALFORD,
President of the Royal College of Physicians.

(Signed) ASTLEY COOPER,
President of the Royal College of Surgeons.

(Signed) J. HINGESTON,
Master of the Society of Apothecaries.

May 1st, 1837.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

The recent Act for registering Births, Deaths, and Marriages in England presents an opportunity for obtaining that great *desideratum* in medical statistics, a more exact statement of *the causes of death*, in the case of every registered death throughout the whole of England and Wales, after the month of June next ensuing.

The Register-Books in which all deaths are to be registered after the last day of June, 1837, contain columns wherein may be inserted the *cause of death*, in juxtaposition with those other important illustrative circumstances, the *sex*, the *age*, and the *profession* or calling of the deceased person. Each Register Book will also be assigned to a particular District of small extent, and will thus show in what part of the kingdom each death has occurred. If, therefore, the cause of death be correctly inserted, there will exist thenceforward public documents, from whence may be derived a more accurate knowledge, not only of the comparative prevalence of various mortal diseases, as regards the whole of England and Wales, but also of *localities* in which they respectively prevail, and the *sex*, *age*, and *conditions of life*, which each principally affects.

For the attainment of this object, it is necessary to ensure, as far as it is possible, the correct insertion of the "*cause of death*." It is obvious that on this subject the requisite information can seldom be given to the Registrar, except by the medical attendant of the deceased person, and that even if the Registrar be a medical practitioner (which in many instances will be the case), yet will he often be unable to ascertain the truth in this respect, if he is to depend solely on the reports of persons ignorant of medicine, and of the names and nature of diseases; and it cannot be expected that from his own knowledge he will be able so far to correct their errors, as to ensure a statement worthy of credit. The

requisite information must therefore be supplied either *directly* or *indirectly* by the medical attendant of the deceased person; - that is to say, if such medical attendant is **not** applied to by the Registrar, he must afford the requisite information to those other persons to whom the Registrar must apply.

The persons who according to the Act for Registering Births, Deaths, and Marriages in England, must give information to the Registrar on being requested so to do, are "some person *present at the death, or in attendance* during the last illness," or "in case of the death, illness, "inability, or default of all such persons, the *occupier* of the house or "tenement, or, if the occupier be the person who shall have died, some "*inmate* of the house or tenement in which such death shall have happened." It is also provided that "for the purposes of this Act, the "master or keeper of every gaol, prison, or house of correction, or "workhouse, hospital, or lunatic asylum, or public or charitable institution, shall be deemed the *occupier* thereof."

It is therefore earnestly recommended that every practising member of any branch of the medical profession who may have been present at the death, or in attendance during the last illness of any person, shall, immediately after such death, place in the hands of such other persons as were in attendance, of the occupier of the house in which the death occurred, and of some inmate who may probably be required to give information, *written statements of the cause of death*, which such persons may show to the Registrar, and give as their information on that subject.

It is desirable that such statement should be very short, the column in the Register Book in which it is to be inserted being not more than sufficient for the insertion of about ten words of moderate length. It should therefore contain only the name of the disease which was considered to be the cause of death, and not a *detailed* account either of antecedent symptoms or of the appearances which may have presented themselves after death. It is also desirable that such statement should exhibit the popular or common name of the disease, in preference to such as is known only to medical men, whenever the popular name will denote the cause of death with sufficient precision.

The Historical Methods Newsletter

We have recently been in communication with the editors of the Historical Methods Newsletter and notice it here in the belief that many of our readers will find it of interest. This journal, published quarterly by the Department of History at the University of Pittsburgh, was founded in 1967 "in response to the need for communication among scholars interested in the social sciences, especially quantitative historical analysis".

It publishes short articles, research notes, review essays and reports of research in progress. Recent issues have included articles on the study of literacy, concepts of violence in historical and social analysis, applications of content analysis to historical research, the teaching of statistics to historians and applications of the computer to historical bibliography.

The editor maintains a file of research reports and can respond to requests for information about particular techniques or data by referring the enquirer to individuals known to be using the methods concerned.

Circulation (in the United States and 35 other countries) is about 2,300 plus over 90 institutions. The readers are mainly historians, but some thirty percent are scholars in other areas of the social and behavioural sciences.

The yearly subscription is: Students \$1.00, Other Individuals \$2.00, Institutions \$5.00. Address: Historical Methods Newsletter, Department of History, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213.

L.P.S. Reprints: The Hearth Taxes 1662-1689

John Patten's article, The Hearth Taxes 1662-1689 which first appeared in L.P.S.7, is now available as an offprint. Copies may be obtained from the subscription secretary. Prices (including postage) are single copies 10p; 5 copies 45p; 10 copies 85p, 20 copies £1 65p.

LOCAL POPULATION STUDIES

WEEKEND RESIDENTIAL CONFERENCE

21st - 23rd July, 1972

For most of the weekend, the work of the Conference will be conducted in three seminar groups.

Seminar 1. The Aggregative Analysis of Parish Registers

This seminar will be led by Richard Wall and Roger Schofield, both members of the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure, and will use material drawn from the Group's files. Its aim is to provide an elementary introduction to the study of parish registers to show how they may be used to reveal the course of population change and for various other purposes, such as the discovery of monthly patterns of baptism, marriage and burial, and for more specialised studies of illegitimacy and marriage horizons.

Seminar 2. Population Estimates and the Local Historian

Most local historians have to ask themselves how big was the parish which they are studying at some given point of time, or what were the trends in its population over some given period. Before the beginning of the 19th century, such questions about population can only be answered from indirect evidence. The object of this seminar will be to describe and discuss some of the source material from which local historians can make population estimates, and to discuss methods of making the estimates and their probable validity. Discussion will centre round a case study of a Hundred for which, in the later part of the 17th century, six sources are available for almost every parish. How far are these sources useful for population estimates? How do the resulting estimates compare, and what does this tell us about their reliability? It is hoped that the work of the seminar can be so arranged as to provide scope both for newcomers to this aspect of demography and for those with some experience. Members of the group are invited to bring with them useful material for display and discussion. The seminar will be conducted by Leslie Bradley.

Seminar 3. Historical demography in schools, colleges & groups

In many of the new types of history and humanities courses being

developed in schools and colleges, historical demography is more and more finding an important place in the curriculum, linking as it does history to other school subjects such as geography and economics, and providing a lead-in to social science topics. This study group will examine some of the most appropriate methods of parish register and census analysis that can be undertaken at an elementary level, with both schoolchildren and also with students or adult groups who are inexperienced in this field. It will suggest some sources of information, guides to research, hints on preparing supervising, writing up and displaying, project (an individual or group) work. Practical examples of work done at this level will be available, and ideas for pilot schemes will be discussed.

The group will be led by Derek Turner, author of the Historical Association pamphlet Historical Demography in Schools, assisted by Colin Barham and Christopher Charlton.

The Conference will be held at Matlock College of Education, Matlock, Derbyshire, fee, including accommodation and tuition, is £8. Non-residents welcome - tuition fee £2.

Application for membership of this conference should be addressed to: Leslie Parkes, The University Department of Adult Education, 14-22, Shakespeare Street, Nottingham.

Conference organised in conjunction with the University of Nottingham Department of Adult Education.

David Avery
Colin Barham
Christopher Charlton
Roger Schofield
Richard Wall

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

The Representativeness of Family Reconstitution

Although the method of family reconstitution has transformed the kind of information which parish registers can be made to yield, there are often considerable doubts about the representativeness of this new knowledge about population in the past. The first area of doubt springs from the fact that the laboriousness of family reconstitution means that very few parish registers can be analysed in this degree of detail. The question therefore immediately arises of how far the experience of a small group of parishes was typical of the country as a whole. The French have attempted to get round this problem by drawing a random sample of parishes from each of their regions, to be used as the basis of regional and national estimates. Unfortunately this solution is impossible in England because the comparatively low quality of registration means that only a small proportion of registers are in fact suitable for family reconstitution. Since a fully representative sample is out of the question we have therefore adopted the strategy of deliberately selecting for reconstitution parishes which are in contrasting social and economic situations. For example, we have reconstituted a market town in a mixed farming area, a large market town in an arable area, an isolated seaboard parish, and a northern pastoral parish at high altitude. In this way we hope to be able to see whether fertility, mortality and nuptiality varied with different social and economic circumstances, and we are now concentrating on registers which regularly give occupations so that we can observe differences between social and economic groups directly. Indeed, a study of the dimensions of variations in demographic behaviour may be more illuminating than the compilation of summary national statistics.

A second question which often arises in connection with family reconstitution is whether the "reconstitutable minority" is representative of the parish community being studied. The point which often gets obscured in discussion is that there is no single "reconstitutable minority", for different calculations impose different periods of observation, and as a result rest upon very different proportions of the events recorded in the register. For example, most children feature in the calculation of an infant mortality rate, because the family is only required to be in observation for one year after the

birth of each child. On the other hand relatively few women contribute to some of the stricter measures of completed marital fertility, for they have to be in observation from birth until their 45th birthday. It is in this context of the measurement of fertility that the greatest doubts have been expressed about the representativeness of family reconstitution, especially in the form of fears that that the fertility of migrant women, who are excluded from the calculations, may have differed in some way from the fertility of the less mobile women, on whose experience the fertility rates are based. But migration has a rather different impact on family reconstitution, depending on whether it occurred before or after marriage. If the family moves after marriage this means that it passes out of observation, and this usually also means that the date of the end of the marriage is unknown. We are trying to get some idea of the importance of this kind of migration for fertility measures by tabulating all our fertility calculations twice: once for these migrant women whose date of end of marriage is not known, and again for the group of women who do not migrate after marriage and for whom the date of end of marriage is known.

In England, however, migration was an age-specific event, and migration after marriage was much less frequent than migration before marriage.⁽¹⁾ If a woman moves at marriage and spends her fertile life in a parish other than the one in which she was born, she will almost certainly be excluded from all age-specific fertility calculations based on the register of the parish to which she moves at marriage. This is because her baptism will be recorded elsewhere, in the register of the parish of her birth, and since marriage registers rarely give age at marriage, and burial registers rarely give age at death before the 19th century, her age at the dates of birth of her children will therefore be unknown.

Although, a large proportion of all married women in a parish are excluded in this way, it does not follow that age-specific fertility rates for English parishes in the past are based entirely on a minority of immobile couples. Firstly the English parishes which have been reconstituted are both large in extent (Colyton, Devon, for example comprises 7,000 acres, and Hawkshead, Lancashire 19,000 acres) and contain a number of separate communities. Much of the migration of young people was local, within a distance of 5 miles,⁽¹⁾ and the registers of the parishes which have been reconstituted include a number of people who migrated this distance yet remained within the parish boundaries. It is unlikely that the fertility of other young people who migrated similarly short distances, but across the parish boundaries, was for that reason different.

But it would be a mistake to assume that migrants over longer distances are altogether excluded from fertility calculations. For although on balance a couple was more likely to reside in the birth-place of the husband than the birth-place of the bride, cases in which the bride was a native and her husband came from a considerable distance are quite common in English parishes. These cases are included in age-specific fertility because the wife's age is known, and it is easy to compare the fertility of these marriages, in which the husband was mobile, with those in which both partners were immobile. Unfortunately, the lack of age information in marriage and burial entries in English registers means that the fertility of the reverse case of an immobile husband and a migrant bride cannot be observed. But, it is a little difficult to see why the fertility of marriages where the bride moves some distance should be different from the fertility of marriages either where the husband moves some distance, or where neither partner moves very far. This, in any case, can be checked by taking groups of parishes and comparing those who move from one parish to another with those who have all their vital events recorded in a single register. Unfortunately, it is rare to find a group of adjacent parishes all of whose registers are suitable for family reconstitution. There was however, in England, one minority group of young people who migrated very long distances to cities, pre-eminently London, as early as the 16th century. This group was undoubtedly distinctive in its migratory patterns, but whether its members were also different in their fertility, before they were killed off by the higher urban mortality rates, is unfortunately a question which the size of the cities concerned and the distances covered make very difficult to answer.

A third problem of representativeness in family reconstitution is the more general one of the adequacy of parish registers as recordings of vital events. Considerable suspicion has been thrown on English parish registers on this score. The worst cases of defective registration have been found in the rapidly growing urban areas in the early 19th century, in which population far outstripped both the organisation and the enthusiasm of the official church. (2) But it would be foolish to expect that the national estimates of under-registration which have been calculated for the early 19th century, and which are heavily weighted by these large centres of population will apply to small rural parishes at the same date, let alone at the time of the Reformation. Unfortunately, before the 19th century, it is exceedingly difficult to check on the completeness of parish registration, although two attempts have been made. Hollingsworth

has thrown suspicion on the adequacy of baptismal registration in the early 18th century on two grounds: firstly because a tax on births failed to yield as much as a contemporary (Gregory King) forecast that it should, and secondly because the number of baptisms is lower than would be predicted by stable population theory given some assumptions about other demographic parameters at the time.⁽³⁾ But these grounds are at least as contentious as the baptism registration they purport to evaluate. In the first case, Gregory King's forecast of the amount the tax would yield may have been unreasonably high. However that may be, contemporary Treasury evidence certainly shows that far more tax was assessed than was actually paid, and in any case the amount assessed is scarcely a test of the completeness of the parish registers, because the assessment was based on a special registration system of vital events and not on the parish registers. The second ground is plausible only if the assumptions about other demographic parameters are correct and stable population conditions in fact obtained. At present these are all guesses, and to reject a system of registration on these grounds is as much an act of faith as is accepting it at its face value. Glass has used the alternative taxation system of registration of vital events referred to above to estimate the total number of baptisms and burials omitted from a number of parish registers in London and Southampton at the end of the 17th century, but the estimation technique assumes that the chances of being included or excluded from each system of registration are independent.⁽⁴⁾ This is unlikely to have been the case, and since registration in one system may well have decreased the chances of people bothering to register in the other, Glass' estimates of the proportion of baptisms and burials omitted from the parish registers are probably too high even for these two towns.

In the absence of any general estimates of the adequacy of parish registers it is obviously prudent in English conditions to scrutinise carefully both the register and the community for signs which suggest defective registration before embarking upon the labour of family reconstitution. Fortunately, family reconstitution is fairly proof against some of the more common kinds of omission. In England, a relatively late age of baptisms, which on the whole increased during the 18th century, coupled with the levels of infant mortality prevailing, meant that a number of children died before they could be baptised.⁽⁵⁾ This is an embarrassment to studies which are based on the simple frequency of baptisms and burials, but in family reconstitution special steps are taken to recover children who were buried, but for whom there were no entries in the baptism registers. The effect of non-

conformity is somewhat similar to that of migration: conversion to another religious group leads to a family passing out of observation in the parish registers. But the calculation of demographic rates from reconstituted families carefully defines the end of observation of a family so that passage out of observation does not lead to bias. The dangerous migrants are those who return to the parish, thereby giving a false impression of continuous residence. Unfortunately, English registration does not allow the same kinds of checks to be made as are possible in France,⁽⁶⁾ so the extent to which family reconstitution is deficient because of temporary migration is unknown. Fortunately, however, this problem is minimal with "religious migrants" for very few non-conformists returned to the Anglican fold. We have used non-conformist registers to investigate the effect of non-conformity on demographic rates calculated from a family reconstitution of the parish registers in Colyton in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. Although non-conformists comprised about 6% of the population at this period, the operation of the normal rules of observation ensured that age-specific fertility rates, for example, were understated by the negligible amount of 4 per thousand.

A fourth difficulty with the representativeness of the results of family reconstitution lies in the small numbers of families which can be used for some of the calculations. This problem is particularly severe when it is necessary to subdivide the individuals on the family forms into a number of categories (for example, by date period, age-at-marriage, sex, first or later marriage), for this often reduces the number of family forms used in any one category to very small figures indeed. This is the reason why we have so far reconstituted only very large parishes, and it is worth while bearing in mind when considering reconstituting a register that if the population is much under 1000 only fairly summary demographic calculations can be made. At all events it is important that whenever the results of family reconstitution studies are presented, the number of families on which each figure is based should also be stated. Otherwise it is all too easy to mislead the reader into accepting general conclusions based on ludicrously small numbers of families. Indeed, wherever possible statistical confidence limits should be calculated for simple estimates, such as average ages at marriage: and where differences between periods or groups are being discussed, the size of these differences should always be tested statistically to ensure that they are not chance effects due to the very small numbers of families involved.

R. S. SCHOFIELD

NOTES

1. R.S. Schofield, 'Age-specific mobility in an eighteenth century English parish'; Annales de Demographie Historique (1970) pp.261-74.
2. See especially, J.T. Krause, 'The changing adequacy of English registration, 1690-1837', in Population and History, ed. D.V. Glass and D.E.C. Eversley (London 1965) pp.379-393.
3. T.H. Hollingsworth, Historical Demography (London, 1969), pp. 126-7, 184-5, 351.
4. D.V. Glass 'Notes on the demography of London at the end of the 17th century', Daedalus (Spring 1968), pp. 581-92.
5. B.M. Berry and R.S. Schofield 'Age at baptism in pre-industrial England', Population Studies (November 1971).
6. L. Henry, Manuel de demographie historique (Geneva, 1967), pp. 12-17.

Copies of Documents

In L.P.S. No. 6 we offered to supply xerox copies of any research material held by us at 20 Silver Street. Unfortunately we forgot to point out that we cannot do this in cases where we do not hold the copyright. Thus copies of original documents, for example Listings of Inhabitants, should be obtained from the record office which holds the original document.

Peter Laslett
R.S. Schofield
E.A. Wrigley

VISITORS TO MARGATE IN THE 1841 CENSUS RETURNS

An attempt to look at the age and social
structure of Victorian holidaymaking

John Whyman

John Whyman is a lecturer in the Department of Economic History in the University of Kent at Canterbury.

Margate, having originated in the eighteenth century as a major coastal watering place, enjoyed particular renown during the 1830's and 1840's as a well developed and popular steamboat resort. The number of passengers arriving at and departing from Margate by water communication amounted to 2,219,364 over thirty-five years between 1812-13 and 1846-7, giving an annual average of 63,410 passengers. The number of passengers coming and going annually during the three years prior to the arrival of the South Eastern Railway in December 1846 averaged 86,802.(2)

Since 1801 there have been three summer censuses, 30 May 1831, 7 June 1841, and 20 June 1921; and, particularly in the case of sea-side resort towns, the exact date of the census can be of vital importance to the information obtained from the census returns. We know this from the census of 1921 undoubtedly the best recent example of a summer census. This shows for Margate a total resident population of 46,480 but the Registrar General, taking into consideration the fact that the season was sufficiently far advanced by then to produce a large number of visitors in the population, subsequently reduced the 1921 resident population of Margate to 27,740. Following the 1831 census, it was reported that "Margate and Ramsgate have increased in Population (2,496 and 1,954 Persons respectively) which is attributable to their being resorted to as Watering Places". (3) What, therefore, can we conclude from the 1841 census?

The 1841 count was only two weeks earlier in the year than that of 1921. It was recorded that "the Return for Margate includes 245 Persons in the Royal Sea Bathing Infirmary, 68 Seamen, etc., in vessels and steam packets in the harbour and 1,586 visitors." (4) This figure of 1,586 visitors on 7 June 1841 is quoted in J.A.R. Pimlott, The Englishman's Holiday: A Social History (1947), along with 590

visitors at Blackpool, 89 at Shanklin, 186 at Cleethorpes, 65 at Seaton, 49 at Budleigh Salterton, 50 at Cromer, 44 at Skegness, and 60 at Bridlington. ⁽⁵⁾ Of these returns, 1,586 is clearly the most impressive figure, but it does not tally with information obtained from the Margate Enumeration Schedules. I estimate that there were 1,297 visitors within Margate over the census night of 7 June 1841. 1,265 can be specifically identified in 22 of the Enumeration Schedules for Margate. All told there were 23 Enumeration Schedules, one of which mentions the presence of "Gentlefolk Visitors 32" ⁽⁶⁾ and 1,265 plus 32 gives 1,297.

Visitors were recorded as such by means of a tick, cross or a small 'v' or 'L' entered against their names, or they were bracketed in groups in lodgings, boarding houses, or hotels as visitors.

This distinguishing of visitors by a tick, cross or small 'v' or 'L' appears to be an unorthodox local variation, and certainly no instructions were specifically given as to whether such people should be distinguished, or how. Nor did the Margate enumerators always follow the instruction requiring ages to be rounded to the nearest five years. ⁽⁷⁾

The Enumerators' Schedules confirm an important characteristic of Victorian holiday-making, namely that few mid-nineteenth century holiday-makers stayed in hotels or boarding houses. Hotel occupancy was invariably temporary while alternative lodgings were sought. Most visitors resided with a lodging-house keeper, there being 97 to choose from in Margate in June 1841, or quite frequently occupied spare rooms or parts of a tradesman's house or business premises, as in the example below.

The presence of visitors within the 23 Enumeration Schedules for Margate in 1841 is indicated in at least two other ways. Firstly, the enumerators were asked to state the cause of any increase in population since the 1831 census and their comments provide clear-cut evidence of the presence of holidaymakers; for instance, "Visitors from London principally for Sea Bathing or Pleasure" ⁽¹⁰⁾. Secondly, and yet another clear indication that the season had commenced in Thanet, was the enumeration of 72 people (68 males and 4 females) on board 7 vessels, 4 of which were steam packets within Margate Harbour. ⁽¹¹⁾ The London to Thanet steamboats proceeded to Margate or Ramsgate and returned to London, apart from day excursions, on alternative days. Three of the steam packets had on board crews numbering respectively 19, 18 and 15, making 52 in all.

<u>Place</u>	<u>Houses</u>	<u>Names</u>	<u>Age & Sex</u>		<u>Profession, Trade, Employment, Independent Means</u>	<u>Where born. Y for Kent or No</u>	
			<u>M</u>	<u>F</u>			
Bridge Street	1	Thomas Scott (8)	41		Grocer	Y	
		Elizabeth do.		33		Y	
		Stephen do.	12			Y	
		Eliza do.		10		Y	
		William do	7			Y	
		Elizabeth do.		4		Y	
		Thomas do.	6			Y	
		Joanna do.		2		Y	
		Elizabeth Cook		20		Female Servant	Y
		V J. R. Rucktro	34			Independent	No
		V Sarah Mitin		74		Independent	No
		V Thomas Rucktro	6				No
		V Sarah Colman		20		Independent	No
		V B. Brooks	50			Independent	No
V L. Brooks		50	Independent	No			
V L. Brooks		18	Independent	No			
-do-	1	Richard Deveson	46		Coachmaster	Y	
		Theresa do.		45		No	
		Mary Morris		19	Female Servant	Y	
		V William Johnson	29		Lawyer	No	
		V Mary do.		24		Y	

V Percy Dunshill	28		Independent	No
V Mary do.		20		No
V William Watson	69		Independent	Scotland
V E. do.		68		Y
V John Smith	50		Innkeeper	Y
V Mary do.		22		Y

A large and wealthy family would take over a complete lodging house facing the sea, as at Buenos Ayres.

<u>Place</u>	<u>Houses</u>	<u>Names</u>	<u>Age & Sex</u>		<u>Profession, Trade, Employment, Independent Means</u>	<u>Where born. Y for Kent or No</u>
			<u>M</u>	<u>F</u>		
Buenos	1	V Sarah Read (9)		35	Independent	No
Ayres		V Sarah do.		15		No
		V Helen do.		10		No
		V Margaret do.		10		No
		V William do.	5			No
		V Francis do.	4			No
		V Thomas do.	2			No
		V Sophia Hayes		35	Female Servant	No

There is clearly no reason to doubt the residence of 1,297 visitors within Margate over the census night of June 7, 1841. In total they represented a high figure for so early in the season added to which 214 patients were receiving seasonal treatment in the Royal Sea Bathing Infirmary. The 1851 Census, by contrast, was conducted on 31 March when the holiday season had not commenced, and there were no patients in the Margate Sea Bathing Infirmary.

What we learn of the age and social composition of early-Victorian Margate holidaymakers and of their geographical origins from the 1841 Census? The following tables detail the sex ratio, age structure, occupational structure, and place of birth of the 1,265 visitors who are known to have been staying at Margate on 7th June, 1841.

<u>Sex Ratio</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>	(11a)
Visitors	496	769	1265	
Residents*	4429	5356	9785	
Total Population	4925	6125	11050	

* Including staff and patients in the infirmary.

Age structure of the total population of Margate in 1841, Percentages in brackets

<u>Age-group</u>	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>	(11b)
0-4	640 (13)	611 (10)	
5-9	661 (13)	633 (10)	
10-14	673 (14)	610 (9)	
15-19	411 (8)	648 (10)	
20-4	401 (8)	698 (11)	
25-9	336 (7)	540 (9)	
30-4	322 (6)	472 (8)	
35-9	265 (5)	353 (6)	
40-4	263 (5)	340 (6)	
45-9	206 (4)	289 (5)	
50-4	212 (4)	284 (5)	
55-9	134 (3)	164 (3)	
60-4	128 (3)	157 (2)	
65-9	101 (2)	126 (2)	
70-4	73 (1)	93 (2)	
75-9	31 (1)	47 (1)	
80+	32 (1)	42 (1)	
Unknown	36 (1)	18 (0)	
TOTAL	4925 (99%)	6125 (100%)	

61% of the visitors to Margate but only 55% of the resident population were female. Their preponderance over male visitors at all ages between 11 and 40 is very noticeable and the female age groups 11-15, 16-20, 21-25 and 26-30 exceeded in total the female age group 6-10, and with one exception (26-30) that of 0-5.

Comparison with the previous table is a little difficult because in 1841 the population was divided into different age groups; residents and visitors cannot be distinguished as was possible when calculating the sex ratio. Nevertheless with 40% of the total male population aged under 15 (compared with a figure for the visitors of 39% under 16) and 30% between the ages of 10 and 24 (visitors 24% between 11 and 25) the inference must be that young males were under-represented amongst the visitors. On the other hand for the female population the proportion between 10 and 24 was the same (30%), although as many as 37% of the female visitors were aged between 11 and 25.

The opportunity to take holidays, which were invariably unpaid holidays, varied with age and family circumstances. The expenses of running a home (rent, rates, servants' wages) continued while paying for a holiday elsewhere. Relative affluence when young, single, or newly married (without children) was reduced or negated while raising a family (depending on the number of children, income or alternative sources of wealth). When parents were middle-aged and the family had grown-up relative affluence could return again, the grown-up children contributing perhaps to the running expenses of the home. The real crux was the family holiday as Elizabeth Brunner's study of holiday-making in 1945 pointed out. (12)

Single people or brothers and sisters staying together were numerous among the Margate visitors of 7 June 1841. There were in addition the following combinations of visitors:-

Whole families (husband, wife and children) or families indicating the presence of a father.	90
Husbands and wives with no children.	63
Mothers and family, no fathers being present.	71

The latter two categories are of interest. The husband and wife combinations were mainly either middle aged and elderly in their 50's and 60's, or they were still comparatively young in their 20's. Fathers without guaranteed holidays would if they could afford it send their families away to the seaside, preferably not too far from London where they could visit them at weekends. Margate linked by steam-boats with London was ideally located for this sort of family arrangement, which gave rise to a late Saturday steamboat "called in the language of the place, 'The Hats' Boat' or 'The Husbands' Boat'." (12a)

Initially in the eighteenth century the demand for holidays came mainly from the aristocracy, gentry, clergy and a few among the professional and mercantile classes. The increasing wealth of the middle classes

and tradesmen, particularly during the first half of the nineteenth century, produced greater social depth in the demand for holidaymaking, and the existence of cheap means of water communication between London and Thanet caused this process to develop relatively early in the case of Margate. In the 1840's the noun 'distinction' and the adjectives 'genteel' and 'vulgar' were used to describe in very general terms the company at Margate.

"Ten people land at Margate for one that lands at any other part of the island...That part of society which is called 'Fashionable', and which once frequented the place, have long since deserted it almost entirely..The place is annually visited by tradespeople, varying in degrees of prosperity, or ..'respectability', by professional men and their families, and by not a few retired independent gentle-folk,...At Ramsgate we are much dearer, duller and more genteel than at Margate...Margate is 'shocking vulgar' in our sight. Margate comes to us, and we stare at her: but Ramsgate goes not to Margate." (13)

Contemporary observations of mid-nineteenth century holidaymaking which stress gentility and vulgarity must inevitably confuse the social historian to some extent. Who saw who as vulgar or genteel is not an easy question to answer. The following table derived from the 1841 census shows the occupations of 601 Margate visitors; represented among them being 98 different occupations.

The Occupations of Margate Visitors Arranged Alphabetically

<u>Occupation</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Occupation</u>	<u>No.</u>
Accountant	1	Joiner	1
Agricultural Labourer	1	Lawyer	2
Army	2	Law Stationer	3
Artist	1	Licensed Victualler	2
Auctioneer	1	Linen Draper	1
Barrister-at-Law	1	Male Servant	7
Bill Broker	1	Mariner	1
Boiler maker	3	Mechanic	5
Bookseller	2	Manufacturer	1
Brassfounder	1	Merchant	12
Broker	1	Milliner	1
Builder	1	Missionary	1

<u>Occupation</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Occupation</u>	<u>No.</u>
Butcher	1	Navy half pay	2
Chemist	1	Nurseryman	1
Clergyman	3	Nursery seedsman	1
Clerk	7	Optician	1
Cloth factor	1	Outfitter	1
Coachman	1	Painter	2
Coal merchant	1	Paper stainer	1
Collector	1	Pattern drawer	1
Compositor	1	Pianoforte maker	1
Confectioner	2	Picture dealer	1
Conveyancer	1	Plasterer	2
Cooper	2	Plumber	1
Coppersmith	1	Publican	2
Cordwainer	1	Publisher	1
Cork cutter	1	Railway officer	1
Decorator	1	Saddler	1
Dentist	1	Schoolmaster	2
Draper	2	Shell merchant	1
Dressmaker	2	Shipowner	2
Embosser	1	Ship surveyor	1
Engineer	4	Silk mercer	1
Engraver	1	Solicitor	7
Farmer	4	Stationer	1
Female servant	79	Stockbroker	2
Florist	1	Surgeon	2
Furnishing undertaker	1	Surveyor	2
Furrier	1	Tailor	3
Gas engineer	1	Tea dealer	1
Goldsmith	2	Timber merchant	1
Governess	3	Tobacconist	2
Grocer	3	Upholsterer	1
Hat maker	1	Vice Admiral	1
Independent	351	Victualler	1
Independent Bart.	1	Warehouseman	2
India-rubber merchant	1	Wax chandler	1
Innkeeper	2	Wine merchant	4
Ironmonger	1	Woollen factor	1

MAJOR OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES

Independent	352
Servant and governess	89
Tradespeople	70
Merchant, dealer, factor	25
Professional, other than legal	16
Legal profession	11
Engineer and mechanic	10
Manufacturer or maker	7
Clerk	7
Armed services	5
Farming	5
Church	4
	<hr/>
	TOTAL: 601
	<hr/>

The social trends of holidaymaking as revealed by occupations suggest that the middle classes were strongly entrenched in Margate by 1841. Aristocratic and titled visitors, or the old category of nobility, gentry and clergy, were few in number, though gentry, no doubt, were probably well represented among the 352 visitors of independent means. This is the hardest category to break down. While it is disappointing to find so many in this vague category, the instruction to enumerators in 1841 as to "Profession, Trade, Employment, or of Independent Means," stated:

"Men, or widows, or single women, having no profession or calling, but living on their means, may be inserted as independent, which may be written shortly thus, Ind." (14)

Independent means can be taken to include an unearned income from inherited wealth, from urban or agricultural rents, and/or from investments. Industrialization, the growth of towns, and the construction of canals, harbours, railways, and public utilities, particularly gas and waterworks undertakings, had greatly widened the opportunities of middle-class investment income.

Of the 352 visitors of independent means no fewer than 222, or 63%, were women who had a strong tendency to so record themselves.

Some had only rather indirect links with the expanding middle classes and the investing public generally. Some were spinsters or widows of independent means. Some were wives and mothers whose husbands were left behind in London, perhaps only to come down at weekends as noted above. There is no means of knowing the occupational title which was appropriate to a married woman of independent means, but it may be presumed to have been middle class, professional, or commercial in the vast majority of cases. The 130 male visitors of independent means, a proportion of whom were elderly or retired, compares therefore with 70 tradespeople, 32 merchants or manufacturers and 27 drawn from the professions. Titled visitors numbered no more than three viz: Sir W. White, aged 50, Independent, staying near the Duke's Head, (15); and Lady Bathurst, aged 40, Independent, residing with her daughter and servants (16), and Sir Thomas Apreed, aged 45, Independent Bart, (17), both staying in Fort Crescent. The Church and farming were also noticeably well down the list.

The third major occupational group, coming after people of independent means and domestic servants and governesses, comprised tradespeople. They along with merchants, dealers and factors as a combined group of 95 exceeded the number of servants and governesses. Tradespeople, merchants, dealers, factors, the professions, engineers, mechanics, manufacturers, and clerks, numbering 146, exceeded in total the 130 male visitors of independent means. The professions, including the church and armed services, were outnumbered by tradespeople by about 2:1. Shopkeepers and tradesmen multiplied in number and wealth during the first half of the nineteenth century, and noticeably so in London that great centre of varied and ostentatious consumption, whose resident population doubled between 1801 and 1851. (18)

Nineteenth century England may have remained an aristocratic country(19) but confronted by the commercial and industrial changes of the period, the aristocracy were unable to retain an eighteenth-century monopoly hold over the resorts and spas of England when faced with the growing economic strength of the middle classes. Margate had become by 1841 one of the holiday resorts of an extensive and diverse middle class.

The 1841 Enumeration Schedules provided also some indication of the geographical preference and distribution of visitors in the town according to street or district. The cost of taking lodgings varied according to the period of the season and according to location, lodgings with a sea view being preferred but always being the dearer. By

far the largest proportion of well-to-do visitors favoured lodgings with a close proximity to the sea front.

Visitors to Margate in June 1841 were staying in 76 districts, streets, squares, terraces, crescents, rows, places, and lanes, with a decided preference for seafront lodgings or lodgings in close proximity to shops, libraries, baths, the theatre, etc., in the more fashionable streets or squares. 504 visitors were residing in lodgings or hotels with district access to the seafront viz:

Buenos Ayres	31
Upper and Lower Marine Terraces	240
The Parade	37
The Fort Area including Fort Crescent	135
Cliff Terrace	30
Zion Place	<u>31</u>
Total:	<u>504</u>

Of the 504 visitors, 348 were concentrated in the Upper and Lower Marine Terraces and in Fort Crescent. The Parade contained two of the leading hotels of Margate, the White Hart Hotel and the York Hotel, having between them 14 visitors. They were sizeable establishments, the White Hart employing a clerk, three female servants, and two male servants, and the York Hotel six female servants and two male servants.⁽²⁰⁾ Eighteenth and nineteenth-century seaside towns developed as terraces of tall houses and hotels strung out along the sea front.⁽²¹⁾ Behind the sea front there was a mixture of areas and properties: some fashionable squares and streets; a High Street or an area or areas of shops selling necessities and good quality wares; residential parts containing some lodging houses, some of which would be for poorer visitors; and rows of meaner streets, housing the working population, whose employment depended in large measure upon the money spent by visitors on the sea front.⁽²²⁾ On the outskirts or periphery of the town settlement became increasingly agrarian. The residence of Margate visitors by street and district in 1841 reflects exactly this pattern. Slightly inland from the sea front there were concentrations of visitors in particular parts of Margate; for instance, 31 in lodging houses in Danehill Row, 49 residing in the main thoroughfare of the High Street, which was in close proximity to the circulating libraries, bathing rooms, the Theatre Royal, the assembly rooms, etc., as was the fairly fashionable district bounded by and incorporating Hawley Square, Union Crescent, Cecil Square, Cecil Street, Hawley Street, Churchfields Place, Princes Street, and Vicarage Place housing altogether at least 104 visitors.

Lying west of Margate and indeed west of the Margate Sea Bathing Infirmary were 27 visitors in Garlinge, 75 in Westbrook, and 19 in Rancorn, that is, a total of 121 most of whom it must be supposed were outpatients of the Infirmary, containing among their number a high proportion of children. In Garlinge there were 13 children under the age of ten who were residing in lodging or boarding houses independently of any other relatives. ⁽²³⁾ In Westbrook there were 26 children similarly placed. ⁽²⁴⁾ Garlinge, Westbrook and Rancorn were settlements detached from Margate in 1841, very much on the periphery of urban settlement. Westbrook contained among its inhabitants 12 Coastguards, ⁽²⁵⁾ while the area known as Rancorn, Mutrix, Marsh Bay, Street and Street Green, Dandelion, Garlinge, Crowhill, and Hartsdown, had 48 agricultural labourers as one of the 25 occupations represented among 121 persons, ⁽²⁶⁾.

The places of birth of Margate's visitors in June 1841 are

1,265 MARGATE VISITORS WHERE BORN

<u>Where Born</u>	<u>Number</u>
In Kent	128
In another County	1,081
In Scotland	8
In Ireland	23
In Foreign Parts	20
? Don't know	<u>5</u>
Total:	<u>1,265</u>

In another county includes, of course, London. Just about 10% of the visitors spending holidays in Margate in June 1841 had been born in Kent; the vast majority almost certainly came from London, the census enumerators' statements attributing the increase in population since 1831 in great measure to visitors from the capital. Margate in the 1840's attracted a few foreign visitors; and a few others who had been born in foreign parts having apparently returned to settle in England.

Quite apart from the 1,297 visitors residing in Margate over the census night of 7 June 1841, there were also 214 patients who were receiving seasonal treatment in the Royal Sea Bathing Infirmary, the pioneering founder of which was a famous eighteenth-century Quaker physician, John Coakley Lettsom (1744-1815), who had come to

believe that fresh air, sea water, sunlight and regular habits were essential to the treatment of many diseases, especially those of the chest and all tubercular troubles. (27) The Infirmary, intended for poor people, suffering from scrofula or tuberculosis, coming mainly from London, was founded in 1791 and opened its doors in 1796 at Westbrook, as "the county's first hospital for tuberculosis". (28) The Infirmary had treated 3,756 patients up to January 1816, (29) and by December 1850 it was reckoned that "no less than 22,000 persons have obtained relief through this charity." (30)

The Royal Sea Bathing Infirmary was operational over the night of 7 June 1841. The residential institutions of Victorian England were enumerated separately, showing the names of each person therein, age, sex, occupation if any, and where born. The details respecting this particular institution are best given in tabular form. (31)

<u>BUILDINGS:</u>	The Infirmary	
	The Resident Surgeon's House	
<u>NUMBER OF PERSONS:</u>	Males	133
	Females	<u>112</u>
	Total	245
<u>NUMBER OF PATIENTS:</u>	Males	128
	Females	<u>86</u>
	Total	214

THE OFFICERS AND STAFF OF THE INFIRMARY:

<u>10 OCCUPATIONS</u>	<u>25 PERSONS</u>
<u>Occupation</u>	<u>No.</u>
Nurses	10
Housemaids	7
Steward	1
Matron	1
Surgeon	1
Assistant surgeon	1
Bath nurse	1
Male servant	1
Female servant	1
Cook	<u>1</u>
Total:	<u>25</u>

Staff and patients totalled 239 which leaves 6 people unaccounted for. These were living or staying in the resident surgeon's house as follows:-

<u>Names</u>	<u>Age and Sex</u>		<u>Occupation</u>	<u>Born in Kent</u>
	<u>M</u>	<u>F</u>		
William Oliver Chalk	35		Surgeon	Yes
Emily do.		23		No
Susanna Easthope		25	Independent	No
Annette Connell		35	Independent	No
Jane Lowry		20	Independent	No
Elizabeth McTashill		8		Yes
Sarah Hill		60	Independent	No
Ann Bougson		25	Female servant	No

It seems quite probable that the four ladies of independent means were technically holidaymaking visitors.

THE AGE STRUCTURE OF THE 25 INFIRMARY STAFF

<u>Years</u>	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>	<u>Total</u>
Under 20	1	2	3
21-30	1	6	7
31-40	1	4	5
41-50	1	6	7
51-60	1	1	2
61+	0	1	1
<u>Total</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>25</u>

The Steward followed the instructions for 1841 in entering ages rounded to the nearest five years both as regards the staff and the patients. (32)

THE AGE STRUCTURE OF THE 214 PATIENTS

<u>Years</u>	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>	<u>Total</u>
5	7	2	9
6	3	4	7
7	10	9	19
8	10	5	15
9	14	3	17
10	10	6	16
11	8	4	12
12	3	2	5
13	4	9	13
14	10	3	13
15	15	13	28
<u>5-15</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>154</u>

<u>Years</u>	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>	<u>Total</u>
20	15	8	23
25	4	12	16
30	4	3	7
35	8	1	9
40	3	0	3
45	0	1	1
50	0	1	1
	<u>128</u>	<u>86</u>	<u>214</u>

In enumerating the patients the steward entered year by year all the ages of the child patients from 5 to 15 years, and it is clear from these figures that children aged 15 years and under constituted the bulk of the inpatients of the Infirmary in June 1841; 73% in the case of males and just on 70% in the case of females. The inpatients were cared for by staff over 50% of whom were aged 35 years and over. The Infirmary treated also outpatients, the presence of whom, including a high proportion of young children, in Garlinge, Westbrook and Rancorn has been noted above.

The occupations of male patients only were recorded:

THE OCCUPATIONS OF 43 MALE INPATIENTS IN THE ROYAL SEA BATHING INFIRMARY, ARRANGED ALPHABETICALLY

<u>31 OCCUPATIONS</u>	<u>PERSONS</u>	<u>OCCUPATIONS</u>	<u>PERSONS</u>
Agricultural labourer	3	Ostler	1
Artist	1	Painter	1
Banker's clerk	1	Plumber	2
Bricklayer	1	Ploughman	1
Bricklayer's labourer	1	Porter	2
Cabinet maker	1	Printer	3
Carpenter	1	Schoolmaster	1
Compositor	1	Shoemaker	3
Counting office clerk	1	Tailor	3
Druggist	1	Tea dealer	1
Footman	2	Waiter	1
Gardener	1	Watch gilder	1
Lighterman	2	Wheelwright	1
Male servant	1	Whipmaker	1
Medical student	1	Wine porter	1
Nurseryman	1		

As distinct from the visitors to Margate in June 1841, the inpatients of the Royal Sea Bathing Hospital contained a marked working class element. Only 6 of the 49 male inpatients aged 15 years and over were entered without occupations, and since 30 out of the 49 were given as aged 15 and 20 years it seems reasonable to conclude that the vast majority of these inpatients were journeymen or labourers. The following rough classification suggests that the inpatients of the Infirmary were of a much lower income and social strata than the average 1841 holidaymaker to Margate.

MAJOR OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES

Journeyman or Self-employed tradesman	24
Labourer, Porter, Lighterman	10
Servant	5
Clerk, Teacher, etc.	<u>4</u>
<u>TOTAL</u>	43

The ability of these people to benefit by way of sea air and sea bathing or convalescence depended solely on the existence of a charitable institution such as the Royal Sea Bathing Hospital.

The overwhelming majority of the staff and patients of the Infirmary were returned as having been born outside Kent.

THE OFFICERS, STAFF AND RESIDENT SURGEON'S HOUSEHOLD
WHERE BORN - - 31 PERSONS IN TOTAL

<u>Where Born</u>	<u>Number</u>
In Kent	8
In another county	<u>23</u>
<u>TOTAL</u>	31

214 PATIENTS WHERE BORN

<u>Where born</u>	<u>Number</u>
In Kent	9
In another county	204
In Ireland	<u>1</u>
<u>TOTAL</u>	214

Because the census of 1841 was an early summer census the presence within Margate of 1,297 visitors and 214 patients in the Royal Sea

Bathing Infirmary becomes crucial in interpreting the trends in resident population in the town in the early nineteenth century.

GROWTH OF POPULATION IN MARGATE 1801 TO 1871

<u>Year</u>	<u>According to Census</u>	<u>Resident Population</u>
1801	4,766	4,766
1811	6,126	6,126
1821	7,843	7,843
1831	10,339	10,339
<u>1841</u>	<u>11,050</u>	<u>9,539</u>
1851	10,099	10,099
1861	10,019	10,019
1871	13,903	13,903

The effect of excluding visitors and patients from the 1841 total removes the impression of a marked sustained increase of population in Margate up to 1841. (33)

The population of Margate having grown markedly up to 1831 then entered a period of decline and stability which lasted for three decades. 1831, it should be noted, was also a census held fairly late in the year (30 May) so that while the 1841 population figure for Margate is obviously inflated, 1831 might be too. In 1851 the resident population was still lower than for 1831, and was to fall further to 10,019 in 1861, thereafter reversing this decline with an increase of the order of 38.7% between 1861 and 1871.

The calculations derived from the 1841 Census concerning visitors to Margate are perhaps unique. The position as regards the neighbouring Thanet resorts of Broadstairs and Ramsgate is unfortunately less satisfactory. The most relevant Broadstairs return covering the High Street, Charlotte Street, York Place, Chandos Place, and Nuckall's Place, (34) where visitors are known to have resided during the nineteenth century, makes no attempt to identify visitors from inhabitants and merely attributes the computed increase of population amounting to 72 persons since 1831, to "Gentry visiting Broadstairs during the summer season". In the case of Ramsgate visitors can be found in the leading hotels of the town, or in positions fronting the sea and although it might be possible to make some approximate calculations of visitors to Ramsgate and Broadstairs, by scrutinizing lodgings and hotels for wealthy and professional people, born outside Kent, such a counting of possible visitors would represent no more

than a vague estimate of holidaymakers to these two resorts on 7 June 1841.

Census material exists as one of the most valuable quantifiable sources for studying local economic and social history, yet the details which emerge from the 1841 census returns provide only a static picture at one point of time. There is, however, much detailed material existing in other sources, which can be used to corroborate the evidence drawn from the 1841 census. The 1841 returns, considered in conjunction with other contemporary sources, provide a good insight into the patterns and extent of early Victorian holidaymaking.

NOTES

- (1) I express my grateful thanks to Dr. W.A. Armstrong and Dr. D.J. Richardson of the University of Kent for their valuable comments and suggestions for improving the original manuscript.
- (2) Calculated from the Report of the Select Committee on Ramsgate and Margate Harbours, 1850 (660).
- (3) Census of England and Wales (1831) Enumeration Abstract Volume 1 (1833), 260n(n).
- (4) Enumeration Abstract, England and Wales, Volume 1 (1843), 128 n (6).
- (5) J.A.R. Pimlott, The Englishman's Holiday: A Social History (1947), 77.
- (6) P.R.O. H.O. 107/468/2.
- (7) On the instructions given to the 1841 enumerators see Abstract of the Answers and Returns Enumeration Abstract, M.DCCC.XLI England and Wales (1843), or Maurice Beresford, "The Unprinted Census Returns of 1841, 1851, 1861 for England and Wales". The Amateur Historian (Summer, 1963).
- (8) P.R.O. H.O. 107/468/3.
- (9) P.R.O. H.O. 107/468/3.
- (10) P.R.O. H.O. 107/468/5.
- (11) P.R.O. H.O. 107/468/3.
- (11a) Census of England and Wales (1841) Enumeration Abstract, (1843), 128.

- (11b) Census of England and Wales (1841) Age Abstract, (1843), 124-5.
- (12) Elizabeth Brunner, Holiday Making and the Holiday Trades (O.U.P., 1945), 18.
- (12a) "The Isle of Thanet", The Land We Live In, (C.1840s), 147, 152.
- (13) Ibid, 150, 157.
- (14) Abstract of the Answers and Returns, op.cit., 3.
- (15) P.R.O. H.O. 107/468/3.
- (16) P.R.O. H.O. 107/468/4.
- (17) P.R.O. H.O. 107/468/4.
- (18) On the expanding prosperity of shopkeepers Dorothy Davis, A History of Shopping (1966), 252, 256-7; Alison Adburgham, Shops and Shopping 1800-1914: Where, and in What Manner the Well Dressed Englishwoman Bought her Clothes (1964), 42.
- (19) F.M.L. Thompson, English Landed Society in the Nineteenth Century (1963), 1.
- (20) P.R.O. H.O. 107/468/2.
- (21) J.A. Williamson, The English Channel: A History (1959), 327.
- (22) Ibid, 327.
- (23) P.R.O. H.O. 107/468/6.
- (24) P.R.O. H.O. 107/468/3.
- (25) P.R.O. H.O. 107/468/3.
- (26) P.R.O. H.O. 107/468/6.
- (27) Arthur Raistrick, Quakers in Science and Industry (1950), 311; Courtney Dainton, The Story of England's Hospitals (1961), 93.
- (28) Dainton, op.cit., 93.
- (29) The Gentleman's Magazine, LXXXVI, Part 1 (January 1816), 17.
- (30) Ibid, CXX (December 1850), 632.
- (31) P.R.O. H.O. 107/468/6.
- (32) Beresford, op.cit., 262.

- (33) The figure for 1841, uncorrected for the presence of visitors, has been taken at its face value by W.T.W. Morgan, The Development of Settlement on the Isle of Thanet, in its Geographical Setting, with Special Reference to the Growth of the Holiday Industry, London, M.Sc. (Econ.) Thesis (1950), 54, 57-8.
- (34) P.R.O. H.O. 107/468/18.

GLOUCESTERSHIRE VILLAGE POPULATIONS

Alicia Percival

Dr. Percival has written on the subject of the endowed grammar and public schools and on several topics in Gloucestershire history

Most local population studies are based on the parish registers and are concerned with changes in the population through birth, marriage and death. Yet it is often valuable to know the size of a population, either in the context of local social or economic history, or as a basis for calculating vital rates. To discover this is usually a hopeless task before the national censuses began in 1801, unless one is lucky enough to find a local census. But there are a number of sources which enumerate a part of the population (for example communicants or heads of families or households) at several points in the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries. Since it is usually uncertain what proportion of the total population is covered by those enumerated in these partial censuses, the numbers should perhaps be considered relatively to each other rather than absolutely. Yet if we are prepared to accept a rough figure of 1.65 for the multiplying of the communicants and of 4.5 (in rural areas and small towns) for households or families we can get some idea of the size of the population. (1). In Gloucestershire, a specific number of censuses of this kind are available to allow us to establish the village populations approximately every 50 years between the mid 16th century and the early 19th century. The towns of Gloucester and Bristol and the diocese of Bristol are not considered here at all.

It is worth noting what Sir James Frazer has called "the general aversion which many ignorant people feel to allowing themselves, their cattle or their possessions to be counted." In his chapter entitled "The Sin of a Census" (2) he gives examples of this curious superstition all over Africa, from the Indians of North America and the Arabs of Syria; he even quotes similar superstitions from Europe including the British Isles, current in the 19th century. Of course there is also the more sophisticated suspicion that enumeration will lead to some form of tax or other social evil, but the early reluctance, even in this country, to being numbered may well have been based just as much on this apparently innate and wide-spread fear of a census. It might have been rationalized in mediaeval times by the consideration that such a

procedure was scripturally condemned. The reference is to II Samuel XXIV, when the Israelites were numbered, and plague, representing the wrath of the Lord, broke out. The story is told more fully in I Chronicles XXI, 17ff. Here, King David who had ordered the enumeration of his people took the blame: "Is it not I that commanded the people to be numbered? Even I, it is that have sinned and done evil indeed, but as for those sheep, what have they done?" However, a great ceremony was needed to remove the evil - and it was better not to provoke the Lord by such blasphemy.

The figures available for Gloucestershire were not obtained with population enumeration as the principal object of the enquiry but as an addendum to other information. In the 16th and 17th centuries there are extant the following ecclesiastical records for Gloucestershire:

Answers to:

Bishop Hooper's visitation,	1551
Archbishop Parker's enquiry,	1563
Archbishop Whitgift's enquiry,	1603
Parliamentary (Cromwellian) enquiry,	1650
Bishop Compton's Census	1676

All but the first refer to general surveys, i.e. throughout the Province of Canterbury or even the entire country. The survival of these records is extremely patchy, but the originals or copies of these, referring to Gloucestershire have fortunately all been preserved.

The purpose of these enquiries was to give information to the Church Authorities about dioceses and parishes, but the emphasis in the questions varied according to the occasion. Bishop Hooper in his visitation enquiry of 1551 was chiefly interested in the clergy's attitudes and state of knowledge - or lack of it. The most important answers consist of records of their examination and the sufficiency or otherwise with which each incumbent could answer basic questions on The Lord's Prayer, The Ten Commandments and The Articles of Faith (Creed). Besides the name of the parson and his answers, the record gives that of the Patron of the living and - casually at the end - the number of communicants. These numbers are preceded in almost every case by the word "about" and the figures have evidently been rounded off to tens or even hundreds.

The investigation of 1563, though like other ecclesiastical surveys it was carried out through the Bishops, seems to have originated with

the Privy Council whose letter to the Archbishop is quoted by Strype. (3)

After our very hearty commendations to your good Lordship, the Queen's Majesty, upon certain good consideration moving her to understand in some part the state of your diocese, hath commanded us to write unto your Lordship with all speed possible and thereby to require the same to make answer by writing distinctly to us of all the articles following

IV. How many Churches . . . Which be parochial. How many of them have Parsons, Vicars, Curates. And whereas the parishes are so large as they have divers chapels of ease which have or ought to have curates or ministers to certify how many there be . . . with the names of the towns or hamlets where the same churches and chapels are so situated.

V. How many households are within every parish, or within any such member of any parish that hath such Churches and Chapels of Ease.

This shows clearly that the enquiry was a directive from Queen Elizabeth I herself, who kept a close hand over all clergy from the Archbishop downwards. (Another example quoted by Strype (4) is "The Queen's brief to the Archbishop" to summon a Synod in 1562). Here Archbishop Parker (to whom the replies of the Bishops were to be addressed in the first place, for forwarding to the Privy Council) had been told exactly what questions to ask; most were concerned with diocesan administration and in particular with the interlocking of dioceses with one another and with the shires/counties. But as shown, the number of households was asked for, almost casually as No. V of six questions.

In 1603 another return was demanded on this occasion by Archbishop Whitgift on his own initiative. It was one of his last actions; he died the following year. He was preparing for a new battle in the long struggle between the Anglican Church and the Puritan opposition. The Puritan attack had been opened by the so-called "Millenary Petition", signed by some 700 persons and laid before King James almost as soon as he arrived in his new kingdom from Scotland. Whitgift wanted information about the clergy and their parishes to help him present an answer to the King. All the Bishops may have returned answers but if this was the case by no means all survive. The record from Gloucestershire not merely survives but is contained in a copy attested by the Regisarius and is in good clear condition.

Here the enumeration of communicants was considered important and was recorded in every case but one. One of the objects was to find out in what parishes there were "Recusants" (Roman Catholics) or non-communicants (Dissenters), and how many of each. The very low proportion of the numbers set down in the records as being either one or the other, suggests that as few cases as possible were mentioned. Time after time the explicit formula is used : "No recusants of any sort." Where more than one or two are mentioned, they clearly belong to one household or group, as at Seizincote (Roman Catholics) and Westbury-on-Severn (Puritans). Even more important, however, to the enquirer than these numbers were the figures concerning the values of the incumbency, the curate's stipend and the name or absence of the parson, with his qualifications (for example M.A.).

The Parliamentary Survey of 1650 had the clear purpose of discovering "how adequate were the parochial arrangements and how they might be improved" .(5) It dealt chiefly with the type of incumbent ("Minster", "Preaching Minister", "Able Preaching Minister", "Constant Preacher" etc.) in charge of each parish or chapelry, the value of the living and the number of families. Absence of minister was also recorded. Where two or more very small parishes or chapelries could be united or when hamlets or other units could be considered "fit to be joined" to an existing parish, this was indicated. Likewise when a chapelry should become a separate parish. Clearly, the size of populations was here of major importance in sorting out anomalies of parish boundaries but had these suggestions (often very sensible ones), been carried out it would have made comparisons with later censuses of the same village difficult to assess. In fact, though some changes were effected at the time, they were undone at the Restoration. When in the 19th century such revisions were made, they often followed the lines suggested in this survey.

The Compton Census of 1676 is likewise an ecclesiastical enquiry set on foot by an Archbishop in the last year of his life. The reason for it is clearly stated by Archbishop Sheldon who had been "the chief architect of the Anglican Settlement after the Restoration of 1660". (6) He wrote to Dr. Henry Compton, Bishop of London and Provincial Dean of Canterbury, directing him, and through him the rest of the Bishops, to obtain "most certain information on three points;

1. the "number of persons, or at least families" inhabiting each parish;

2. the number of "popish recusants, or such as are suspected for recusancy" among the inhabitants
- and 3. the number of "other dissenters...which either obstinately refuse or wholly absent themselves from the communion..."

The enquiry here consists of no other questions, which does make it look more like a census than any previous enquiry; however, the Archbishops alternative in the first question ("persons or at least families") would seem to make it less valuable as a census. Some authorities asked for guidance, or stated their own terms of reference, e.g. the Archdeacon of Canterbury and the Bishops of Bristol and Bath gave the number of inhabitants over the age of 16. This would bring the procedure more or less into line with the previous reports which referred to Communicants, as the age for coming to Communion was rising. (7)

The record is referred to throughout the Salt Ms., in which it is found, as the Compton Census, but Compton though a notable man ecclesiastically and politically was not Archbishop when it was taken nor at any other time. Nevertheless, the Bishops were directed to send to him the results of the enquiries sent to them by their "Archdeacons and Commissaries", who were to confer with ministers and churchwardens in each parish. It has been suggested that Sheldon wished to play down the number of dissenters and it should be noted that with regard to Papists he asked that not only recusants but "suspected" recusants should be numbered.

Besides these ecclesiastical surveys, there is information to be gained from the taxpayers' returns but as these are, locally less reliable and more difficult to equate with numbers of persons, they are not recorded here.

There exists also a survey in 1608 of the able-bodied men - the record known as Smith's Men and Armour. This was drawn up for the purpose of showing what men could be put into the field for military service. As R. H. Tawney (8) has shown, this is of particular social and economic interest in that it sets out the numbers of men in various trades. It is unsuitable for our present purpose because the population enumerated bears no relation to that included in the other surveys.

With the 18th century, we come to the two great Gloucestershire local historians, Sir Robert Atkyns and Samuel Rudder, the first of whom

put out his work in 1712 and the second, a revision of this, in 1779. Population estimates are given in both and these are set out in the civil districts, by Divisions and Hundreds, though the places and their hamlets are parochially named. Unfortunately, Atkyn's list of both persons and of houses is often rounded off, while Rudder usually notes only the total population with occasionally some more detailed figures relating to households and persons (as opposed to houses and persons). His revision is based on an attempt to study parochial figures of births and deaths and he occasionally makes a comment on his alteration of the figures, either questioning those of Atkyns or attempting to find a cause for the variation during the century.

There are various suggested investigations to which the information given in these tables might lead, for example:-

1. A comparison between villages, or groups of villages, in different parts of the county showing for instance, evidence of "conurbation".
2. A search for the reason for the rise, stability or fall of the population of individual places.
 - (a) Economic factors may have been at work, for example Northleach was an important centre in the wool trade but became comparatively unimportant in the age of cloth making. Here the contrast with Witney (Oxon), a comparable town some 40 miles off, with a still-flourishing blanket manufacture, points to the need for water-power at a critical period.
 - (b) Where figures for an individual village deviate from the average experience, this might stimulate investigation into its fortunes. Rudder mentions the incipience of "ague" at Fretherne which reduced its population during the 18th century from 125 to 96: how far were other riverside villages affected by the same type of illness? and what precisely was it?
 - (c) Investigation might indeed throw doubt on a particular figure, e.g. that of Tewkesbury in 1551. Was it an error or had it to do with the suppression of the Abbey? Or it might lead a local historian to scrutinize more closely alterations in parish boundaries. Mr. Machin in the Victoria County History of Gloucestershire points out that the Registrar General admits not to have been able to trace the alterations "in detail", when defining units for the 19th century censuses.

3. Assessment of the figures for calculating the population from numbers of "households" and "families" may be considered against the evidence of Atkyns and Rudder who (sometimes tentatively) give both "persons" and "houses" or "households" respectively.

Any of these investigations would add to our understanding of the past in Gloucestershire, and similarly of other counties for which such information may become available. All are beyond the scope of this article, the purpose of which is merely to make readily available the figures which have at various times over four centuries been regarded as representing the population of Gloucestershire towns and villages.

NOTES

1. For hearth tax multipliers see LPS No. 1, Autumn 1968, pp.30-4; multipliers for censuses of particular age-groups (e.g. communicants) are discussed in the correspondence section of this issue. (editor's note).
2. Sir James Fraser, Folk-lore in the Old Testament, Abridged version, Part III, pp. 308-13.
3. J. Strype, Life and acts of Matthew Parker, Oxford, 1821, p. 255.
4. Strype, *op.cit.*, p. 245.
5. C.R. Elrington, 'A survey of church livings in Gloucestershire 1650', Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society Transactions, 63, 1964, p. 90.
6. T. Richards 'The religious census of 1676... mainly in reference to Wales', Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion, 1925-6, Supplement, quoting Cardwell, Documentary Annals, ii, 1839, pp. 339-42.
7. L. Bradley, 'A Glossary for Local Population Studies', L.P.S., Supplement, January 1971, p. 61.
"The Compton Census ... lists the returns, parish by parish (with a small number of omissions) under the heads Conformists, Papists and Non-conformists. The precise interpretation of these figures and hence the values of the multipliers needed to convert the parish totals into parish populations is controversial."

8. R.H. Tawney, 'An occupational census of the seventeenth century', Economic History Review, V, 1934, pp. 25-64.

AUTHORITIES

- (1) The 1551 Visitation of Bishop Hooper was edited and abbreviated by Geirdner and printed in the English Historical Review, XIX, 1904. The original ms. seems to have disappeared but there is an 18th century transcript in Dr. Williams' Library. (Roger Morrice Collection, Vol. L.) The numbers of communicants given are identical in the two texts.
- (2) The Ecclesiastical Return of 1563 is to be found at Oxford University among the Bodleian mss (Rawl. c. 790) and in the Bristol and Gloucestershire Library (Furney ms. B) from which the numbers of households were extracted by Mr. F.D. Price. The Rawlinson ms. is the more complete, and the relevant figures from this have kindly been supplied by Mr. Julian Cornwall.
- (3) The Ecclesiastical Returns of 1603 are to be found in the British Museum (Harleian ms. 594 ff 225-255). They have not so far been published in full but a transcription by the author of the Gloucestershire returns is expected to become available shortly in a publication of the Bristol & Glos. Archaeological Record Series (in a Religious Miscellany).
- (4). The Cromwellian or Parliamentary Survey, as it affected Gloucestershire was taken from the Lambeth Palace Library ms. 910, by Mr. C.R. Elrington, F.S.A. and is available in Bristol & Glos. Archaeological Transactions, 63, 1964, pp. 85-98.
- (5) The Compton Census returns have not all survived in contemporary ms, but there is an 18th century copy of the whole in the William Salt Library, Stafford. The history of the ms., so far as was known, was given in an article by Thomas Richards in the Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion, 1925-6, Supplement. Other sections have been published by various Record Societies. However, an edition of the complete census is being prepared by Dr. Ann Whiteman for publication shortly.
- (6) Sir Robert Atkyns, The ancient and present state of Gloucestershire, London, 1712.

- (7) Samuel Rudder, A New History of Gloucestershire, Cirencester, 1779.
- (8) The figures of censuses since 1801 are published in Victoria County History of Gloucestershire, II.

Editors Note

The table of Gloucestershire Population figures referred to in this article was too long to be included in the text and is to be found in the pocket attached to the back cover.

GLOUCESTERSHIRE
VILLAGE
POPULATIONS

Key: C—Communicants					Hh—Households	R—Recusants	F—Families	P—Papists	N—Nonconformists	H—Houses	I—Inhabitants							
					1551	1563	1603	1603	1603	1650	1676	1676	1676	1712	1712	1779	1779	1801
					C	Hh	C	R	N	F	C	P	N	H	I	Hh	I	I
Villages	C	Hh	C	R	N	F	C	P	N	H	I	Hh	I	I
Abbenhall	50	24	89	—	—	60	118	—	—	22	88	—	158	185
Abston & Wick...	120	24	160	—	—	100	—	—	—	50	230	—	400	571
Acton (Iron Acton)	210	49	185	—	—	50	173	—	5	60	240	—	460	860
Acton Turville	—	15	46	—	—	70	37	—	—	20	80	—	90	156
(see also Badminton)																		
Adelstrop	160	18	160	—	—	19	94	—	4	34	200	34	245	225
(see also Broadwell)																		
Alderley...	126	24	80	—	—	28	199	—	2	30	120	—	157	212
Alderton & Dixon	95	22	106	—	—	10	122	—	—	46	200	—	172	222
Aldsworth	—	21	94	—	—	—	51	—	—	30	120	c	120	288
Almondsbury	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	719
Alveston (Alliston)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	198	412
Alvington	110	34	189	—	—	52	—	—	—	40	200	—	—	211
Ampney Crucis	130	24	129	—	—	60	143	1	2	100	350	—	357	511
" St. Mary	40	7	27	—	—	—	66	—	3	20	80	—	118	167
" St. Peter	—	—	—	—	—	32	76	—	2	22	100	—	105	162
" Down (see Down Ampney)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Arlingham	254	57	366	—	—	60	330	—	—	80	400	—	372	506
Ashchurch	260	64	283	—	—	70	280	—	30	77	308	c	436	558
Ashelworth	200	60	200	—	—	90	140	—	6	70	350	—	—	476
Ashton (Cold Ashton)	80	22	126	—	—	32	129	—	6	33	142	38	213	224
Aston Blank (Cold Aston)	48	9	50	—	—	14	69	—	—	25	120	—	176	216
Aston Somerville	40	8	—	—	—	14	67	—	4	—	—	—	51	87
Aston sub Edge	60	8	72	—	2	20	56	—	14	24	104	—	80	116
Aston under Hill	—	—	—	—	—	—	150	1	—	—	—	—	—	305
Avening	260	61	240	—	—	60	340	—	10	160	600	—	856	1507
Awre	420	133	240	2	—	250	449	—	—	139	700	—	755	952
Aylburton	60	50	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	48	—	—	—	249
Badgeworth	300	47	220	—	—	—	365	2	9	104	506	109	549	603
(see also Shurdington)																		
Badminton, Great	120	30	110	—	—	70	173	4	3	20	176	—	—	423
Badminton Little	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	13	50	—	54	217
(see also Acton Turville)																		
Bagendon	40	7	42	—	—	15	56	—	—	13	60	—	139	133

Barnsley	93	28	120	—	—	30	107	—	2	46	160	56	217	271
Barnwood	117	25	133	—	—	—	117	—	8	40	180	—	—	309
Barrington, Great	130	30	146	—	2	62	187	—	—	28	120	c	393	348
” Little	40	7	62	—	—	24	60	—	—	18	82	—	124	140
Batsford...	52	6	60	—	—	17	37	4	1	11	80	—	87	89
Baunton...	—	12	—	—	—	16	56	—	—	18	70	—	56	108
Beckford	190	41	400	1	2	50	204	6	—	56	250	—	403	459
Berkeley	1012	297	1900	—	—	275	1100	—	3	500	2500	—	1854	3090
Beverston	240	35	115	—	—	44	100	—	1	34	164	—	144	150
(see also Kingscote)																	
Bilbury	80	40	202	—	—	80	285	—	9	100	500	160	780	707
(see also Winson)																	
Bicknor (English Bicknor)	177	25	206	—	—	100	279	—	—	60	300	c	500	465
Birdlip														
(see also Brimpsfield)																	
Bishops Cleeve														
(see Cleeve)																	
Bisley	400	113	900	—	—	300	1200	—	6	710	3200	c	4905	4227
Bitton	300	55	220	—	—	120	279	—	11	320	1150	—	4634	4992
Blaisdon	100	35	100	—	—	40	126	—	—	40	180	—	137	152
Bleddington	100	20	143	—	—	40	151	—	5	53	260	—	251	282
Boddington	100	26	140	—	—	20	133	—	6	40	180	—	95	272
(see also Staverton)																	
Bourton on the Hill	100	40	350	—	—	30	—	—	—	120	526	—	269	369
(see also Moreton in the Marsh)																	
Bourton on the Water	111	50	200	1	5	40	194	7	96	70	350	c	500	697
(see also Clapton on the Hill)																	
Boxwell, Slaughter Lower & Leighterton	68	26	60	—	—	23	94	—	—	26	104	—	175	217
St. Briavels	170	49	148	—	—	80	242	1	1	80	400	122	766	670
Brimpsfield & Birdlip	77	16	112	—	—	160	142	—	—	52	200	63	283	299
Broadwell	—	20	160	—	—	24	102	1	7	30	126	—	245	239
(see also Adelstrop)																	
Brockhampton (see Sevenhampton)																	
Brockworth	144	30	140	—	—	—	129	1	10	50	200	—	253	350
Bromsberrow	80	30	120	—	—	50	128	—	4	20	80	—	138	235
Brookthorpe	82	16	86	—	—	—	78	—	—	40	200	—	107	112
Buckland & Laverton	160	18	195	—	—	51	149	—	—	50	250	c	316	328
Bulley	—	15	—	—	—	32	—	—	—	22	85	—	51	179

Key: C—Communicants Hh—Households R—Recusants F—Families P—Papists N—Nonconformists H—Houses I—Inhabitants					1551	1563	1603	1603	1603	1650	1676	1676	1676	1712	1712	1779	1779	1801
					C	Hh	C	R	N	F	C	P	N	H	I	Hh	I	I
Villages	460	72	400	—	—	1300	669	—	10	150	800	—	1070	1285
(see also Stinchcombe)																		
Cambridge (see Slimbridge)																		
Campden	485	120	700	3	3	300	775	—	15	391	1618	—	1618	1700
Cerney, North	145	7	220	—	—	40	123	—	—	42	190	—	384	565
Cerney, South	160	25	260	—	1	100	294	—	11	120	500	247	806	798
Charfield	100	28	108	—	—	40	85	—	—	30	145	—	200	247
Charlton Abbots	—	12	36	—	—	—	127	—	—	13	60	12	63	100
Charlton Kings...	315	103	310	—	—	40	188	—	12	102	550	c	458	730
Chedworth	160	40	200	—	—	100	323	—	—	150	500	181	787	848
Cheltenham	526	164	800	—	5	350	1068	4	97	321	1500	—	1433	3076
Cherington	70	21	100	—	—	30	131	—	—	30	120	—	158	181
Chipping Campden (see Campden)																		
Churcham	340	50	295	3	—	79	282	—	12	77	340	—	309	327
Churchdown	290	75	—	—	—	—	260	1	16	100	400	131	630	644
Cirencester	1460	320	1825	6	7	700	1745	—	155	810	4000	838	3878	4130
Clapton on the Hill	—	200	—	—	—	15	51	—	11	18	80	—	112	430
(see also Bourton on the Water)																		
Cleeve	540	98	520	—	—	200	749	—	37	175	875	295	1252	1355
Clifford Chambers	60	18	80	—	—	32	92	—	2	76	320	51	249	223
Coaley	200	53	234	—	—	70	260	—	6	120	500	—	598	850
Coates	30	11	60	—	—	20	60	—	—	26	120	40	200	227
Codrington (see Wopley)																		
Coldashton (see Ashton Cold)																		
Colesbourne	60	18	67	—	—	34	105	—	3	30	120	48	254	231
Coleford (see Newland)	—	—	—	—	—	32	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2457
Coln St. Aldwyn	—	23	131	—	—	40	110	2	4	53	300	86	392	385
Coln St. Dennis	41	6	37	—	—	17	59	—	—	16	80	26	112	163
Coln Rogers	36	10	34	—	—	14	48	—	—	18	70	26	125	110
Compton Abdale	90	38	24	—	—	12	66	—	—	30	130	—	130	157
Compton Little (now Warwicks)	60	22	116	—	—	40	122	—	1	35	180	—	242	296
Condicote	42	8	40	—	—	17	55	—	—	18	80	—	105	115
Corse	130	39	100	—	—	36	150	—	—	65	300	—	252	335
Cow Honeybourne	100	28	40	—	—	40	—	—	—	39	156	40	156	274
Cowley	50	14	95	—	—	67	106	—	—	39	160	—	268	250
Cranham	69	24	93	—	—	26	120	—	—	43	170	—	c170	251
Cromhall	180	44	240	2	—	80	70	—	7	73	360	—	316	550
Cubberley	50	11	66	—	—	14	72	—	—	14	80	27	178	161

Daglingworth	46	12	50	—	—	26	84	—	3	31	138	—	184	215
Dean, Little	200	62	140	—	—	132	289	—	—	70	320	—	c423	541
Dean, Magna (see Mitcheldean)																	
Deerhurst	320	87	200	2	—	130	226	1	40	100	620	—	530	646
Didbrook & Hailes	100	10	94	—	—	—	70	—	18	20	100	17	100	254
Didmarton	30	8	23	—	—	—	37	—	—	11	56	17	72	74
Dodington	—	7	40	—	—	18	50	—	—	14	56	—	98	95
Dorsington	53	14	40	—	—	22	61	—	—	20	100	17	90	100
Dowdeswell	55	8	100	—	—	27	80	—	5	25	120	34	199	196
Down, Ampney	80	27	147	—	—	32	141	—	—	36	180	—	248	279
Down, Hatherley	35	14	55	—	—	—	63	—	—	20	100	—	c100	119
Doynton	120	26	128	—	—	49	164	—	12	48	200	—	340	303
Driffeld...	60	12	46	—	—	26	60	—	8	25	120	21	137	128
Dumbleton	100	24	170	—	—	40	175	—	—	46	200	—	c200	307
Duntisbourne Abbots	72	15	67	—	—	34	92	—	—	42	180	—	176	245
” Rous	42	7	70	—	—	16	50	—	—	13	60	—	72	93
Dursley	460	192	523	—	—	244	800	—	4	600	2500	—	2000	2379
Dymock...	440	106	400	—	—	140	531	—	18	250	1000	—	c1282	1223
Dyrham	180	38	180	2	—	50	175	—	—	60	270	70	350	437

Eastington	234	56	240	—	—	80	368	—	7	100	450	—	767	988
Eastleach Martin	54	14	82	—	3	38	65	—	2	30	120	—	313	210
” Turville	50	9	81	—	1	39	115	1	1	60	200	—	c400	370
Ebrington	180	30	200	—	—	70	228	—	10	74	341	94	469	464
Edgeworth	45	19	85	—	—	22	71	—	—	24	120	—	106	116
Elkstone	56	10	68	—	2	24	116	—	—	35	160	40	178	299
Elmore	230	36	236	—	—	—	153	—	—	70	300	—	c300	381
Elmstone Hardwick	140	40	188	—	—	60	154	—	3	35	150	—	144	177
English Bicknor (see Bicknor)																	

Fairford	260	27	220	—	1	100	331	1	6	—	—	—	1200	1326
Falfield (see also Thornbury)	—	25	100	—	—	—	—	—	—	30	150	—	120	670
Farmington	60	13	52	—	—	27	63	—	2	25	100	38	195	216
Flaxley	—	20	100	—	—	30	123	—	5	40	200	—	196	135
Forthampton	200	42	94	—	—	60	165	—	9	40	160	—	208	449
Frampton Cotterell	120	31	100	—	—	60	192	—	27	56	300	—	393	1208
Frampton on Severn	200	—	328	—	1	105	249	—	—	100	500	—	600	860

Key: C—Communicants Hh—Households R—Recusants F—Families P—Papists N—Nonconformists H—Houses I—Inhabitants																			
					1551	1563	1603	1603	1603	1650	1676	1676	1676	1712	1712	1779	1779	1801	
					C	Hh	C	R	N	F	C	P	N	H	I	Hh	I	I	
Villages															
Fretherne	63	20	65	—	—	28	65	—	—	25	125	—	96		117
Procester	120	41	210	—	—	40	195	—	—	61	250	—	262		362
Guiting Power	116	20	46	—	—	—	164	—	10	62	300	82	375		430
Guiting Temple (see also Swell upper)	177	24	160	—	—	20	150	—	18	45	191	75	428		301
Hayles, Hailes (see Didbrook)																			
Hampnett	30	9	24	—	—	14	43	—	1	14	60	14	78		90
Hampton (see Minchinhampton)																			
Hanham (see Oldland)																			
Hardwicke	169	29	100	—	—	60	171	—	—	70	280	—	c250		341
Harescombe	43	24	80	—	—	—	51	—	—	14	60	—	74		108
Haresfield	244	47	268	—	—	130	263	2	1	170	500	c500	—		553
Harnhill...	25	5	52	—	—	24	59	—	6	20	80	—	89		71
Hartpury	280	51	250	—	—	—	300	—	—	60	300	—	c300		567
Hasfield	140	38	130	—	—	50	130	—	6	15	70	—	175		187
Hatherley (see Down Hatherley)																			
Hatherop	60	14	50	—	4	24	77	9	—	30	150	—	204		247
Hawkesbury	750	99	560	—	—	140	592	—	24	150	598	—	896		1396
Hawling...	71	13	40	—	—	15	75	—	—	21	100	—	132		192
Hazelton (see also Yanworth)...	120	7	80	—	—	8	86	—	1	25	100	—	161		195
Hempstead	100	31	106	—	—	—	96	—	—	30	140	—	129		159
Hewelsfield	80	20	88	—	—	40	101	—	—	40	200	54	253		298
Hill (see also Berkeley)	100	41	140	—	—	90	115	—	1	40	200	32	146		9
Hinton on the Green	100	18	200	—	—	24	85	—	—	25	100	—	105		196
Horsley	217	56	400	—	—	200	—	—	—	300	1200	—	—		2971
Horton	160	38	80	—	—	70	244	—	16	80	320	—	c332		366
Huntley	120	40	150	—	—	50	113	—	1	54	240	—	c269		313

Iron Acton (see Acton)

Kemerton	113	26	127	—	—	46	143	—	3	36	150	—	225	427
Kempley	80	20	60	—	—	36	97	—	3	40	180	45	257	218
Kempsford	240	24	240	—	5	60	200	1	4	66	340	106	493	656
Kingscote	240	29	118	—	—	50	—	—	—	40	180	—	134	271
(see also Newington Bagpath and Beverston)														
King's Stanley (see Stanley)														
Kingswood	—	40	140	2	10	—	508	—	1	—	—	—	—	901
Lasborough (see also Weston Birt)	17	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	33	157
Lassington	34	10	40	—	—	—	41	—	1	10	45	—	33	85
Laverton (see Buckland)														
The Lea (now Hereford)	60	29	47	—	—	—	82	—	—	20	80	—	96	100
Lechlade	200	65	240	—	—	96	256	1	7	157	500	—	925	917
Leckhampton	102	20	93	—	—	40	90	1	—	30	120	—	142	225
Leigh	120	40	197	—	—	59	150	—	1	40	160	—	245	303
Leighterton (see Boxwell)														
Lemington	55	7	60	—	—	20	38	—	14	7	—	30	59	61
Leonard Stanley (see Stanley)														
Littleton-on-Severn	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	84	—	—	130
Longborough	—	30	144	—	—	60	123	—	29	80	400	82	389	473
Longhope	180	63	201	—	—	100	250	—	—	100	500	—	470	636
Longney	130	48	150	—	—	70	169	—	—	60	260	—	217	314
Lydney	460	105	509	7	—	104	495	20	16	153	700	—	661	783
Maisemore	—	36	179	—	—	—	150	—	8	44	200	—	210	343
Marshfield	500	62	561	—	2	200	600	—	50	150	800	—	1237	1246
Marston, Long	80	19	209	—	—	38	60	—	—	40	190	—	199	244
Matson	28	7	37	—	—	—	12	—	1	9	50	—	45	51
Meysey Hampton	120	32	160	—	—	30	192	—	14	83	360	54	265	315
Mickleton	200	41	240	—	6	85	237	—	7	83	375	68	231	489
Minchinhampton (Hampton)	500	134	600	—	—	400	700	—	30	377	1806	—	4000	3419
Minsterworth	227	76	320	—	—	90	195	—	15	66	300	68	300	354
Miserden	89	19	134	—	—	55	250	—	—	54	250	111	451	469
Mitcheldean (see also Dean Magna)	260	92	366	—	—	250	371	—	4	120	600	—	—	563
Moreton-in-the-Marsh	100	40	350	—	—	30	534	—	20	120	526	—	579	829
(see also Bourton-on-the-Hill)														
Moreton Valence	150	20	150	—	—	50	131	—	—	30	150	38	169	265

Key: C—Communicants Hh—Households R—Recusants F—Families P—Papists N—Nonconformists H—Houses I—Inhabitants

					1551	1563	1603	1603	1603	1650	1676	1676	1676	1712	1712	1779	1779	1801
					C	Hh	C	R	N	F	C	P	N	H	I	Hh	I	I
Villages	C	Hh	C	R	N	F	C	P	N	H	I	Hh	I	I
Naunton	80	18	86	—	—	35	124	—	6	34	140	52	257	433
Newent	712	190	550	—	—	300	943	—	—	270	1100	—	1560	2354
Newington Bagpath (see also Kingscote)	70	24	120	—	—	24	51	—	4	27	120	—	354	217
Newland (see also Coleford)	700	250	850	8	—	300	419	3	9	480	2200	—	2997	2543
Newnham	—	55	300	—	4	136	266	—	6	90	400	—	c1000	821
Nibley, North	400	90	403	—	—	180	583	—	1	200	1000	—	1700	1211
Northleach	400	199	440	—	3	120	485	—	27	200	900	149	683	814
Norton	180	31	157	—	—	—	182	—	2	62	300	—	240	303
Notgrove	40	13	52	—	—	30	75	—	7	33	150	—	218	186
Nympsfeld	85	17	90	—	1	44	122	—	33	56	250	—	497	523
Oddington	120	24	105	—	—	66	141	—	14	60	250	—	338	421
Oldbury-on-the-Hill	70	21	60	—	—	36	85	—	5	16	80	—	232	238
Oldbury-on-Severn	—	—	210	—	—	70	—	—	—	50	200	—	—	452
Oldland & Hanham	—	60	246	—	—	140	252	—	8	—	—	—	—	3103
Owlpen	—	10	—	—	—	20	67	—	8	28	140	—	196	188
Oxenhall	90	24	120	—	—	50	112	—	—	96	200	46	202	313
Oxenton	77	21	41	—	—	30	108	—	12	30	90	—	120	150
Ozleworth	22	20	70	—	—	15	50	—	—	17	70	—	80	133
Painswick	360	142	609	—	10	200	1055	—	32	750	3000	—	3300	3150
Pauntley	60	16	80	1	—	40	85	—	—	30	150	—	87	215
Pebworth	151	40	200	—	—	75	223	7	—	95	400	104	436	579
Pinnock	18	3	12	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	24	—	25	125
Pitchcombe	26	211	80	—	—	—	55	—	—	20	80	—	90	216
Prestbury	160	54	300	—	—	60	177	—	10	100	445	—	4/500	485
Preston (Cirencester)	65	12	40	—	—	15	73	—	—	17	70	35	171	141
Preston (Forest)	60	13	48	—	—	—	—	—	—	13	66	10	40	87
Preston-upon-Stour	30	18	200	7	7	24	—	—	—	45	200	—	—	267
Pucklechurch	120	22	190	—	—	32	174	—	12	60	250	92	460	542
Quedgeley	69	28	123	—	—	40	130	—	—	34	170	33	166	165
Quenington	16	10	49	—	—	30	83	2	2	30	120	54	267	239
Quinton	200	38	400	—	—	80	82	—	—	120	500	—	547	485

Randwick	100	18	223	—	—	100	339	—	11	80	400	140	650	856
Rangeworthy	—	25	130	—	—	—	—	—	—	30	150	—	120	230
Rendcombe	61	12	72	—	—	18	69	—	—	21	120	23	139	147
Rissington Great	107	23	160	—	—	50	163	—	15	75	277	—	252	349
” Little	80	20	90	—	—	30	86	—	14	30	160	—	176	227
” Wick	62	15	80	—	—	30	91	—	3	26	120	—	182	217
Rockhampton	50	28	60	—	—	30	78	—	18	26	126	22	122	160
Rodborough	240	50	155	—	—	170	442	—	4	160	750	—	1481	1658
Rodmarton	160	19	80	—	1	22	141	—	4	37	180	56	241	305
Ruardean	160	54	250	—	1	80	300	8	4	100	500	112	758	845
Rudford...	70	12	82	—	—	30	66	—	—	22	106	—	c106	78
Saintbury	100	24	200	—	—	20	—	—	—	54	240	31	135	152
Salperton	100	9	40	—	—	13	48	—	4	15	60	23	155	186
Sandhurst	160	42	232	—	—	—	196	—	3	60	300	80	260	365
Sapperton	100	35	190	—	—	60	195	—	—	60	320	—	300	351
Saul	67	14	50	—	—	—	40	—	—	30	130	29	151	349
Sevenhampton & Brockhampton	140	20	125	—	—	—	203	—	—	—	—	63	288	349
Sezincot...	6	2	—	—	9	1	—	—	—	7	30	6	43	44
Shennington (now Warwicks)	—	—	—	—	—	—	104	—	6	—	—	—	—	300
Sherbourne	180	40	200	—	—	46	110	—	—	60	c300	60	360	526
Shipton Moyne	90	26	120	—	—	40	150	—	—	60	250	—	234	237
} Shipton Oliffe	20	8	60	6	—	18	69	—	1	20	80	29	130	} 239
} Shipton Sollars	30	14	24	—	—	9	37	—	—	29	120	—	133	
Shurdington (see also Badgeworth)	33	11	37	—	—	—	—	—	—	60	200	80	300	63
} Siddington St. Mary	—	6	20	—	—	16	37	—	3	—	—	17	74	} 325
} Siddington St. Peter	24	6	60	—	—	26	37	—	—	14	60	35	153	
Side	35	6	36	—	—	28	45	—	2	17	70	11	47	41
Siston	80	20	100	—	—	40	138	—	4	98	450	—	—	856
Slaughter, Lower	94	11	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	32	150	39	194	198
(see also Bourton-on-the-Water)	40	14	66	—	—	22	48	—	2	30	150	84	178	253
Slaughter, Upper	400	101	300	—	—	90	382	—	1	120	560	—	c800	770
Slimbridge & Cambridge	130	13	176	—	—	75	82	—	1	38	192	48	236	263
Snowshill (see also Stanway)	400	9	340	2	—	160	424	—	51	140	650	—	c800	1090
Sodbury, Chipping	70	12	80	—	—	—	81	—	3	24	90	—	115	89
Sodbury, Little	120	47	146	—	—	58	174	—	12	48	200	—	c200	687
Sodbury, Old	46	12	50	—	—	35	76	—	—	38	170	47	216	238
Southrop	246	52	310	—	—	—	381	—	—	123	500	—	400	504

Key: C—Communicants Hh—Households R—Recusants F—Families P—Papists N—Nonconformists H—Houses I—Inhabitants					1551	1563	1603	1603	1603	1650	1676	1676	1676	1712	1712	1779	1779	1801
					C	Hh	C	R	N	F	C	P	N	H	I	Hh	I	I
Villages	1551	1563	1603	1603	1603	1650	1676	1676	1676	1712	1712	1779	1779	1801
Stanley, King's...	140	59	436	—	—	180	500	—	150	250	1100	—	1257	1434
Stanley, Leonard	263	47	250	—	—	86	206	—	1	90	400	—	512	590
Stanton	130	27	176	—	—	75	132	—	—	60	300	—	310	256
Stanway (see also Snowhill)	160	36	140	—	—	36	120	—	—	49	240	—	260	342
Staunton (Forest)	100	25	100	—	12	40	—	—	—	54	220	—	c260	159
Staverton (see also Boddington)	50	13	140	—	—	20	61	—	3	40	200	—	120	159
Stinchcombe (see also Cam)	—	—	220	—	—	100	—	—	—	120	500	—	450	419
Stone	100	67	190	—	—	87	105	—	1	44	c200	44	200	835
Stonehouse	280	52	284	—	—	90	379	1	4	110	500	—	759	1412
Stow-on-the-Wold (Edwardstow)	350	82	400	—	—	200	257	—	55	329	1300	—	1180	1471
Stowell	9	1	10	—	—	—	15	—	—	—	—	1	—	13
Stratton	44	13	160	—	—	30	86	—	—	30	130	35	173	166
Stroud	580	130	900	—	3	600	1000	—	1	750	3000	—	4000	5422
Sudeley	30	10	20	—	—	—	12	—	—	20	90	5	—	68
Sutton-under-Brailes (now Warwicks)	80	20	103	—	—	30	111	5	4	33	130	—	150	—
Swell, Lower (or Temple Guiting)	58	14	80	—	—	20	82	—	3	36	162	—	213	239
Swell, Upper (see also Guiting, Temple)	31	7	47	—	—	24	43	—	2	19	82	14	19	74
Swindon	60	16	40	—	—	140	53	—	—	24	90	—	105	116
Taynton	140	41	60	—	—	86	156	—	2	45	200	—	256	378
Temple Guiting (see Guiting)
Tetbury	600	176	600	—	—	500	191	1	8	300	1200	—	3500	2500
Tewkesbury	2600	396	1600	—	—	1000	500	—	—	470	2500	—	3000	4199
Thornbury (see also Falfield)	700	200	1705	—	—	300	740	1	92	270	1100	—	1971	856
Tibberton	80	23	48	—	—	36	100	—	3	33	150	—	230	254
Tidenham (Forest)	260	40	360	—	—	100	269	1	—	140	600	112	500	696
Tirley	180	60	220	—	—	60	183	—	—	76	300	65	280	365
Tytherington	160	43	250	—	—	60	28	—	—	85	320	—	310	295
Toddington	52	22	130	—	—	26	117	1	—	48	200	—	186	268
Todenham	40	28	146	—	—	—	155	1	1	38	160	—	250	339
Tormarton	100	21	108	—	—	40	134	—	2	30	130	—	207	225
Tortworth	172	42	169	—	18	68	170	—	—	45	240	—	241	269
Tredington	49	15	48	—	—	16	70	—	5	23	100	30	169	121
Turkdean	68	14	84	—	—	22	99	—	7	32	120	25	113	143
Twynning	260	58	280	—	—	60	235	1	4	140	600	—	567	752

Uley	140	30	180	—	—	70	300	—	25	200	900	—	1310	1492
Upleadon	80	20	60	—	—	24	44	—	—	25	100	19	100	160
Upton St. Leonards	206	57	287	—	—	—	325	7	7	110	450	—	300	621
Wapley & Codrington	110	28	155	—	—	42	160	—	—	45	180	—	200	258
Washbourne	42	8	72	—	—	10	19	—	—	14	60	—	60	89
Welford	44	42	220	—	—	75	236	2	2	98	450	—	450	516
Westbury	700	162	900	—	40	300	800	—	12	290	1200	—	1300	1651
Westcote	56	10	88	—	—	25	72	—	—	45	160	—	120	127
Westerleigh	280	28	240	—	—	120	170	—	30	120	900	—	930	1582
Weston-on-Avon	—	—	—	—	—	—	36	3	—	—	70	—	80	118
Weston, Birt (see also Lasborough)	40	13	62	—	—	30	55	—	1	18	80	72	106	157
Weston-sub-Edge	—	—	—	—	—	—	133	—	—	—	—	—	197	332
Whaddon	70	31	84	—	—	—	75	—	—	27	110	—	123	88
Whitminster (Wheatenhurst)	100	24	85	—	—	50	95	—	—	47	200	—	231	284
Whittington	53	13	36	—	—	17	70	—	—	32	126	—	126	194
Wickham, Child's	211	48	280	—	—	40	216	—	5	75	340	—	306	351
Wickwar	400	81	200	—	—	100	420	—	8	220	1000	—	850	764
Widford... ..	16	3	19	—	—	—	—	—	—	7	36	3	20	40
Willersley	100	30	120	—	—	50	136	—	3	56	250	—	—	273
Winchcombe	700	146	860	—	11	340	1226	—	35	564	2715	—	c1960	1888
Windrush	60	12	60	—	—	26	90	—	—	36	140	—	190	317
Winson (see also Bibury)	—	9	—	—	—	16	141	—	1	24	90	—	—	—
Winstone	50	7	61	—	—	21	70	—	—	26	100	30	160	245
Witcombe	71	24	70	—	—	—	96	—	—	24	90	24	96	119
Withington	30	35	20	—	1	87	217	—	—	73	320	—	500	572
Woodchester	120	33	130	—	—	60	120	—	—	120	460	—	792	870
Woolstone	46	10	46	—	—	17	46	—	3	23	90	—	100	83
Woolaston (Forest)	120	48	250	—	—	250	153	6	6	96	400	—	c459	613
Wormington	40	10	40	—	—	18	56	—	—	19	80	—	85	91
Wotton-under-Edge	400	115	1216	—	—	1500*	1713	—	14	840	3500	—	4000	4880
Yanworth (see also Hazleton)... ..	120	11	80	—	—	20	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	97
Yate	240	70	195	—	—	66	250	—	7	80	320	—	c412	654

NOTES

*The original simply reads 5,000 souls, which must be wrong.

1. Most double barrelled place names have been listed according to their principal name; for example, Shipton Oliffe, Marston Long, Wickham Child's rather than Oliffe Shipton, Long Marston and Child's Wickham.
2. Cross references are provided for all villages which were not seperately distinguished on every survey.

Notes and Queries

Seasonality, some further thoughts

Having read again Mr. Bradley's articles on Seasonality (L.P.S. 4, 5 and 6) I wondered what pattern might appear for my own parish, Burton Joyce, if I examined the peak months per decade.

When dealing with a very small parish in isolation the very smallness of the numbers involved can cause difficulty. Percentages can be most misleading. For example, in dealing with, say, baptism numbers one might say that 22% of the baptisms for a given year took place in February and 55% in June. It sounds an enormous increase, but if the total number of baptisms for the year is only 9, then the 22% is 2 and the 55% is 5. Of course using percentages is essential if comparing one parish with another. Or is it? There is a much less laborious way of examining trends in a variety of parishes. I am not sure that it would be statistically acceptable, but it certainly gives a picture, a pattern, which may be all one wants.

For any parish which has done an aggregative analysis it is comparatively easy to find the number of events, baptisms, burials or marriages in each month for a decade at a time. These, of course are the figures that Mr. Bradley has used for his work on seasonality. Instead of working out and drawing graphs for every month or every decade, marking on a chart the peak months for each decade quickly and clearly shows a pattern, if there is one.

The accompanying diagrams for the years 1581-1830 in the Parish of Burton Joyce shows these patterns very clearly. Of course these patterns give an incomplete picture. They take no account of the events which took place in the other months of the year, and they give no hint at all of variations in the numbers of events between one decade and another. Nevertheless I think they give a reasonable picture of seasonality. It would be quite quick to do this for a large number of parishes and the results might be illuminating.

Marriage

If we look at the Marriage diagram there is no difficulty in deciding which month wins, but it indicates other things too. We notice that

Peak months for Marriages in decades

J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	
						X						1581-90
										X		91-1600
										X		1601-10
					X				X			11-20
										X		21-30
				X					X			31-40
			X	X								41-50
						X						51-60
		X										61-70
X					X					X		71-80
						X		X				81-90
										X		91-1700
										X		1701-10
						X				X		11-20
										X		21-30
										X		31-40
										X		41-50
									X			51-60
										X		61-70
											X	71-80
				X						X		81-90
								X				91-1800
										X		1801-10
	X											11-20
				X								21-30

never in the whole 250 years did March top the poll. March is always largely if not completely in Lent. August, perhaps surprisingly, was never a peak month. Too busy in harvest? December features only once, and that late in the period under consideration. December is always Advent. Do March and December reflect Church prohibitions? Probably. But what is the explanation of January and February? Is this in fact the result of drawing a diagram showing only the peak months? Well, as some check here is a table showing the number of years in which marriages took place in each month. For example, in no less than 99 of the 250 years marriages occurred in November. There appears to be no local social custom which might account for this.

Table showing the number of years in which marriages took place in each month. (Table covers 250 years)

November	99
July	62
May	61
April and June	57
October	54
December	48
January	47
February	41
August	34
September	28
March	26

It has to be remembered all the time that these diagrams and Tables take no account of the number of marriages, only of when they took place.

Baptism

When one looks at the diagram for Baptisms it is less easy to see the top month. Indeed I think it is impossible without counting, but the pattern is significant nevertheless. The weight lies in the early months of the year. Does this give credence to the suggestion that the Birth-Baptism interval must have remained fairly stable?

April appears most frequently in this diagram. Has that any connection with Easter?

Peak months for Baptisms in decades

J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	
							X					1561-70
		X										71-80
X												81-90
	X		X								X	91-1600
			X	X								1601-10
X												11-20
		X					X	X				21-30
			X									31-40
			X									41-50
										X		51-60
							X					61-70
	X											71-80
											X	81-90
		X										91-1700
		X										1701-10
	X											11-20
	X											21-30
X												31-40
			X									41-50
		X										51-60
			X					X				61-70
	X										X	71-80
										X		81-90
X												91-1800
X			X									1801-10
		X									X	11-20
			X									21-30

Here is the Table showing the number of years in which there were baptisms, for each month of the year, again in descending numerical order. Incidentally the Baptism details are started 20 years earlier, in 1561.

Table showing the number of years in which baptisms took place in each month.

March	150
April	149
January	147
February	144
November	141
October	138
December	133
May	132
July	116
August	112
September	110
June	100

Here the differences from month to month are much smaller, but the general picture is confirmed, with the most frequent use being made of the early months of the year followed by those at the end of the year with a trough in the middle or summer months. It is not surprising that March and April top the list, given that baptism does not always follow birth as soon as possible, but perhaps it is surprising that June should be at the bottom of the list.

Burials

The picture for burials is slightly different, showing weight in the early and late months of the year and a very definite trough in the middle months. Another difference is that there is not one month in this chart which is never the peak month. Is this what one would expect?

The feature of this chart is the general consistency of Winter burial peaks. Of particular interest are the Summer peaks for the decades 1631-40, 1711-20 and 1761-70.

Peak months for Burials in decades

J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	
X												1581-90
X	X											1591-1600
										X		1601-10
							X					11-20
											X	21-30
			X		X							31-40
X												41-50
										X		51-60
	X									X		61-70
										X		71-80
		X										81-90
	X											91-1700
	X								X			1701-10
	X											11-20
			X									21-30
										X		31-40
								X	X			41-50
										X		51-60
		X	X									61-70
										X		71-80
X												81-90
			X									91-1800
										X		1801-10
			X	X								11-20
				X								21-30

Table showing the number of years in which burials
took place in each month. (Table covers 250 years)

March	128
April	121
February	113
November	111
January	107
October	104
December	103
May	98
June	92
September	81
August	80
July	77

Here again the picture is much what one would expect, with all the winter months huddled together at the top of the Table and quite a distinct difference for all the summer months.

Is it a coincidence that March heads the Table for both baptisms and burials?

What would be extremely interesting would be to see the patterns like these, and preferably in more detail for a large number of parishes. This would be so easy to do. This would reveal whether the unlikely choice of November as the overall favourite month for weddings is a regional feature, a Burton Joyce peculiarity, or a national feature.

Margaret Massey

Pre 1841 Census lists

Mr. R.J. Chamberlaine - Brother has contributed the following information about a number of Warwickshire parishes.

<u>Parish</u>			
Kineton	1821	Tamworth	1821
Bedworth	1821	St. Mary	
Austrey	1821	Warwick	1801, 1811, 1821, 1831

All these lists are to be found in the County Record Office.

WILLS AND THEIR SCRIBES

A communication from the Matlock Population Studies Group.

It may be of interest to compare an analysis which the Matlock Population Studies Group is making of Matlock wills with that which Margaret Spufford made of Cambridgeshire wills in the last issue of L.P.S.

Of 115 wills for the parish of Matlock, dated between 1664 and 1742, which were found in the Lichfield Probate Records, 71 could be ascribed with reasonable certainty to specific scribes. The most interesting series, spanning the whole period, is by John Woolley senior (5 wills between 1664 and 1669), his son Adam (16 wills, 1675-1711) and his grandson John (11 wills, 1720-1742). A second series is by Henry Flint senior (6 wills, 1672-1685) and his son Henry (5 wills, 1716-1740). Stephen Badsley wrote 10 wills (1672-1714). Six other scribes wrote two or three wills each. The remaining 44 wills could not be ascribed with any certainty. Some 30 elements used in the formulae of the 115 wills were plotted to see how they were distributed both in decades and as between scribes.

The first fact to emerge is that most of the elements occurred throughout the whole period of eighty years with identical or almost identical words, and were used by a considerable number of scribes. This could, of course, be due to a given scribe copying the form used by another, but the fact that most of the formulae quoted by Margaret Spufford for Cambridgeshire occur in almost identical form in Matlock wills makes one wonder whether there did not exist a printed source from which scribes could select appropriate phrases.

Most of the remaining points emerge if we consider the long Woolley series. There is a definite "house style". All three of them "call to mind the uncertain state of this transitory life and that all life must yield unto death." Other scribes share this, or a similar formulae, but far less frequently. All three use the formula "I bequeath (or commend) my soul to Almighty God", a formula common to all but a very few of the wills, but thereafter ring the changes on a variety of phrases such as "and to Jesus Christ my Redeemer", "hoping for the remission of my sins", "through the merits, blood-shed and death of Jesus Christ" but in a way which leaves one in doubt as to whether these phrases are used at the request of the testator or whether the scribe is exhibiting his skill in varied phraseology.

Occasionally, though, there comes a phrase which must almost certainly have been demanded by the testator. Neither John senior nor Adam commonly introduce the idea of salvation or of eternal life, so that when one will only by each of these scribes does so, it does seem significant. John junior, on the other hand, has a phrase relating to salvation in six of his eleven wills, and in the same six wills he uses the phrase "being penitent and sorry for all my sins", an idea not used by his father and grandfather or by the Flints or by Stephen Badsley and which is used by only six of the unidentified scribes. Adam who, like his father, rarely uses the more elaborate forms, does produce an elaborate one for Margery Johns, a substantial shop-keeper, who bequeaths her "soule to Almighty god my Macker and to Jesus Christ my redeemer and to ye holy ghost my sanctifier and my bodye to the earth from whence it came to be buried in such devout and Christian Manor as to my Executors shall be thought meette and convenient; their to rest until my sowle and bodye meete againe and be joynd together at ye joyfull resurection and being made Ptakers of ye neverending joyes of immortalety which god in mercy through ye meritts of Jesus Christ alone hath promised and prepared for all those that truley and unfeignedly repent and beleive in him." And, thirteen years later, he produces an almost identical form for William Pidcocke.

It is noticeable that, at a time when the phrases "through the blood-shed, death and passion of Jesus Christ" and "to be made partakers of life everlasting" were in common use, they were never used by Stephen Badsley.

There are two points which do seem to us to be of positive significance. There are seven wills only, drawn up by six scribes, out of the total of 115 which use the form "trusting that I am one of the number of Gods elect and chosen people" or some very similar form of words. This must surely reflect the religious views of the testators and suggests that they may have belonged to one of the 'particular' groups opposed to the growing Arminian doctrine that salvation was available to all men and not only to the predestined few. Such a group may have existed within the Anglican Church or as a separate denomination. The fact that all seven specifically desired that their bodies be buried in the churchyard at Matlock may suggest a group within the Anglican Church. All these wills date before 1690. And there are six wills, drawn by four scribes and all after 1700, in which, apart from "In the name of God, Amen" and "of good and perfect memory, thanks be to God", there is absolutely no religious formula, not even "I bequeath

my soul". This, too, must be deliberate. It has not yet been possible to trace the religious affiliation of any of these thirteen testators, but the enquiry is proceeding.

Further work is being done on wills, including a group between 1550 and 1660. Our present impression (and it can be no more) is of scribes who had some common source available, who had a choice of phrases, some of which a given scribe invariably used, others which he varied either for his own satisfaction or according to his knowledge of what would please his testator, but that there were occasional testators whose religious views led them to demand a phraseology to express them. For the most part, we doubt whether the religious views of the scribe himself determined the form of the will.

MISCELLANY

More Midland Midwifery
contributed by Christopher Charlton

The extracts which follow are taken from Observations in Midwifery a book, written by Percivall Willughby, a seventeenth century physician, first published in 1863 and now, with a new introduction by John L. Thornton F.L.A. republished by S.R. Publishers Ltd. Willughby practised in Derbyshire, Staffordshire and London and the book is primarily a collection of case histories drawn from his experiences in these areas. Willughby believed in something like natural childbirth and time and again condemns the futile practices, the brutality, and the ignorance of the local midwife.

THE MIDWIFES DUTY

The midwife's dutie, in a natural birth, is no more but to attend, and wait on, nature, and to receive the child; and, (if need require) to help to fetch the after-birth, and her best care will bee to see that the woman and child bee fittingly and decently ordered with necessary conveniences

I have known severall women, that have been delivered without a midwife. Therefore to have a midwife is not absolutely necessary, yet very convenient, to assist the woman, and so to avoid all future suspicions, and to free some of the looser sort from the danger of the statute-law, in case that the child should bee found dead.

Let not women, turning midwives, delude themselves, by thinking, That this work will be learned by seeing a few women delivered, or by little practice, or by discourse, or by reading books, that it will sufficiently bee understood. All these bee good helps and inducements to shew them somewhat in the way of practice. But in cases of danger, and in unnatural births, without much practice, they will find themselves ignorant, and at a stand, not knowing what path to follow, or what course to take for the woman's safety, or the saving of their own credits.

Every delivery hath taught mee something, or, at the least, hath confirmed my practice.

(pages 11 and 12)

WITHOUT A MIDWIFE

There was a naturall foole, shee had good friends. It was her mishap to prove with child. Her friends were very carefull of her, and shee lay between two women every night, and, by them, shee was looked unto, and attended.

But at the last, not knowing what labour was, as these women slept, finding her belly to ake, shee stole from between them, and hasted to a ditch side, where did run a small rivulet of water; There, supposing to ease her belly-ach, instead of a naturall stoole, an abortion came from her.

This business was soon begun, and quickly ended, and shee presently returned.

But the women, her attenders, missing her, did arise to follow her, and they met her nigh, comming towards the house. They asked her where shee had been; shee said, That her belly did ake, that shee went to the ditch to grunt, that some-thing was come from her, and that it lay on the bank.

So this poor creature, not knowing what labour meant, was, through ignorance, by Dame nature, quickly, and easily delivered; and, instead of going to the ground, was freed of an abortment.

Nevertheless the Coroner sent this poor foole to the Goale. Shee knew not how to plead for her life. I was hearily grieved at her simplicity. I moved the Coroner to speak for her. Hee informed the judg, that it was a very small child, and the whole Bench saw that shee was a foole. It was in the Protector's dayes, and I feared that shee would have summum jus.

The judg shewed the statute-book to the jury. Neither judg nor jury regarded her simplicity. They found her guilty, the judg condemned her, and shee was, afterwards, hanged for not having a woman by her, at her delivery. (1)

Let all honest women take notice how easily, and quickly shee was delivered, through warme keeping, and quietnes, without a midwife. Let the looser sort fear to commit folly, and, if casually they should transgresse, to bee carefull, not to bee alone in their travails, least they should suffer, as this poore, simple creature did.

And let all midwives bee assured, That it is not their labours, in pulling, and haling their women's bodies, that causeth delivery.

But that it is the work of Dame nature. And that the apple peare, or plumb, or any other fruit, being full ripe, will fall off it self, without enforcement.

(pages 273, 274 and 275)

THE CROCHET

The crochet is of most excellent use, to extract the dead child, when it is locked between the os pubis, and coccygis, and cannot bee displaced, or pushed upward, to turn, and so to draw it forth by the feet, without hurting the mother, or endangering her life, through bruises. It is also convenient to take forth a child's head, that is pulled off and so left in the womb.

It should bee about 10 or 11 inches long, of a reasonable circuit in the head of it, that it may take hold; and not too sharp pointed, but rather somewhat bluntish.

And, for feare, in your working, you should not certainly know where the point of your instrument bendeth, let there bee a broad nick, or notch, or some other mark in the handle of your instrument; right against the point of it, and it will direct you where the point resteth, and which way it turneth, Without such a mark you cannot, alwayes, well find the point of your instrument.

I know not a better instrument, than the crochet, to help a woman in extremity, when shee is overweari'd, and that her strength, with all other meanes, doth faile, and the woman's body very narrow, or strait, or swel'd by violent enforcement, and the child dead.

But, if it bee not used with great care, and judgment, it may prove destructive, by ill fixing, as well as by tearing, and losing the hold, as also by hasty, and rash drawing, and so wound the woman.

..... Mrs. Curson. At Brelsford about the yeare 1634 I layd a Gentlewoman, that had lien severall dayes in labour. The child came by the head, and did stink. I quickly drew it with the crochet. Shee soon recovered her weaknes, and, afterwards, had severall children.

(pages 87 and 88)

SOME DIFFICULT BIRTHS

A London midwife, very officious, endeavouring to have a speedy delivery, through haling, and stretching those tender parts, made a labour of long continuance, and, with her halings, a breach about an inch long into the fundament. With this affliction the woman was much disquieted. For ever afterwards her excrements came forth by the birth place; yet this woman did much commend her laborious midwife, and said that shee took great pains to deliver her, to save her life.

This fact was done in Fleet -street. The woman came to mee for help, and, shewed me her torn body.

(page 54)

(A) Ticknall midwife endeavoured, ... to deliver a potter 's wife by quartering the skull with a knife, and taking forth the braines, yet shee could not bring forth the child. But shee much hurted the woman. Her ignorance, with the woman's afflictions, stopt her for proceeding any farther. So her husband came to mee. I went with him . I sent for the midwife and drew the child with the crochet, as shee stood by mee. The child was great, and smelt, and did stink This poore woman died the next day, I believe, through the hurts that shee received from her midwife's knife.

(page 155)

Not far from Ashburn there was a poor creature, that was willing to suffer any affliction to bee deliverd. After much pulling , and stretching her body, her conceited midwife's last refuge was, not to roll her on the bed , but to tosse her in a blanket, as some have served dogs, hoping that this violent motion would enforce the child out of her body.. But her conceits failing , I was sent for

(page 157)

A good friend , and an honest , good woman gave mee this report of her mother's sufferings. Her mother had a lusty , young woman for her midwife. And , in the time of her travaile, the infant came by the arme. Shee pulled long by the arme, so hoping to deliver her. But at the last , with her pulling shee tore the shoulder from the child's body; then, wrapping it privately in cloths, shee conveyed it into her pocket, and fained an excuse, That she must needs go home, saying that shee would come again. But , her mother continuing in extremity, another midwife was sent for, and shee was delivered before the first midwife returned. The child, being viewed, was seen to want an arme. Much search was made to find it, but it was not to bee found. At last, the first midwife returned. Shee was asked what shee had done with the child's arme. Then , with shame , shee took it forth of her pocket , and gave it to the company.

(page 161)

- (1) The Editors would be pleased to hear from anyone who can illuminate the legal requirements referred to by Willugby here and above.

CORRESPONDENCE

Is L.P.S. too technical?

Dear Sir,

How I welcomed the letter from Mrs. Massey in L.P.S. 6 but even she falls into the trap of being too technical. Population Study is in great danger of following the fate of the Wozzle Wozzle bird if it has not already done so.

An historians job is to explain history and make it live, some of us who are left to explain population study are finding it necessary to explain explanations. If we are not very careful we shall find egghead talking to egghead and none to understand what they mean except another egghead.

History is about people, to produce, as Mr. Bradley has done in his article in No. 5 of L.P.S., a table of birth-baptism intervals for two imaginary parishes is a mathematical digression into a world of fantasy which has nothing to do with people who lived, died, had babies and woke screaming in the night.

Take this as a friendly appeal to alter course and fly not in smaller and smaller circles muttering to ourselves but in a straight line which leads somewhere.

Yours faithfully,

David N. Durant,
The Old House,
Bleasby,
Nottingham, NG14 7FU

Dear Sir,

I might be interested in coming to your meeting on the 16th April, but I would feel a fish out of water among so many who have given so much time to unravelling population statistics, as my interest is only occasional and not very deep. But it may possibly help you in deciding the pattern of issues if I pass a comment on the articles in L.P.S. 6.

Editorial Of interest, even though I am regularly at the P.R.O.
Look forward to the continuation.

News from Cambridge Group. Is interesting to me as a check list,
to see what other people are doing, to see if there are
any ideas I can "pinch". In this case there is nothing
directly relevant; but I would like to know more about
the effects of the civil wars on the population, as there
seems to have been a decline in trade.

Seasonality of Baptisms. I read this to see if there would be any-
thing in it for me. But I think it is bound to be
inconclusive and we lack the information to explain
differences. I have dabbled in this and given it up
as pointless.

Parish Registers and Mobility. Of interest for technique, but of no
interest as it deals with the north of England, and I
am parochial.

Group Research Methods. Too elementary for me as I have
struggled through these stages.

Miscellany. Good clean fun.

Correspondence. At times tends to be like "Economica" with answer
and rejoinder; but all the same I am glad to see how
people deal with their difficulties.

Has L.P.S. become too technical. This is largely what my letter
is all about. 1542 Muster Rolls has brought these to
my notice as a source for the future.

Some Recent Publications. I am always glad to look through this to
see if there is anything that would be of interest to me.

Local Research in Progress. I am always glad to look down this
list, for the counties and towns which interest me.

In past issues I was glad to see the list of early census
returns.

I have dabbled with hearth tax returns as local studies.
I have thought of trying an analysis of the ship money returns, to
see what would come out in the wash; but have not had time to try it.

Some years ago I did an analysis of the plague deaths in
Ipswich. Fortunately, the Rev. Ralph Josselin at Earls Colne kept

a diary, and the weather recorded there and in Pepys gave me a rough guide to temperatures. There was a remarkably close relationship between temperature and burials, allowing for incubation.

Yours faithfully,

A.G.E. Jones
Southborough,
Tunbridge Wells, Kent

Hearth Tax, a useful reference

Dear Sir,

In the list of references in my article on Hearth Tax (L.P.S. 7) I failed to mention one extremely useful general reference, West J. Village Records, London 1962. In particular pages 134 and 135 which give an interesting list of published and unpublished Hearth Tax returns for different counties.

Yours faithfully,

John Patten,
School of Geography,
University of Oxford,
Mansfield Road, Oxford

Will precedent books?

Dear Sir,

The views expressed by Dr. Margaret Spufford (The Scribes of Villagers' Wills; No. 7, Autumn 1971) accord in the main with those I have formed whilst studying the wills of upper Wensleydale.

I wonder, however, whether there may not have been precedent books (or, perhaps, pamphlets) setting out various introductory phrases for the use of those preparing wills.

This suggestion is made as a result of noticing similar phrases in wills from many parts of the country. In particular, may I draw your attention to one phrase from the will of Thomas Staploe in 1668, quoted by Dr. Spufford on p.40: "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."

The identical phrase, verbatim, occurs in the will of Thomas Rudd of Bainbridge, miller, made 10 Jan 1690/1. I find it difficult to believe that a will made in East Anglia in 1668 and one made in north Yorkshire in 1691 did not use the same source, rather than that Thomas Staploe was using his own words, although I would agree that the phrase would be used to express Staploe's personal feelings, and that would also apply to Thomas Rudd.

Yours faithfully,

Dear Sir,

May I add to my earlier letter this preamble which I particularly like, and which may interest Dr. Spufford. It is from the will of Henry Deacon, yeoman, of Burton in Bishopdale, dated 11 April 1677: "First as touchinge my wife with whome I coupled my selfe in the feare of god, refusinge all other women, I linked my selfe unto her, livinge with her in the blessed estate of honorable wedlocke And albeit I doubt not but that god after my departure accordinge to his promise will bee unto her A husband; yea A father, a patron and A defender and will not suffer her to lacke if she trust, feare and serve him diligently callinge upon his holy name; yet for asmuchas god hath blessed me with some worldly substance and she is my owne flesh, and who soe provideth not for his, denyeth the fayeth, and is worse than an Infidell, I therefore give and bequeath unto Hellenay my wife dureinge her naturall life The occupacon of this howse and killne with the appurtenances (wherein I now dwell)..."

It seems to me clear that it was the testator himself who was expressing his own feelings, for surely no-one would put just those words into the mouth of another.

Yours sincerely,

Hartley Thwaite
7, Manor Park,
Scarcroft, Leeds LS14 3BW

Margaret Spufford Comments

Dear Sir,

I found Mr. Thwaite's letter enquiring whether there were formulary books in general use in the seventeenth century very interesting. It raises a point I have been puzzling over myself for some time, and one, indeed, which I would appreciate help with, since I have found no satisfactory answer. I do agree that the approximate coincidence between dedicatory clauses in a cross-section of wills from different settlements within the same area made at the same date is very striking. I must point out that Mr. Thwaite has used my example of the initial part of the dedicatory clause of Thomas Staploe's will made in Cambs. in 1668, and compared it with that of the identical opening to Thomas Rudd's will made in the East Riding in 1691, but not used the really idiosyncratic clauses of Thomas Staploe's will, which follow the opening. I doubt if these are identical?

However I admit the approximate coincidence in dedicatory clauses over the same period in widespread parts of the country. I can only say to this, that in the first place, whatever general ecclesiastical fashion was in vogue did percolate right down to the humble levels of society and that only a finite number of phrases existed. In the second place, I have shown that, although the approximate coincidence between wills made at the same time over a wide area no doubt existed, the exact coincidence between the wording of the same scribe working in the same place, unless he was writing for a man of strong opinions, was even more remarkable. Thirdly, I have shown that most wills, in the few villages I have examined, were not written by ecclesiastical officials, or by notaries public, who might be expected to have a formulary book to hand, but by villagers, and shopkeepers. I would not necessarily expect them to be pre-equipped with a formulary book; even though very minor gentry, and schoolmasters might well be.

I would still be glad to have Mr. Thwaite's question answered myself. The only formulary book I have been able to find (although I have not been able to look extensively myself) is that of H. Swinbourne (or Swinburne) A Brief Treatise of Testaments and Last Willes (1611). This is entirely a legal guide, although it does state that in 'unsolemne' testaments, which are those that concern us, it does not matter if the will is written on paper or parchment, or in what hand or language 'either faire or otherwise, so the same may be read and understood'. He also states that the words are immaterial 'Words and sentences are not required for the forme of a testament,

but for expressing the Will and meaning of the testator'. (My italics)
He nowhere gives an example of a clause bequeathing the soul. This is not conclusive; but it is suggestive. It is also suggestive that Mrs. Owen, Archivist to the Bishop of Ely, tells me that there are no formal examples of dedicatory clauses in the manuscript formulary books of the diocese. These include one of the appropriate date, the second half of the sixteenth century. I simply do not believe that most village scribes copied from a formulary, now that I know who, in one county, they were; I believe that they followed the fashion in vogue in the particular village at that time, although this naturally reflected general fashion to some extent.

If any reader could enlighten me on the number, and volume of willformularies in circulation up to 1700 and their dates and prove me wrong, I as well as Mr. Thwaite, would be grateful for help with a problem I have found difficult.

Yours sincerely,

Margaret Spufford,
Lucy Cavendish College,
Cambridge CB3 0BU

Errata

Editor's Note

Dr. Spufford has identified a number of errors and omissions in her article *The Scribes of Villagers' Wills in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and their influence* L.P.S.7. We can only apologise for these mistakes and thank Dr. Spufford for drawing them to our attention.

Page 36 line 26 supply 'y' to Almighty
page 39 line 11 delete 'n' to read 'God that gave it me'
page 39 last three lines. Third line from the bottom, delete 'books incidentally'; second line from the bottom, delete the whole of the sentence beginning 'Neither of the' and also delete the first two words of the last line. Begin a new sentence, giving 'Four' a capital letter.
Page 41 through a misunderstanding, Dr. Spufford's conclusion was not printed as she would have wished and a number of lines were omitted.

Notes

19. This should read Studies in Church History,
8, 1971, 203-11.
21. W.M. Palmer not W.N. Palmer.

In Search of Nonconformity L.P.S. 7

Dear Sir,

I have some experience in Nottinghamshire of the problems relating to the location of Non-conformist records cited by your correspondent Mrs. Thoday in your last issue and possibly can give you some general assistance.

Unfortunately the records of non-conformist bodies are some of the hardest to track down since there is no central agency to retain them: the individual churches themselves very often keep their documents though the appointment of denominational archivists has resulted in this becoming less common. Many of the Baptist records for the E. Midlands have recently been handed over to the appropriate county or city record office, or occasionally to the University: where the appeal has had no response at least those concerned with the church have been made aware of the importance of their holdings. A similar operation is being mounted for the Methodist records which it is hoped will bring considerable material into the record offices where it can be preserved and seen by the public. Current records, or those of a confidential nature are of course excepted, though the latter are often deposited with a time limit imposed upon them. The Quaker records for Notts. and Derbys., up to about 1850, are all held in the archives department of the Nottingham Central Library in Sherwood Street. These are a particularly satisfactory group in that the Society of Friends was exceptionally careful to record all their meetings and business. The Congregationalists either still retain their records - for instance those at Castle Gate Congregational Church in Nottingham - or have made small deposits in the record offices: the most interesting Presbyterian material - that connected with High Pavement chapel - is at the University with other similar deposits for the Old Meeting House in Mansfield. The local records are therefore scattered between the University, the city and county record offices and the individual churches. It seems likely that this is a familiar pattern

throughout the country.

At a national level, apart from the sources mentioned by your correspondent, there is also Dr. William's Library in Gordon Square, London, where there are considerable deposits including statistical surveys. Other libraries such as the one at Friends House in the Euston Road, or the Methodist Archives in City Road, have substantial printed and manuscript sources which are well worth checking through. Unfortunately not all the large deposits are even in London: for example a very large corpus of material on the Countess of Huntingdon's Connexion from 1769 onwards is at Cheshunt College, Cambridge. All the foregoing information is mainly concerned with the manuscript material, but it must not be forgotten that many of the most important records have been printed and are thus much easier to obtain and use. An indication of some of the main printed sources can be found in a very useful article on Protestant non-conformity and its sources in the Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research vol. xxv (1952).

It would be possible to elaborate indefinitely on the whereabouts of non-conformist records but perhaps this will give other searchers some guide lines on which to work. It need only be added that records frequently exist when the custodians are unaware of them, and it is often only because of the diligent and persistent enquirer that they come to light.

Yours,

Helen Forde,
18 Linden Drive, Evington,
Leicester, LE5 6AH

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; 1972 Price £0.40. (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. £0.45
- A. Rogers (ed.) REPRINT OF THREE LOCAL HISTORY BOOKLETS BASED ON RADIO NOTTINGHAM To be published 1972. £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

LOCAL RESEARCH IN PROGRESS

The Editors believe that one of the functions of Local Population Studies should be to enable readers to make contact with others working in the same field as themselves. LOCAL RESEARCH IN PROGRESS, which should be the medium for this contact, has hitherto been confined to work known to the Cambridge Group. THE EDITORS CORDIALLY INVITE READERS TO SUBMIT BRIEF DETAILS OF WORK WHICH THEY HAVE IN PROGRESS.

The Institute of Heraldic and Genealogical Studies, Northgate, Canterbury, has a research group working on The Nineteenth Century Workhouse Population. It has a complete set of microfilm of the 1851 census returns for the following workhouses: the whole Thanet Area, Canterbury and Bridge Blaen. These are being analysed, with indexes of the individuals involved and family histories.

The Matlock Population Studies Group is working on a Reconstitution for the parish of Matlock and on Wills and Inventories, Literacy, the Manorial Court Rolls and on the growth of Nonconformity.

At Bleasby (Notts.) a group is attempting a full scale reconstitution of the parish register and integrating the information it contains with a wide range of other documentary sources. These include estate records, wills, inventories, overseers accounts, some fine maps and a parish listing. Aggregative analyses of Bleasby and Hoveringham are near completion.

L. Bradley, Sheldon Cottage, Elton, Matlock, is collating Hearth Tax, Poll Tax and Compton Census returns for the whole of the Hundred of Wirksworth in order to compare the resulting population estimates and assess their validity. He is also collating these returns for some of the parishes with the parish registers for the second half of the 17th century in a partial reconstitution in order to test such factors as stability and mobility.

Aggregation, Listings etc. known to the Cambridge Group.

COUNTY	PARISH	NAME	ADDRESSES
<u>OXFORDSHIRE</u>			
<u>Aggregative</u>	Banbury*	J. S. W. Gibson	Humber House, Bloxham, Banbury

COUNTY	PARISH	NAMES	ADDRESSES
	Chinnor*	K. Evans	Beorcham, Manor Park Avenue, Princes Risborough, Bucks.
	Chipping Norton*	Miss M.G. and O.M. Meades	65 New Street, Chipping Norton
	Cuddesdon*	The Misses M. M. H. Cross	Jack Straw House, 123 Staunton Road, Headington, Oxford
	Standlake	Mrs. J. Goadby	Gaunthill, Standlake, Nr. Witney
	Wootton*	G. M. Pearce	Little Leys, 52 Franklin Road, Headington, Oxford

Literacy

	Beckley*	Miss C. Kùcheman	Dept. of Physical Anthropology, 11 Keble Rd., Oxford
	Charlton-on- Otmoor*	Miss C. Kùcheman	
	Claydon*	Miss M. M. H. Cross	
	Cuddesdon*	Miss M. M. H. Cross	
	Elsfield*	Miss C. Kùcheman	
	Great Tew*	Miss M. M. H. Cross	
	Merton*	Miss C. Kùcheman	
	Oddington*	Miss C. Kùcheman	
	Purton*	Miss M. M. H. Cross	
	Swalecliffe*	Miss M. M. H. Cross	
	Wendebury*	Miss C. Kùcheman	
	Weston*	Miss C. Kùcheman	
	Wigginton*	Miss M. M. H. Cross	

Listings

Lower Heyford* 1742, 1771

Summertown 1832

Reconstitution

Banbury	Mrs. S. Stewart	45 Trafalgar Road, Birmingham 13
---------	-----------------	-------------------------------------

RUTLAND

Aggregative

Exton*	J. C. Jennings	Uppingham School, Stonehurst, Uppingham
Lyddington*	J. C. Jennings	
Oakham*	J. H. Rhodes	Kesteven Training College, Stoke Rochford, Grantham, Lincs.

Literacy

Bisbrooke*	B. C. Morgan	Uppingham School, Uppingham Rutland
Braunston*	B. C. Morgan	
Lyddington*	B. C. Morgan	
Stoke Dry*	B. C. Morgan	

Listings

Reconstitution

SALOP

Albersbury*	L. C. Lloyd	The Coppice, Cardeston, Ford, Shrewsbury
Albrighton*	Miss J. Edwards	F. 12 Madeley Coll. of Edn, Nelson Hall, Nr. Stafford
Baschurch*	Miss M. C. Hill	County Record Office, Shirehall, Abbey Foregate, Shrewsbury
Bitterley*	E. L. Morley	2 Dinham, Ludlow, Salop

Bromfield *	E. L. Morley	2 Dinham, Ludlow, Salop
Broseley	D. Mason	Pen y Bryn, Benthall, Nr. Broseley, Salop
Cleobury Mortimer*	E. L. Morley	
Ercall Magna*	Miss M. and Miss O. Meades	65 New St., Chipping Norton, Oxon
Ludlow St. Lawrence*	E. L. Morley	
Much Wenlock	L. C. Lloyd	
Onibury*	E. L. Morley	
Oswestry*	L. C. Lloyd	
Pontesbury*	Miss K. Oosterveen	Cambridge Group
Shrewsbury St. Alkmund*	A. Gaydon	Victoria History of
St. Chad*	A. Gaydon	Shropshire, Shirehall, Abbey Foregate, Shrewsbury
Holy Cross and St. Giles*		
St. Julian*	A. Gaydon	
St. Mary*	A. Gaydon	
Stanton Lacy*	E. L. Morley	
Westbury*	Miss K. Oosterveen	
Wem*	Robert Laslett	3 Clarkson Road, Cambridge
<u>Literacy</u>	-----	
<u>Listings</u>	Ludlow 1689*	
<u>Reconstitution</u>	-----	
<u>SOMERSET</u>		
<u>Aggregative</u>		
Axbridge	Mrs. F. Neale	The Knoll, Winscombe Hill, Winscombe, Somerset

Bridgewater*	T. Hedley Barry	Crofton Hotel, Bridgewater, Som.
Castle Cary*	Mrs. P. M. Shorrocks	222 Staplegrove Road, Taunton
Congresbury*	Mrs. F. Neale	
Crewkerne*	L. C. Hayward	222 Goldcroft Road, Yeovil, Som.
Frome*	A. H. Noble	1 Vale Court, London, W. 9
Martock*	Miss A. Cunningham	The Chantry, Ilminster, Som.
Milborne Port*	L. C. Hayward	
North Cadbury*	E. Harrison	18 Hopton Road, Cam, Dursley, Glos.
North Petherton*	R. L. Stevens	26 Cambridge Road, Linton, Cambs.
Nunney	Mrs. H. M. Massey	Hurst, Spring Gardens, Frome, Som.
Pitminster*	I. I. Jeffries	Rosemary Cottage, Clayhidon, Collumpton, Devon
Wedmore*	Miss K. Oosterveen	Cambridge Group
Wrington	Mrs. F. Neale	
Yeovil*	L. C. Hayward	
<u>Literacy</u>		
Combe-Hay	Mrs. H. M. Massy	
Dunster*	Dr. R. S. Schofield	Cambridge Group
Fitzhead*	-ditto-	
Haslebury- Plunkett*	-ditto-	
Kilmington*	Mrs. H. M. Massey	
Leighland*	Dr. R. S. Schofield	
Lamyat*	Mrs. H. M. Massey	
Long Sutton*	Dr. R. S. Schofield	

Staple-Fitzpaine* Dr. R. S. Schofield

Stringston* -ditto-

Tintinhull* -ditto-

Listings

Badstock* 1803

Reconstitution

**THE UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
PUBLICATIONS**

**Paper 11
SOURCES FOR THE HISTORY
OF POPULATION AND
THEIR USES**

Edited by W. B. STEPHENS,
M.A., Ph.D., F.R.Hist.S., F.S.A.

This booklet is one of a projected series which aims to promote the study of history from source material with special reference to Yorkshire. It provides in three sections an account of the types of sources available for the study of historical demography and their nature; a set of examples of typical documents; and detailed suggestions for the use of such records by children of various age groups.

Price: 50p, plus postage
Available from The Secretary,
The Institute of Education,
The University, Leeds, LS2 9JT

**PARISH MAPS
OF THE COUNTIES OF
ENGLAND & WALES**

Indispensable series for
genealogists, record searchers
and local historians

Delineating parochial boundaries and probate jurisdictions together with dates of commencement of registers, 17 in. x 13 in.

Each map 60p (\$1.50); London 80p (\$2.00),
post and packing free.

Wales and Yorkshire both appear as three maps.

Available from The Institute of Heraldic
and Genealogical Studies, Northgate,
Canterbury, Kent. The Institute has
produced a journal

FAMILY HISTORY since 1962—
£1.60 p.a.

**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.