

Local
Population
Studies

No. 9
Autumn 1972

LOCAL POPULATION STUDIES

No. 9 Autumn 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
DEREK TURNER
RICHARD WALL

LETTERS to the Editorial Board should be addressed to:-

RICHARD WALL,
20 SILVER STREET,
CAMBRIDGE

L.P.S. retains the COPYRIGHT of any articles published.

SUBSCRIPTIONS

The Annual Subscription to Local Population Studies is 75p for U.K. and 3 dollars for 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. Bankers Orders should be made payable to Local Population Studies, Cooperative Bank Ltd., 10 The Wardwick, Derby.

Individual copies and back numbers available from the Subscription Secretary. 50p each.

Details of advertising rates are obtainable from:-

The Advertising and Business Manager,
Local Population Studies,
Tawney House,
Matlock,
Derbyshire, DE4 3BT

CONTENTS

	Page
Editorial	
A conversation at Somerset House (part two)	4
A new member of the editorial board	8
The Matlock Conference	8
Access to University Libraries	9
News from the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure: Crisis Mortality	10
R. S. Schofield	
An Enquiry into the Frequency of the Parochial Registration of Catholics in a 17th century Warwickshire Parish.	23
V. T. J. Arkell	
Wills and Will-makers in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: some Lancashire Evidence.	33
R. C. Richardson	
Notes and Queries:	
Homicide, infanticide and child assault in late Tudor Middlesex.	43
P. E. H. Hair	
Seventeenth century Midland Midwifery: A comment.	47
Janet M. Blackman	
Correspondence	49
Some Recent Publications	64
Work in Progress	74

Miscellany has been omitted from this issue
to make way for an enlarged correspondence
section.

EDITORIAL

CONVERSATION AT SOMERSET HOUSE (part 2)

A conversation at Somerset House between two members of the Editorial Board and Mr. R. Schueller and Mr. I.M. Golds of the Office of Population Censuses and Surveys.

Editors: Could we now move to the question of access to census documents.

Mr. Golds: Access to the census records themselves is restricted by the hundred years rule that is placed upon the census returns. They are not released to the public until 100 years has elapsed. The latest one available is 1871 and that's now at the Public Record Office.

Editors: Is there then no possibility of obtaining material for research purposes from later censuses?

Mr. Golds We are bound by the 100 years rule to keep the records closed to the public for that time, but we have access to the records ourselves and could of course always consider means of meeting particular requests which we receive for information from past censuses which is additional to what was tabulated at the time. But we would have to ensure that we were not supplying data in a form which would reveal information about identifiable individuals. Another restriction is that (except for recent censuses) we do not have any special staff resources to meet this sort of requirement, so that it is only in cases of really serious research projects that we could hope to take on the work involved.

Editors: You mention the 100 year rule. As a recent contributor to L.P.S. pointed out, this hasn't always applied to the whole of the U.K.

- Mr. Golds: As far as England and Wales is concerned, the rule is laid down by an Order of the Lord Chancellor which was made in 1966. But that was not in fact a change of policy because public access to the census records from 1871 onwards had not yet been permitted at that time and the records were kept in the GRO under our control. 1861 Census records were not opened for the public to inspect until 1962, on the expiry of 100 years. I am not certain off-hand when the 1851 and 1841 records were opened to the public but a less specific pledge of confidentiality seems to have been given for those early censuses and there wouldn't have been the same constraints on policy about general access.
- Editors: This rule puts the U. K. out of line with the practice of certain other European countries. Is this likely to be altered or influenced by Common Market ties? Several other countries have adopted the 50-year rule.
- Mr. Golds: I don't feel competent to forecast the influence of the Market on future censuses, but I do not see us modifying our rule on access to past census returns; certain assurances of confidentiality were given at the time to the public and we have an obligation therefore to the people whose details were given on the form.
- Editors: It would be interesting to know how the decision about the 100-year rule came to be made. It has come at a time when the regulations governing access to other documents have been relaxed. The 50-year rule has given way to a 30-year rule for many Government records, so it looks like a movement in two different directions.
- Mr. Schueller: Yes, but we are talking about two quite different things. One is purely political, but in a census we deal with knowledge which is the property of individuals, and the Registrar General is bound to stick to the rule which says that census information is confidential. He is the guardian of the rules laid down in Parliament.
- Mr. Golds: Census records which are only 30 or even 50 years old contain information about people who are very much still around. The hundred-year period was fixed because it comes near ensuring that the risk of any disclosure about living people is eliminated.

- Editors: The question of confidentiality is very difficult. The suggestion has been put to us that if you and other Civil Servants are able to sign the Official Secrets Act, why can't academics or others do the same in order to have access to confidential information for research purposes?
- Mr. Schueller: Because a civil servant would lose his job if he disclosed information. In any case even though a person is engaged in some research project he is still someone from whom the public expect their confidential information to be protected.
- Editors: On the question of access again, for most readers of L. P. S. the most important question is likely to be concerned with the vital registration material held by local Registrars, which could be of enormous value, for instance as a supplement to family reconstitution.
- Mr. Schueller: Normally any member of the public may obtain a copy of an entry if he can supply enough detail and pays the statutory fee. A Registrar, if he gets a request for special facilities from a person doing research, will write to the Registrar General for guidance. It will then be decided how far research is valuable and how far any request for such facilities should be supported. If it is supported, the person will then have to give certain undertakings. The Registration Act says that the Registrar General is to issue and make available for public inspection only alphabetical indexes of records, so that records can be traced.
- Editors: Many of our readers, if they were working on your material, would want to make a general search of the registers, not merely use the index to find individual entries, as would usually be the case with genealogical or legal enquiries.
- Mr. Schueller: Normally people would have to use the indexes for general searches. Use of the records themselves in the way you mention goes beyond what is authorised by statute.
- Editors: Presumably enquiries about research of this kind should be addressed to the appropriate local Registrar?
- Mr. Schueller: Yes, and the local Registrar must pass on the enquiry to the Registrar General, who would then decide.

Editors: We believe you are eventually hoping to make pre-1871 vital registration material openly available to the public on micro-film?

Mr. Schueller: We are now preparing micro-film copies of all the records we have. At the moment the conditions under which the registration documents are stored are such that public access to records in any kind of numbers would be impossible. Once microfilms are available, it might be possible, if there is the necessary machinery and if accommodation which is already inadequate for existing work can be expanded.

Editors: Where would a person making a general enquiry stand with regard to fees?

Mr. Schueller: If access is permitted to local records research workers must arrange charges with the Superintendent Registrar and the council.
At Somerset House, you can search the indexes without charge, and it then depends on the type of information you want. If you want certificates, you pay the established fee; if you want only extracted information, it might be possible to do it on an ad hoc basis.
This department tries to support anything we feel worthwhile so long as it does not conflict with the conditions as laid down by law and the assurances which have been given to the public. We realise we have a terrific lot of information here which is partially unused and could be used more.

This concludes this conversation. Certain other aspects of work carried on in Somerset House will be considered in a later issue.

A NEW MEMBER OF THE EDITORIAL BOARD

In L.P.S. 6 the editors expressed the hope that it would soon be possible to increase the membership of the editorial board and in particular, to find someone to work with Colin Barham in bringing L.P.S. into closer contact with population studies in schools and colleges.

Now, we have invited Derek Turner to serve L.P.S. in this capacity. Already, as the author of the Historical Association pamphlet, Historical Demography in Schools, and as head of the History Department at Christ's Hospital, he has explored the practical connection between population studies and the school syllabus. Through L.P.S. he hopes to develop this further.

We look forward to L.P.S. promoting demographic studies in schools and colleges more effectively. The next editorial (L.P.S. 10) will have more to say on this subject.

THE MATLOCK CONFERENCE

The L.P.S. weekend residential conference held in Matlock (July 21st - 23rd) in association with Nottingham University Department of Adult Education, seemed to its sponsors to have more than justified the efforts required to organise and promote it. It was attended by L.P.S. subscribers and others from all over the country; some beginners, some more expert, but in sufficient numbers to run all the three seminar groups as planned. One meeting was devoted to L.P.S. affairs. The main points emerging from that discussion are presented in the Correspondence section in letters from others who took part. But one editorial decision that followed the conference should be reported here. It was suggested that the conference should become an annual event. We were flattered and impressed by this request, but on reflection felt an L.P.S. Conference every two years would be a pattern more suited to our present strength. So the next L.P.S. Conference should be in 1974.

In the meantime, the best we can offer is assistance in organizing local or regional 'schools' or seminars introducing some of the elementary techniques of local population studies for groups of local historians or teachers. Anyone interested in discussing such a project should contact Richard Wall who will pass on the request to whichever members of the editorial board are likely to be able to participate.

ACCESS TO UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

An L.P.S. subscriber has drawn our attention to the recent controversy concerning public access to university libraries. At his request we wish to point out that any library purchasing books under the special terms allowed to libraries by the net book agreement is bound to permit public access. In our experience most university and other academic libraries are generally prepared to accommodate and even welcome the serious student if not the less distinguished public. But we are informed that this is not always so. We hope L.P.S. subscribers, should they be refused access, will so far as they are able, insist on their rights. If nothing else, write to L.P.S. about it!

David Avery
Colin Barham
Christopher Charlton
Roger Schofield
Derek Turner
Richard Wall

POSTSCRIPT

The Editor's are planning and L.P.S. supplement entirely devoted to Plague. They would be glad to hear of any register or other information relating to Plague suitable for inclusion in a Plague Miscellany.

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

We have recently embarked on a detailed comparison of the results of our family reconstitution of Colyton in Devon with the information given in the census schedules of 1841, 1851 and 1861. This is revealing some interesting points about the completeness and accuracy of registration in both the parish registers and the census schedules. It also allows new kinds of questions to be tackled: for example, the ages at which children left home, how near to their parents' married children lived, and the relationship of servants to the head of the household in which they were living and working. Tony Wrigley and Richard Wall will be reporting on this work at a Seminar on Population History organised by the Department of Economic History of the University of Exeter, to be held at Dartington Hall, Devon on 10th and 11th February 1973. Other speakers will be Professor Norman Pound on the Population of Cornwall before the First Census, Dr. Mary Griffiths on Mortality and Social Studies in the Population of Exeter in the 19th century, Brian Clapp on Wembworthy, and Nicholas Crafts. Further details can be obtained from Professor W.E. Minchinton, Department of Economic History, Streatham Court, Rennes Drive, Exeter EX4 4PU.

Peter Laslett
R. Schofield
E.A. Wrigley

"CRISIS" MORTALITY

One of the most striking features of some parish registers is the recording of unusually large numbers of burials over short periods of time. We can easily imagine the dramatic impact of such "crisis" mortality on both families and communities, but "crisis" mortality has also featured in the more abstract debate over the reasons for the course of population change in the past. Some writers, for example J.D. Chambers in L.P.S. No. 3, have stressed the importance of this kind of mortality for the relative stability of the population in the seventeenth century, and pointed to its disappearance in the eighteenth century as a powerful agent of population growth.¹ Although "crisis" mortality deserves to be studied in detail, there is

something to be said for taking a relatively simple definition of a "crisis" and using this to get some idea of the prevalence of epidemics in a parish, or in a group of parishes, at different periods in the past.

If we decide to work in this rather summary way, the first thing we need to do is to discover the years in which unusually large numbers of burials were recorded. By proceeding on a yearly, rather than on a monthly, basis, we shall lose some detail and in particular we may be in danger of missing "crisis" periods which run through December and January and thus get split between two calendar years. We should probably lose fewer "crisis" periods in this way if we were to start the year at a date when burials were usually relatively low, say on May 1st; but the calendar year is adequate for most purposes. In order to be able to tell whether any particular year witnessed an unusually large number of burials or not, we need to have some idea of what the usual annual number of burials would have been for that date. One reasonable way of discovering this would be to take a fairly long moving average, say of eleven years, centred on the year in question. This is probably better than taking a period of eleven years proceeding that year because if there were a rising or falling trend in the annual number of burials, possibly because the population were growing or declining, a figure based on the preceding eleven years would lead us to expect too few burials in the current year in the case of a rising trend, and too many burials in the case of a falling trend. The moving average, on the other hand, includes years both before and after the year in question and therefore takes changes in trend into account. We might complicate the issue by excluding the year we are testing when we calculate the moving average in case it should turn out to be a "crisis" year and give us an inflated notion of the average annual number of burials. But by the same token, we also ought to exclude from our calculation of the moving average any of the surrounding years which can be shown to be a "crisis" year. Unfortunately, this would both involve us in a somewhat circular argument, and also make it more difficult to adopt a short-cut 'running' method of calculating the moving average.

In any case, we can get round this difficulty in the next stage of the argument, for we now have to decide whether the number of burials recorded in any one year is so much higher than the average annual figure as to warrant our calling it a year of "crisis" mortality. Since we are approaching the subject in an impressionistic and subjective manner, we shall have to take some arbitrary decision as to how large this discrepancy should be. Indeed, both the number

and the nature of the "crises" that we find, will depend far more on our choice of the factor by which the annual number of burials must exceed the average annual number, than on the way in which we calculate the average annual number. So there is little point in spending much time on arithmetical refinements. Thus if we decide to take a short cut and include all years in calculating the moving average, rather than omit "crisis" years, we can offset the tendency to discover too few crisis years that this entails by accepting a less extreme deviation from the average as our definition of a "crisis".

Since the factor, by which the annual number of burials should differ from the average annual number, is so critical to the discovery of a "crisis", how should we set about choosing it? It would scarcely be sensible to make the factor one, for then we should classify as "crisis" years all those years in which the number of burials at least reached the average, and we should end up with about a half the period we are studying as years of "crisis" mortality. If, on the other hand, we take some large factor, such as four or five times the average annual number of burials, we shall find few crisis years, often none at all. There is obviously no one right answer to this question; it all depends on how strictly we want to define a "crisis". Since, within limits, we can please ourselves, we might as well choose a convenient figure, such as twice the average annual number of burials. In practice, a factor of two picks out a reasonable group of "crisis" years in most parishes, very much the sort of years one might notice oneself by looking over a set of aggregative returns. To be sure, if we were to take a factor of 1.5, we should get more "crisis" years, and with a factor of three we should get markedly fewer "crisis" years; but providing everyone is aware that there is nothing sacred about the figure 2, it affords a simple and reasonable, though arbitrary, definition of "crisis" mortality. In any parish there will be the odd year in which the number of burials, although higher than usual, is just under twice the expected figure, and it may seem unfair not to call it a "crisis" year when another year, with only a few more burials, is just more than twice the expected average figure and therefore qualifies for the title. But arbitrariness of this kind is the penalty one has to pay for being able to get a quick and relatively effortless overall view of the situation.

I thought it might be constructive to apply a superficial approach of this kind to discover the patterns of "crisis" mortality recorded on the aggregative analysis forms for the 550 odd parishes now in the Group's collection. Others may be interested to compare their own

findings with the results presented below. Although the method of calculation is a summary one, the amount of work involved in applying it to 550 parishes is rather large. I therefore decided to take a sample. In order to get a reasonable geographical spread I took advantage of the fact that we keep the aggregative returns arranged alphabetically under county, and I systematically picked out every tenth parish. In fact this simple procedure did not always work, because some parishes had burial registers which either started too late to be useful, or were obviously defective for a number of years, especially in the 1640s and 50s. These parishes were rejected and I took the next suitable parish. The parishes in the sample were therefore those with consistent burial registration which began relatively early, for example 40 out of the 54 burial registers in the sample had begun by 1570 and all had begun by 1613. It should also be stressed that the original group of 550 odd aggregative returns do not in any way constitute a scientifically drawn sample of all the parishes in the country. For example there are too few London parishes and too many from Bedfordshire, too few very small parishes and too many market towns, and this imbalance is reflected in the sample of 54 burial registers. Nonetheless the collection covers a fair variety of different kinds of parish in all parts of the country, as is clear from Table 1.

The definition of "crisis" mortality which I used was an annual total number of burials more than twice the average annual number of burials for that year. For reasons of speed and convenience I decided to use the information contained on the standard aggregative analysis forms, so the annual totals were taken directly from the forms and refer to calendar years. The average annual numbers of burials were determined by an even more summary method than the one of moving averages discussed above. If there were no obviously defective years on a 20-year aggregative analysis form, then the average number of burials for each year on the form was taken to be one twentieth of the total number of burials recorded on the form. If certain years were deficient or omitted, as at the beginning of registration, then the average figure was adjusted accordingly. This procedure fails to meet many of the objections which we considered earlier on, and a full scale study would have to do better than this. Yet in view of the arbitrary definition of "crisis" mortality which I am using, this particular collection of corner-cutting devices may perhaps be acceptable for a preliminary survey of the field.

TABLE 1.

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>PARISHES</u>
Beds.	Blunham with Mogerhanger, Kempston, Cranfield
Berks.	Winkfield
Cambs.	Cottenham
Cheshire	Wilmslow
Cornwall	St. Columb Major
Derbyshire	Dronfield
Devon	Colyton, Widecombe on the Moor
Durham	Whitburn
Essex	Great Baddow, Bradwell Juxta Mare
Glos.	North Nibley
Hants.	Aldershot, Odiham
Herefords.	Lugwardine
Herts.	Watford
Kent	Chislehurst, Tenterden, Cranbrook
Lancs.	Hawkshead, Rochdale, Warton
Leics.	Desford, Loughborough
Lincs.	Gainsborough, Horncastle
Middx.	New Brentford
Norfolk	Shipdham
Northumbs.	Berwick-on-Tweed
Notts.	Gedling
Oxon.	Banbury
Shropshire	Shrewsbury (St. Alkmund), Pontesbury
Somerset	Congresbury
Suffolk	Mendlesham, Horringer
Staffs.	Sedgley, Barton under Needwood
Surrey	Abinger, Cranley
Sussex	Eastbourne, Frant
Warwicks.	Alcester, Solihull
Wilts.	Bishops Cannings
Worcs.	Kings Norton
Yorkshire NR	York (St. Michael le Belfry)
ER	Hull (St. Mary's)
WR	Conisbrough, Rilston, Thornton in Lonsdale, Hartshead

Table II summarises the number of "crisis" years found for each of the 54 parishes over a period running from the start of burial registration in each parish up to 1809.

TABLE II

NUMBER OF YEARS OF "CRISIS" MORTALITY
FROM START OF BURIAL REGISTRATION (1538-1613) TO 1809

No. of "crisis" years	No. of parishes	Parishes
0	4	Dronfield, Rochdale, Pontesbury, Bishops Cannings
1	5	Winkfield, Cranbrook, Desford, Horncastle, Hull (St. Mary's)
2	10	Cottenham, St. Columb Major, Great Baddow, Watford, Tenterden, Gainsborough, Berwick- on Tweed, Sedgley, Cranley, Hartshead
3	7	Widecombe on the Moor, North Nibley, Chislehurst, Hawkshead, Barton under Needwood, King's Norton, York (St. Michael le Belfry)
4	8	Cranfield, Wilmslow, Warton, Loughborough, New Brentford, Shrewsbury (St. Alkmund), Mendlesham, Rilston
5	3	Banbury, Eastbourne, Alcester
6	4	Colyton, Whitburn, Odiham, Thornton in Lonsdale
7	4	Bradwell Juxta Mare, Gedling, Solihull, Conisbrough
8	2	Kempston, Shipdham
9	0	-
10	1	Congresbury
11	2	Abinger, Frant
12	2	Blunham with Mogerhanger, Lugwardine
13	0	-
14	2	Aldershot, Horringer

We should not pay too much attention to the absolute number of "crisis" years recorded, because this clearly depends on how we have defined a "crisis"; but the Table is interesting in the wide variety of experience it reveals amongst the 54 parishes. With this definition of a "crisis", and over a period of about $2\frac{1}{2}$ centuries there are at

one extreme four parishes (Bishops Cannings, Wilts; Dronfield, Derbys; Pontesbury, Salop; and Rochdale, Lancs.) with no years of "crisis" mortality, while at the other extreme Aldershot, Hants and Horringer, Suffolk have 14 years of "crisis" mortality. This comparison between parishes is not altogether fair, because those which have burial registers beginning early in the 16th century will have a greater opportunity to score a greater number of "crisis" years. But this does not seem to have led to any great distortion, for if we take, for example, the 7 parishes for which burial registration is available before 1540, four of them (St. Columb Major, Pontesbury, Gt. Baddow, Watford) had less than three crisis years, while the other three were distributed over the rest of the range (Colyton and Odiham (6), and Lugwardine (12)). Another way in which the comparison between parishes may be less than fair lies in the fact that one extra burial in each year will have a greater proportional impact on a very small parish, with a very small average annual number of burials a year, than on a large parish, with a large average annual number of burials. Since we are defining "crisis" as being twice the annual average, then purely random fluctuations in the number of burials each year will be more likely to create spurious "crises" in small parishes than in large parishes. A more careful study of "crisis" mortality would make some correction for this fact. We are, however, presently in some difficulty, for the eleven "small" parishes in the sample, with a population of under a thousand in 1811, have twice as high a proportion (64%) with six or more "crisis" years than is the case (31%) in the whole set of 54 parishes. Because no precautions have been taken to eliminate the greater effect of random fluctuations on small parishes, we cannot tell whether this was responsible for the difference we have observed, or whether small parishes were genuinely more subject to "crisis" mortality.

Amongst the whole group of parishes, about half had less than four years of "crisis" mortality over a period of about $2\frac{1}{2}$ centuries. Although this result reflects my arbitrary definition of a "crisis" as twice the expected average annual number of burials, this level is not a particularly high one. Normal rural death rates at this time probably rarely exceeded 30 per thousand, implying that at most about 3% of the population died in a normal year. Thus what I have called a "crisis" year was reached when more than about 6% of the population died in a year. In some of the "crises" experienced by some of these parishes the burial figures suggest that the proportion of the population dying was very much higher than this, for example in Colyton in 1645-6 probably about 20% of the population died; but

TABLE III

ANNUAL FREQUENCY OF "CRISIS" MORTALITY IN 54 PARISHES

Note: Figures in brackets refer to original data when missing registration requires numbers to be raised (see text)

<u>Decade</u>	<u>Years</u>										<u>Decadal Total</u>
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
1540s	-	-	6(1)	-	5(1)	5(1)	-	-	-	-	16 (3)
1550s	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13(3)	25(6)	11(4)	49 (13)
1560s	-	-	-	-	3(2)	-	-	1	1	1	9 (7)
1570s	-	3(2)	-	1	4(3)	-	2	1	4	1	13 (11)
1580s	3	-	1	-	1	-	1	3	4	1	14
1590s	-	2	4	2	1	1	-	11(10)	3	1	25 (24)
1600s	1	-	1	4	2	-	-	-	-	1	9
1610s	2	1	1	2	2	1	5	2	-	1	17
1620s	1	-	-	5	-	1	-	-	-	-	7
1630s	-	2	1	-	1	-	1	1	3	1	10
1640s	2	-	1	8	3	-	-	1	-	-	18
1650s	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	3	7	2	17
1660s	-	1	2	-	1	1	-	3	-	-	8
1670s	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	5	9
1680s	1	2	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	9
1690s	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
1700s	-	1	-	2	-	1	1	2	2	-	9
1710s	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	3
1720s	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	4	6	15
1730s	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	7
1740s	2	2	5	1	-	-	1	1	1	-	13
1750s	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	2
1760s	2	-	-	2	-	1	-	1	1	-	7
1770s	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2
1780s	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
1790s	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
1800s	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1

in many other cases the proportion dying in a "crisis" was not much above the 6% mark.

Perhaps more interesting, however, is the distribution of "crisis" mortality over time. Table III shows how many parishes experienced "crisis" mortality in each year from 1540-1809. The figures are on a uniform basis from 1613, for by then burial registration is available for all 54 parishes. The original figures (given in brackets in the table) for the years before 1613 are based on an increasing number of parishes as more and more parishes begin to have burial registration available. These original figures have been made comparable to the figures for later years by multiplying them by the ratio between the number of parishes in observation in each year and the full complement of 54 parishes. (Corrected number of "crisis" parishes

$$= \frac{\text{Original no. of "crisis" parishes}}{\text{No. parishes with burial registration}} \times 54).$$

This correction is better than nothing, but we should remember that when we make comparisons involving any of these early years for which the number of parishes is rather small, we are assuming that the missing parishes would have had the same experience as those for which burial registration happens to have survived. This point is of some importance, for the corrected calculations show that some of the most popular years for "crisis" mortality lie in this early period, when only a small fraction of the registers are in full observation.

The final column of the table gives the number of "crisis" years experienced by a full set of parishes in each decade. These figures provide a convenient summary view of changes in the incidence of "crisis" mortality from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century. The decades in which relatively few parishes experienced "crises" should give an indication of the "background" level of "crisis" mortality. The table suggests a marked change in this "background" level around 1700. Before 1700, the decadal numbers of "crises" were rarely below 8 while from 1710, with two exceptions, they never reached a total of 8. Decades with numbers of "crises" in excess of this "background" level were much more frequent up to the 1650s. The later sixteenth century scored particularly highly, while in the early seventeenth century, three decades (1610s, 1640s and 1650s) witnessed unusually large numbers of "crises". After 1660 the picture was very different, for only the 1720s and the 1740s disturbed the generally declining trend in the decadal number of "crises".

Table 3 also enables us to see which were the years, or groups of

TABLE IV

"CRISIS" MORTALITY PERIODS

SINGLE YEARS

<u>Years</u>	<u>No. of parishes</u>		<u>Years</u>	<u>No. of parishes</u>	
	<u>Corrected</u>	<u>(original)</u>		<u>Corrected</u>	<u>(original)</u>
1558	25	(6)	1544		(1)
1557	13	(3)	1545		(1)
1559	11	(4)	1616	5	
1597	11	(10)	1623		
1643	8		1679		
1658	7		1742		
1729)	6	(1)	1574		(3)
1542)			1588	4	
			1592		
			1603		

GROUPS OF 3 YEARS

<u>Years</u>	<u>No. of parishes</u>		<u>Diseases</u>
	<u>Corrected</u>	<u>(original)</u>	
1557-9	49	(13)	Influenza
1597-9	15	(14)	Famine; dysentery, fevers, plague(North)
1643-5	14		Typhus, plague
1727-9	13		Fevers, influenza
1657-9	12		Influenza, fevers
1544-5	10	(2)	? Plague
1740-2	9		Spotted fever
1586-8	8		Plague, and ? fevers
1592-3			Plague
1614-16			? Fevers
1679-81			Agues

years, in which "crisis" mortality was most widespread. This information is summarised in Table IV since epidemics did not always strike parishes in the same years, the table presents the information for groups of 3 years as well as for single years. 1558 is by far the most common year for "crisis" mortality and 1557 and 1559 are second and third respectively; but once more we should remember that these are corrected figures based on relatively few parishes. These disputable years apart, 1597 emerges as the individual year in which crisis mortality was most widespread, some 11 parishes, or one in five of the sample, being affected. The rest of the field lags some way behind, led by 1643, 1658 and 1729. Not surprisingly the group of 3 years which emerges as the clear winner is that of 1557-9. If the 13 to 19 parishes on which the results for this period are based are representative of the whole group of 54 parishes, then this mortality was over 3 times more widespread than "crisis" mortality at any other time in the 2½ centuries studied. The rest of the field follows in a bunch, led by 1597-8 with 15 parish-years of "crisis" mortality, followed by 1643-5, 1727-9, 1657-9, 1544-5 and 1740-2. It is interesting to find the two early eighteenth century "crisis" periods so high up the list.

In 1750 Thomas Short conducted a somewhat similar survey of about 200 parish registers, and amongst other things identified what he described as "sickly" years.² Short's work suffers from the disadvantage that, although he included parishes from all over the country, a substantial proportion came from the adjacent counties of Yorkshire and Derbyshire. Short also seems to have defined as "sickly" a year in which a significant, although unstated, proportion of the parishes registered more burials than baptisms. Short's definition of a "sickly" year is therefore rather wider than my definition of a "crisis", for parishes can record more burials than baptisms over a number of years because of a generally higher level of mortality, without there being any sudden surge in the number of burials. It is therefore perhaps not surprising that he should find some years in which there is no sign of "crisis" mortality as I have defined it (1669-74, 1698-9, 1722-3) and that he should ignore some of the years which score quite highly on my criteria (1586-8, 1592-3, 1602-4, 1614-16). Otherwise he confirms the "crisis" periods I have found.

The final column of the second part of table IV gives the diseases which are thought to have been associated with each of the major years of "crisis" mortality. These have been taken from Creighton's History of Epidemics,³ and are in many cases only guesses. Often

the identification has been made on the basis of evidence from only one or two places, and it is of course possible that other parishes may have experienced "crisis" mortality in the same year, or group of years, for quite different reasons. What is striking, however, is that so few of the well-known London plagues (1563, 1592-3, 1603, 1625, 1636 and 1665-6) appear to have been widespread throughout the country. Plague epidemics usually involved large numbers of burials, and certainly left their mark on the burial registers of London and other large towns, such as Bristol and Norwich. For most of the rest of the country, however, heavy mortality seems rather to have been associated with what were probably fevers and influenzas of various kinds.

In conclusion it might be worthwhile stressing once again that for reasons of convenience I elected to study unusually high mortality by the simple expedient of defining an arbitrary level and calling everything above that level "crisis" mortality. There may therefore be occasions on which a parish register appears to record a significantly higher number of burials than normal, but insufficient for the occasion to qualify as a "crisis" year. A fuller study of aggregative mortality should therefore examine the whole range of variations in the numbers of recorded burials. In this way it would be possible to distinguish between parishes which frequently experienced relatively modest increases in the number of burials, and those which were subjected, perhaps more rarely, to the most substantial increases in mortality, which we have been considering here. It would also be possible to calculate and compare the mortality 'profiles' of individual years by observing how many parishes were affected at different levels of severity. In contrast, the present scheme was designed to give a quick bird's-eye view of the situation. But it would, I think, be surprising if a fuller study failed to confirm some of these preliminary results, particularly the identification of the main periods of widespread heavy mortality, and the wide range of experience of heavy mortality amongst individual parishes.

R. S. Schofield

NOTES

1. J.D. Chambers. 'Some aspects of E.A. Wrigley's Population and History', L.P.S. No. 3, 21-2.
2. Thomas Short. New Observations on the Bills of Mortality (1750), 22-30, 44-9, 85-9, 90-109, 187-191.
3. Charles Creighton. A History of Epidemics in Britain, 2 vols. (1894), reprinted with an introduction by D.E.C. Eversley (1965).

AN ENQUIRY INTO THE FREQUENCY OF THE PAROCHIAL
REGISTRATION OF CATHOLICS IN A 17th CENTURY
WARWICKSHIRE PARISH

V.T.J. Arkell

Mr. Arkell is senior lecturer in History at the Coventry College of Education. His main area of interest is in late seventeenth century rural life in Warwickshire.

In 1632 at the Easter meeting of the Warwickshire Quarter Sessions, one couple was presented for an offence which is likely to interest demographic historians. "Lawrence Cowper of Rowington, blacksmith, and his wife, indicted for not resorting to their parish church and for not receiving the Sacrament nor baptizing their children lawfully."

Unfortunately the Quarter Sessions records give no further hint as to the fate of this pair but, whether they were punished or not, they did not alter their ways, because in the Rowington parish registers there is no mention of them baptising a single child. Had the Warwickshire J.Ps. pursued a campaign for the consistent registration of christenings, historians today might have cause to be grateful for their intolerance and officiousness. As it was, however, between 1625, when the surviving Quarter Sessions records begin, and 1696, when their publication ceases, only one similar case was presented from the whole county, "for not baptizing a child which is about two years of age." And the individual concerned proved equally recalcitrant. Twenty years later he reappeared "for not repairing to church to hear divine service for the space of one month last past."

Nevertheless, the haphazard persecution of these recusants continued in Warwickshire from at least the 1620s to the 1690s, reaching one peak in 1679-80 at the time of the Popish Plot and another in 1683-4. It therefore provides the historian with an excellent opportunity to see how often baptisms, marriages and burials in the families of some of the Anglican church's proven opponents were recorded in its registers. The parish which I chose for this task was Rowington, lying on the

old road from Warwick to Birmingham. Many Catholics lived there during the 17th century and it is also one of the few Warwickshire parishes whose registers were published by the Parish Register Society. They run from 1638, but also include the bishop's transcripts for most of the previous twenty years.

Edgbaston was another Warwickshire parish with a substantial Catholic population whose registers have also been published. But on closer inspection, the 17th century entries in the Parish register proved to be so fragmentary that they were of no possible use for my purpose.

Altogether between 1627 and 1686, 106 recusants from Rowington were presented at the Quarter Sessions for not attending their Anglican church.

TABLE A

Presentation of Rowington Recusants at the Quarter Sessions

Ep = Epiphany Ea = Easter Tr = Trinity M = Michaelmas
 R = Recusancy P.R. = Popish Recusancy
 N.C. = Not Coming to Church

1627	Ea	1	R		1678	M	4	N.C.	1683	Tr	70	N.C.
1632	Ea	2	(see p. 23)	1679	Ep	5	R			M	34	N.C.
1642	Ep	1	R		Ea	4	R	1684	Ep	20	N.C.	
1648	Ep	22	R		M	14	P.R.		Ea	19	N.C.	
1673	Ea	2	P.R.	1680	Ea	15	P.R.		Tr	13	N.C.	
1673	M	6			Tr	13	N.C.		M	24	N.C.	
1674	Tr	7	R		M	15	P.R.	1685	Ep	18	N.C.	
									Ea	13	N.C.	
									Tr	13	N.C.	
								1686	Tr	6	N.C.	

Of the twenty-two who appeared together in 1648, one had been presented previously and five were presented again later in the century. Then on twenty occasions between 1673 and 1686, 86 people from Rowington were presented for recusancy at Warwick a total of 315 times - 70 of them all at once at Trinity 1683. Now, according to the Compton Return, Rowington in 1676 contained 171 nonformists, 26 Papists and 4 Nonconformists, but clearly this was a highly optimistic overestimate of the strength of the Anglican church in the parish. And religious dissent was no recent phenomenon there either. Two lists of 1605-6, for instance, show that at the time of

the Gunpowder Plot there were at least 60 recusants living in Rowington.

One cannot identify with certainty the religious persuasion of all the Rowington recusants presented at the Quarter Sessions, but from various sources it seems reasonable to conclude that about 90% were definitely Catholics. From 1659 some were recorded in the Catholic registers of St. Peter's Franciscan Mission at Birmingham, others were described at the Quarter Sessions as popish recusants or stood bail for known Catholics or were closely related to them. Furthermore, it seems likely that eight recusants with the same surname as several proven Catholics also shared their faith. Dubious though this decision may be, it was strengthened by the thought that the remaining eleven who had to be classified as likely non-Catholics almost certainly included some Catholic servants of the local Catholic gentry.

Looking for these recusants in the parish register is no straightforward matter. At the Quarter Sessions a few were recorded simply as 'wife' or 'widow'. In addition the Rowington registers suffer from several failings which prevent one from tracing some other recusants there. As one might expect, the registers do not exist for six years from 1656. When the vicar was restored to his living in 1662 after the Act of Uniformity, he did not return to his previous practice of registering at baptisms the mother's name as well as the father's. In the three months after his death in 1666 only one entry appears in the register, while the average per quarter is about nine entries. Similar obvious under-registration occurs in at least one year in four until the end of the century. Occasionally too one encounters entries like: " the of baptised July 19 1685". The new vicar recorded both parents at christenings for three years, but then the parish abandoned this practice once more from 1669 to 1698. Some names, therefore, appear too frequently for one to identify the individuals concerned with certainty. In Rowington six Thomas Shakespeares, for instance, were buried between 1669 and 1707 and William Shakespeare was equally common. In the fifty years before 1696 the parish laid him to rest at least 7 times.

And so for purposes of identification in the parish registers I have had to divide the Rowington recusants into five categories, with the following results:

Total number of those presented from Rowington at Q.S.
for recusancy 1627-86 who appear in the parish registers

Yes	50
Probable*	11
Possible*	5
No	34
Unidentifiable	<u>6</u>
	106

*Some Examples of Probables and Possibles

Probables

Thomas Blythe presented 11 times 1679-85.
In Parish Register 3 sons of Thomas Blythe buried in 1668.
Thomas Blythe base son of Susan Blythe bapt. 1672.
Thomas Blythe buried 1686.

William Cowper presented 7 times 1679-85.
In the Parish Register Agnes daughter of
William Cowper buried 1684.
Three William Cowpers buried in 1692, 1710 and 1717.

Ann Shakespeare, spinster, presented once in 1683.
1693 Anne Shakespeare buried.

Possibles

William Saunders, labourer, presented 1683 once.
1684 William Saunders of Hycrosse buried.
(There were several other William Saunders in the parish
including one other recusant, a weaver, who had a
daughter buried).

Mary Reeve presented once in 1683.
1696 Mary wife of Thomas Reeve buried.

And so, excluding the six unidentifiable characters and regarding the Possibles as 'Noes' and the Probables as 'Yeses', the conclusion is that about 3 in 5 of these recusants also appear in the parish registers.

I next looked for any significant differences between recusants presented more or less frequently.

<u>R.C. recusants presented:</u>		<u>(Likely non-R.C. recusants)</u>
<u>3 to 12 times</u>	<u>once or twice</u>	<u>once or twice for all but 2</u>
Yes	27	19
Prob.	5	5
Poss.	2	3
No	<u>3</u>	<u>25</u>
	37	11

In simpler figures, over 6 in 7 of the recusants presented more than twice appear in the parish registers too, but only about 3 in 7 of those presented once or twice. When one remembers the likely turnover in population, the gaps in the registers and the extra difficulty in tracking women there it seems safe to conclude that few can have

C. Numbers of Women and Men presented at the Quarter Sessions

	<u>Women</u>	<u>Men</u>
Once or twice	43	21
3 to 6 times	15	10
7 to 12 times	<u>3</u>	<u>14</u>
	61	45

N.B. (In the Birmingham Franciscan Register, Rowington, female entries outnumbered the male ones by two to one).

been omitted from them deliberately.

However, a closer examination soon dispels such a simple conclusion. The great majority of Catholic recusants are recorded only in the burial register.

Since the group of traceable non-Catholic recusants is so small and some may have been R.Cs. any way, there seems no point in considering them further. In the following analysis I have considered the 46 Popish recusants who definitely reappear in the parish registers together with the ten who probably do so.

All but two of these 56 Catholics are mentioned in the burial register, either in connection with their own death and/or that of a child or spouse. In addition 47 or 48 are recorded in the burial register alone. The doubt is over William Shakespeare. In 1683 there were

two Popish recusants with this name and one of them could have christened a son after himself in October 1682 only to bury him two months later. On the other hand there were more than two William Shakespeares in the parish.

Of the other eight Popish recusants one couple, Clement and Dorothy Lucas, had a daughter baptised eleven years before they were presented and then buried less than a month later. The Anglican registers mention no more of their children, although according to the Franciscan registers in Birmingham they had three more baptised in the same decade.

Another couple, Clement Petty (presented 1679) and Compton his wife (presented 1679 & 1683), had six children baptised in the parish register from 1666 - the last two in 1676 and 1684 - and none of them were buried as infants. On the other hand Mary Ragg, whose last child was baptised in 1645, was reconciled to the Catholic faith by the Franciscan Mission in Birmingham in 1660, buried her husband in 1666, but was not presented at the Quarter Sessions until 1680.

Mary Bird, who was presented once in 1683, had three children baptised by the Anglicans in 1682, 1683 and 1685 (and the second one buried in 1684). Her husband Job was buried in 1717 and Mary six years later as a widow. The Franciscan Register also discloses that her maiden name was Shakespeare and that she married Job Bird in Rowington in 1680. Job was almost certainly an R.C. but since he was not indicted at the Quarter Sessions, he seems to have either abandoned or denied his faith under pressure. However, in 1679 he had forfeited £250 of bonds as surety for four prominent Catholics, two of whom were William and Elizabeth Shakespeare, his future parents-in-law.

Margery Cowper's story was similar, but not so detailed. Her marriage to Thomas Cowper in 1635 is recorded in the Anglican register and so are the baptisms of four of their children between 1636 and 1645. Then three years later Thomas Cowper the elder, blacksmith, and Margery, the wife of Thomas Cowper, the younger, yeoman, were presented at the Quarter Sessions. This presumably indicates that Margery's husband had abandoned his faith and so accounts for her appearance in the parish register. Finally, Mary Williams married a 'foreigner' from five miles away who was not presented at the Quarter Sessions. Since their wedding took place in the parish church four years after her own presentation, this may also have been some kind of 'mixed' marriage.

Unless the behaviour of Rowington's Catholics was quite untypical, this study indicates several conclusions. In the 17th century the Anglicans often recorded the burial of Catholic dead, but not their marriages. As for christenings, in Rowington Catholic parents did not have their infants baptised in the Anglican church unless they were sickly and likely to die young or unless the husband was a noticeably less ardent adherent of the Catholic faith than his wife. (Since Compton Petty was presented twice and her husband once, one can just fit them into this pattern, especially since the church wardens also presented her twice for recusancy to the Bishop of Worcester in 1673-4 without her husband). L. Bradley asserted in his Glossary (p.19) that "Roman Catholics ... did not, as a rule, appear in the Anglican registers." My conclusion supports this statement as far as baptisms and marriages are concerned, but not for burials.

This is confirmed by another look at the Franciscan Register of St. Peter's Birmingham. There from 1662 eight deaths were recorded for Rowington, of which six appeared in the parish register. Of the four weddings recorded by the Catholics in the same period, only one reappears in the other register and since the Anglicans dated it seven months later than the Franciscans, presumably it records a second ceremony. As for Catholic baptisms, eleven are recorded between 1662 and 1692, including the three Lucas children, but none of these are repeated in the official register.

The Birmingham register also contains lists of those who were reconciled to the Catholic faith and of those admitted to the Confraternity of St. Francis and altogether 75 people from Rowington are referred to there 88 times. 79 of these references occur between 1659 and 1674, six from 1678 to 1685 and the remaining three in 1692, by when the Birmingham mission had lost touch with Rowington. Sixteen of these 75 Catholics were also presented at the Quarter Sessions and another dozen had not yet reached the age of 16, so that we are left with the evidence for the existence of over 47 more 'adult' R.Cs. in Rowington from 1659 to 1685. And an extra 25 names can be added to them from two more sources - the lists of those who refused to take the oath of Abjuration in 1655-6 and of those whom the church wardens presented as popish recusants to the Bishop of Worcester in 1673-4.

Altogether, therefore, about 165 Roman Catholics aged 16 or more can be traced living in Rowington for some time between 1648 and 1686. Since seventy of them were not presented at the Quarter

Sessions, it is clear that the number of presentations alone is no reliable guide to the strength of Catholicism in one area. Some at least of the less ardent Catholics were always likely to escape. In addition presentation depended upon the decisions of the parochial officers. In 1689, for instance, the constables of Rowington and 13 other parishes were themselves presented for not presenting their popish recusants.

Furthermore, Edgbaston had a much higher proportion of traceable Catholics who escaped presentation at the Quarter Sessions than Rowington. In all 50 Catholics from Edgbaston were presented between 1679 and 1689, but another 180 can be detected in the Franciscan Register in the thirty years from 1670 to 1699. In part this is explained by the fact that Edgbaston is so much nearer to Birmingham than Rowington and that the Franciscan Mission moved to Edgbaston after King James II was deposed in 1688, but other factors could also have contributed. Edgbaston, for instance, might have had a faster turnover of population or there might, perhaps, have been greater ardour among the Rowington Catholics or greater keenness to persecute them among their parish officers.

Now, it is unlikely that more than one Warwickshire parish in twenty was as strongly Catholic as these two, but one cannot be sure because the Compton Return is such an inadequate source for Rowington, while no figures from it survive for Edgbaston. In addition it recorded for example, 200 conformists, 13 Papists and 10 Non-conformists for Brailes in south Warwickshire, but a total of 69 Catholics and 23 Quakers from there were presented at the Quarter Sessions in 1679-81 alone. For this reason one cannot help but wonder by how much the Compton Return underestimated the extent of religious nonconformity elsewhere, in particular perhaps the non-Catholic dissenters for whose existence it is much more difficult to obtain comprehensive evidence and so to examine their influence on the reliability of parish registers.

This study has also left some doubt about the accuracy of some ascriptions of status and occupation in the Quarter Sessions. One Rowington yeoman, for example, who lost £150 of bonds in 1679, was described as a husbandman at Easter 1680 and a labourer at the following Michaelmas. From this one would have deduced that persecution had dragged him down very rapidly, if only he had not reappeared as a yeoman again in 1684. And several other recusants from both Rowington and Edgbaston were similarly described in quick

succession as at least two of labourer, husbandman and yeoman without any apparent reason. Could this perhaps indicate that for contemporaries there was a much greater overlap between these categories than historians normally recognise?

But above all this examination of Rowington recusants seems to reinforce every warning that D.E.C. Eversley, Dr. Wrigley and others have issued to local historians about the failings that they may find in their parish registers. Despite the inclusion of so many Catholic burials, the Rowington registers make no mention of well over 80 Catholics whom one knows were living in the parish at the time. If anyone, therefore, tried to use these registers as a source to discover the extent of geographic mobility, they would not prove to be very reliable.

How many Anglicans were omitted as well? Not only is the Rowington register flawed with a six year gap and obvious under-registration in about one year in four, but it is also not uncommon to find parents baptising two children with the same Christian name at an interval of a few years, without apparently burying the elder one in between.

My doubts about the reliability of these registers for many demographic purposes (but fortunately not my own!) are reinforced by the marriage/baptism and burial/baptism ratios which they yield. For the period 1641-1700 a marriage/baptism ratio of 1: 9.5 for Rowington seems impossibly high. So does a burial/baptism ratio of 1: 1.22, especially when one remembers that the baptisms are deflated by the prevalence of Catholics. And the total number of entries in the register for the 1690s does not show the huge increase from the 1640s that one would expect from such a ratio, but a small decline.

Total entries in Rowington registers

	1641-50	1671-80	1681-90	1691-1700	Total 1641-1700 (w/out 1656-62)
Baptisms	216	154	178	163	905
Burials	145	106	169	134	742
Marriages	14	18	21	23	95
Mar/bapt ratio 1:	15.4	8.6	8.5	7.1	9.5
Bur/bapt ratio 1:	1.49	1.45	1.05	1.22	1.22

Unless one postulates massive migration from Rowington to Birmingham, for which I know of no other evidence, these figures do not support the generally accepted theory that burials were, on the whole, less under-registered than baptisms - quite the reverse. Nor do they accord any better with J.T. Krause's claim (in Population in History p.383) that registration of baptisms improved significantly at the end of the 17th century. Indeed, it seems nearer the truth to suggest that parochial registration in Rowington had "virtually collapsed" at least a century before Krause argues that it first happened nationally. In how many other parishes (like Edgbaston) was this also true?

WILLS AND WILL-MAKERS IN THE SIXTEENTH
AND SEVENTEENTH CENTURIES:
SOME LANCASHIRE EVIDENCE

R.C. Richardson

Dr. Richardson is senior lecturer in History at Thames Polytechnic and is the author of Puritanism in North East England (Manchester 1972). His main research interests are in the general field of seventeenth century social history and in the historiography of the English Revolution.

Mrs. Spufford in her recent article in this journal on villagers' wills has put local historians in her debt by pointing out the largely unexploited uses of probate records for an understanding of English society and religion in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries ¹. She is not, of course, the first historian to appreciate the value of this type of record. The eighteenth-century scholar John Strype, for instance, grasped the significance of will preambles for the historian. In his Memorials of the Reformation under the year 1551 he wrote:

"I cannot but observe how wills and testaments now ran, and how different the wording of a will in King Edward's days was from one drawn up in the reign of King Henry his father; whereby we may gather how at this time of day, by the knowledge of the gospel, superstition generally wore off in the nation". ²

More recently Professor W.K. Jordan used wills as the basis of his monumental study of English philanthropy. But whereas Jordan was primarily interested in bequests in wills, Professor A.G. Dickens - like Strype before him - analysed their preambles for the expression of religious opinion.³ Mrs. Spufford, however, in concentrating attention on the scribes responsible for the making of villagers' wills carries Dicken's pioneering work an important stage further. After reading her article few would disagree with her conclusion that:-

"The evidence is not statistical. It is wrong for the historian to assume that if he takes a cross-section of four hundred and forty wills proved over a particular period, he is getting four hundred and forty different testators' religious opinions reflected". ⁴

To this one should in fact add other warnings about the limitations attached to the use of probate records. The most basic problem of all, of course, is the extent to which will-makers were representative of their local society and its opinions. Testators, after all, were generally the older members of the community and sufficiently wealthy to be preoccupied with the disposal of their property. Testators were also predominantly male; except in exceptional circumstances - when property was held with the husband's consent - married women did not make wills.

Mrs. Spufford drew the evidence of her article from rural Cambridgeshire. It would be interesting, therefore, for comparative purposes, to look at the problems surrounding wills and will-makers in a different part of the country and in a different type of community. Most of the evidence which is presented below is drawn from sixteenth and seventeenth-century Lancashire and in particular from the township of Manchester.

Puritanism is the main research interest of the present writer and it was primarily for evidence of puritan beliefs and inclinations that wills were turned to.⁵ The "puritan will" in its preamble not surprisingly rejected all spirital intermediaries and emphasised the personal link between God and man. But its distinctiveness consisted principally in the expression of the Calvinist concept of exclusiveness. "Elect" was the key word in these puritan wills.

The idea of election was expressed with considerable variety in these Lancashire wills. Some testators were confident that they were of "the number of those elect". There were those who claimed to be about to take their place "amongst his angels and elected", while others counted themselves "one of his elect and chosen". Certain will-makers believed that they would soon be "amongst all the rest of his elected children" while others proclaimed themselves "one of the number of them which shall be elected and chosen".

Amongst these puritan wills there seems to have been a distinctive form of preamble which occurred only in Manchester and its region. With slight variations this ran as follows:-

"first and principally I render and bequeath my soul unto my lord God and creator, firmly trusting that by the death and passion of his dearly beloved son Christ Jesus my saviour and redeemer and by his only mercy and mediation for me, I shall live and

partake with his blessed saints in his heavenly kingdom of those celestial joys which of his eternal goodness he hath prepared for his Elect, of which number, through his infinite grace and mercy, I do confidently hope and believe that I am one." ⁶

Seventeen examples of this form of preamble have been found amongst approximately two hundred Manchester wills of this period, all made between 1616 and 1643. ⁷ A significant point is that in ten of these seventeen wills clerical influence is implied by the witness lists. Moreover it was the influence of a single clergyman - Edward Tacey of the Collegiate Church, a known puritan who had attracted the notice of the ecclesiastical visitors in 1625 when he was charged with administering the communion to those who would not kneel. ⁸ A further indication of his influence in making wills is to be found in the fact that his own will, proved in 1632, is one of this type. This form of will, however, continued to be made after his death. A possible explanation is that continuity may have been preserved by others whose names had appeared earlier in witness lists along with Tacey's. For example the name of Gerard Simkin, gentleman, occurs in six witness lists including the last of this group of wills proved in 1646.

In many cases, however, it is unfortunately impossible to establish the identity of the scribe who wrote out particular wills; we are dealing, after all, with a much larger community than the ones examined by Mrs. Spufford. But it seems likely that only a minority of testators wrote their own wills; outside the ranks of the clergy this practice was exceptional. ⁹

A good many wills - as Mrs. Spufford demonstrates for Cambridgeshire - were no doubt drawn up by ordinary laymen who were better educated than their fellows. There are many wills whose witness lists seem to consist entirely of laymen - though this in itself is not conclusive proof of authorship. The diary of Roger Lowe, a puritan mercer from Ashton-in-Makerfield, Lancashire, throws some light on this question. On April 30th 1663 Lowe wrote:

"...I was sent for to Whitleige Green this night to one William Marsh who lay sick and had several times sent for me to write his will, which I did. John Hasledon went with me at night and William Knowles was there and I composed the man's will somewhat handsomely".

A year later, on May 20th 1664, Lowe's diary contains another entry concerning wills.

"Old Jenkins this day came and payed me for making his will and other things. He payd me 11s 9d., tooke me to Ale house and spent his 6d. on me ..." 10

How general this practice was, however, it is impossible to say, but the fact that presumably it was the cheapest method of making a will may have made it a popular choice. Schoolmasters too - as Mrs. Spufford shows - sometimes had a profitable sideline in drawing up wills. Adam Martindale, for instance, tells us that as a master at Whitley school he also had "opportunities for earning moneys by making writings for neighbours."¹¹ But once again the Lancashire evidence on this point is inadequate.

It is certain, however, that in the towns at any rate many wills in this period were drawn up by members of the legal profession. In the case of Manchester around 10% of wills had this kind of authorship and the names are known of nine scribes who were practising in the town from the late sixteenth century. Six of these have been seen at work in the wills consulted. William Bell, for example, was a Manchester scrivener active in the reign of James I and it was he who drew up the will of the tailor William Smith in 1613. William Sparke was another scrivener in practice at this time. He wrote the will of Edward Pycroft, shoemaker, in 1609, that of Elizabeth Proudlove, widow, in 1608, and probably that of Richard Bowker, tailor in 1619. William Strengthfellow, scrivener, occurs in wills from the 1590's. For example, he drew up the will of Ralph Moss, tanner, proved in 1617, and also that of Richard Ellor proved in 1596. Six of these Manchester wills are known to have been written by the scrivener Thomas Birch. The wills of John Billinge, glazier (1588), Margaret Bowker, widow (1591), Ann Hodgkinson, widow (1594), John Lees, clothworker (1598), Thomas Houghton, yeoman (1606) and William Pycroft, webster (1588), all bear his name. Yet another scrivener, William Eden, drew up the will of Richard Webster, clothier (1590). Amongst later scribes, the name of Robert Holt (d.1644) occasionally appears in wills. It is known that he was responsible for drawing up the wills of Thomas Howarth, yeoman (1634) and Thomas Hulme, butcher (1641).

The names of attorneys as well as scribes occur in the Manchester parish records. George Holden (d.1603), Robert Nield (d.1631), Roger Rogerson and William Radcliffe are mentioned as belonging to this profession. But only one of these has appeared in the Manchester wills. This was Robert Nield whose name is listed amongst the witnesses to the will of Robert Bowker, tailor (1619). It was an attorney who drew up the will of the Rev. Henry Newcome's father. Newcome tells us "... my father fell sick. Finding himself weak he sent for Mr. Loftus, an attorney, to make his will".¹² Humphrey Davenport "learned in the law" was the executor of the will of Alice Hulton, of Manchester, proved in 1610. Besides these members of the legal profession, there was also in Manchester in James I's reign a public notary, Edward Sagar. Four of the wills of the township have been found to have been drawn up by him.¹³

It is probable that by the end of the seventeenth century lawyers had effectively captured the business of making wills, at least in the towns, and these records in the process tended to become increasingly secular and stereotyped. The clergyman William Assheton, although he wrote a treatise on wills, admitted that "to discourse of wills and testaments is chiefly the lawyer's province".¹⁴ But this was in 1696. Before the Civil War, lawyers were by no means assured of this near-monopoly. Professor Jordan, who has probably read more wills of this period than any other historian, has said that of wills made before 1660 "relatively few betray the cold hand of the lawyer or notary in the language and form of their composition".¹⁵

On the contrary the evidence suggests that in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries the role of the clergy in the drafting of wills was an important one. John Glover, Fellow of the Collegiate Church, Manchester, signed himself "the writer hereof" in the wills of William Baguley, clothworker (1572) and of John Cowapp (1581). Edward Pendleton, vicar of Eccles, acted as supervisor and witness of the will of his brother Francis Pendleton, merchantman of Manchester (1574). The will of Joan Newall, widow (1592) was witnessed by no less than three clergymen - Oliver Carter, John Buckley and Robert Barber, all of them puritans. Barber also witnessed the wills of Ottiwell Hodgkinson (1588), Isobel Barlow, widow (1595) and Thomas Hardman, mercer (1578). He was also executor of the will of Margaret Bowker, widow, (1591). The prolific Edward Tacey of the Collegiate Church, Manchester, was witness or executor of no less than thirteen of the Manchester wills consulted.¹⁶ Altogether, clerical influence can be detected in about 14% of these documents.

Activity of this kind, then, was quite clearly a normal part of the clergyman's role in society. Henry Newcome in his Autobiography provides further information on this subject. He writes that in December 1679:

"Mrs. Judith Wollen (a weak, peevish, jealous, wilful person, but I hope a good woman, and a very kind friend to me always) would make her will, and would have me write it. And it must be sealed and none must know what was in it; no, not those that were witnesses: and they also must not tell that she had made a will. This was done according to her mind, when she kept her chamber; but was of perfect understanding as ever".¹⁷

It was a clergyman - William Assheton D.D., rector of Beckenham in Kent - who in 1696 published a Theological Discourse of Last Wills and Testaments. His work was essentially one of instruction.

"I thought it might be useful", he wrote, "to give some direction and assistance to sick and dying persons.. The providence of God having placed me amongst a plain working people who do not much converse with books, some short manual of my own when put into their hands would be accepted and perused".

Assheton was not so much concerned with the legalities of wills as with the sentiments they should embody.

"Remember", he warned, "your will stands upon record for publick perusal and therefore to be idle and extravagant in this last act of your life is to be hissed off the stage and to proclaim your folly to all succeeding ages ... The settling and disposing of a man's estate by his last will and testament is not only the most solemn but also the concluding act of his whole life and as such should be managed with the greatest deliberation and prudence".

Accordingly he advised:

"Make your will in the time of your health. And do not defer so weighty a work, which requires both leisure and composedness of mind, to your death-bed".

The preamble to the will, Assheton argued, ought not to be a meaningless and incidental introduction.

"Let your will be so composed", he declared, "so framed, so worded in the commendatory part as to declare yourself a christian... The first thing which the testator disposeth is his soul. For so run the words First and principally I commend my soul into the hands of God my creator. But here too many of our last wills and testaments do stop and abruptly break off. And then go on in a hurry to the body and estate..."

So Assheton proceeded to give precise instructions about the making of the preamble.

"When therefore you make your will", he wrote, "commend your soul to God in such a manner as may declare your Christianity; give them a reason of the hope that is in you; especially if your religion is suspected (either as having none at all, or as being heretical and corrupt) then vindicate yourself by making a short but pathetic profession of your faith and hope in the beginning of your will.

And that you may better apprehend what I design, you may commend your soul in this or the like form: First and principally I commend my soul into the hands of almighty God as of a faithful creator which I humbly beseech him most mercifully to accept. Looking upon it not as it is in itself (infinitely polluted with sin) but as it is redeemed and purged with the precious blood of his only beloved son and my most sweet saviour Jesus Christ; in confidence of whose merits and mediation alone it is that I cast myself upon the mercy of God for the pardon of my sins and the hopes of eternal life." 18

The clergy, then, played an important part in will-making and of course were constantly presented with the opportunity for so doing. Visiting the sick, after all, was an accepted part of the clergyman's pastoral duties. "It was somewhat new to me", Newcome says in his Autobiography "to visit so many of the sick as I did when I first came to Manchester. Here I visited three or four sick persons a day." 19 Such visits would clearly provide opportunities for prayer, spiritual comfort and preparation for death, and in these circumstances it would be natural for the question of wills to be raised.²⁰ Indeed it was the duty of the clergyman to enquire whether a will had been made. As Assheton wrote in his Discourse:

"According to the order of the Church of England, the minister who visits the sick and dying persons doth admonish them (if they have not done it before) to settle their temporal estates and make their wills". 21

Episcopal visitation articles and injunctions invariably mention this aspect of the clergyman's responsibilities.

To what extent, however, did the scribes of wills - particularly the 'professionals' amongst them, i.e. lawyers and clergy - supply the ideas and form of these documents? Up to a point this was undoubtedly happening in Manchester. Seventeen "puritan wills" opening with the same preamble can admit of no other conclusion, especially since the influence of the puritan clergyman Edward Tacey can be detected in them so frequently. And we have evidence that at least one scrivener supplied a ready-made preamble to a client's will. This was William Strengthfellow whose own will (proved in 1631) is to all intents and purposes identical in its preamble to the one which he drew up for Ralph Moss, tanner, in 1617. But the Manchester wills as a whole display a remarkable variety in the way in which they are prefaced. (Whether this is largely the reflection of a large and diverse range of scribes is another question). Of the Manchester scribes, for example, most is known of Thomas Birch, and significantly all the wills he composed open with a different preamble. Admittedly, in a third of the Manchester "puritan wills" clerical influence is detectable. But it does not automatically follow that this fact is itself the explanation of this kind of will and that wills express religious opinion only because they were on many occasions written by ministers. There was nothing unusual in a clergyman drawing up a will and perhaps the practice need not be attributed with a special significance. In performing this task the minister may only have been acting as a professional scribe. The two wills known to have been written by John Glover of the Collegiate Church, Manchester were different in form and neither was the same as his own will proved in 1591. And Edward Tacey wrote wills containing other preambles than the commonly occurring one quoted above.

But in the absence of further data this problem cannot be finally resolved; in larger communities such as Manchester the authorship of wills is bound to be more difficult to establish than in the case of the Cambridgeshire villages examined by Mrs. Spufford. Wills can provide evidence of religious opinion but they are a difficult source to handle and their value consists as much in the way they indicate

general trends as in providing conclusive evidence in themselves of the religion of an individual.

NOTES

- 1 Margaret Spufford, "The Scribes of Villagers' Wills in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and their influence", Local Population Studies, 7, 1971, pp. 28-43.
- 2 Memorials of the Reformation, 1822, vol. 2 pt. 1, pp. 557-8.
- 3 Of Jordan's several works on philanthropy these two in particular may be noted: Philanthropy in England, 1959, and The Charities of Rural England, 1961; A.G. Dickens, Lollards and Protestants in the Diocese of York 1509-38, 1959. Cf. D.M. Palliser, The Reformation in York 1534-53, Borthwick Papers, 40, York, 1971, pp. 18-20, 27-29, 32.
- 4 Spufford, article cit., p. 41.
- 5 R.C. Richardson, Puritanism in North-West England: A Regional Study of the Diocese of Chester to 1642, Manchester, 1972.
- 6 This particular example is the will of George Clarke, haberdasher, proved in 1637.
- 7 Four other examples of this will have been found but in every case the testator lived close to Manchester - at Worsley, Pilkington, Newton and Broughton.
- 8 Chester. County and Diocesan Record Office. 1625 visitation. EDV 1/26 f.98v.
- 9 The nuncupative will of George Hulton of Chester, shoemaker (d.1647), provides a comment on this fact and highlights the special problems of will-making during plague or illness. Hulton's will points out that "the extremitie of the contagion being so violent ... he could not p(ro)cure anyone to come to him to make his will in writing".
- 10 W.L. Sachse (ed.), The Diary of Roger Lowe of Ashton-in-Makerfield, Lancashire, 1663-74, New Haven, 1938, pp.19, 62.

- 11 R. Parkinson (ed.), Life of Adam Martindale, Chetham Society, o.s.4, Manchester, 1845, p. 46.
- 12 R. Parkinson (ed.), Autobiography of the Rev. Henry Newcome, Chetham Society, o.s. 26-27, Manchester, 1852, I. p.5.
- 13 These were the wills of George Burgess, chapman (1623), Edward Glover, baker (1624), Joan Hardy, widow (1605) and Hugh Marler (1605).
- 14 Assheton, A Theological Discourse of Last Wills and Testaments, 1696, p. 2.
- 15 Jordan, Philanthropy in England, p. 16.
- 16 The wills are as follows: George Swarland, Usher of the Free School, (1619), John Jackson, butcher (1623), Adam Hulme, inn-keeper (1622), Jane Downes, widow (1627), Samuel Dickenson, inn-keeper (1624), George Marshall, merchant (1624), Margaret Nugent, widow (1631), John Sorocold, merchant (1621), Nicholas Hartley, woollen draper (1610), James Hough, clothier (1615), Richard Merriott, glazier (1618), Alice Massy, widow (1608), Alice Pendleton, widow (1617).
- 17 Newcome, op.cit., II, p. 230.
- 18 Assheton, op.cit., epistle dedicatory, pp. 20, 1, 3, 15 - 16, 19.
- 19 Newcome, op.cit., I, p. 73.
- 20 The majority of the wills which would have been examined were made by testators who were conscious that they were failing and that death was close. It is unusual to find a testator not declaring that he is "weak in body".
- 21 Assheton, op.cit., epistle dedicatory.

NOTES AND QUERIES

Homicide, infanticide, and child assault in late Tudor Middlesex

P. E. H. Hair

Since early Victorian times, hundreds of volumes of English local records have been published by record societies. These volumes have been ransacked by genealogists, legal historians, philologists and other scholars seeking information on specific points of detail; but until recently they were not examined in aggregate, that is, their social content was not given systematic statistical analysis, as a means of exploring mass social behaviour in the past. In the case of parish registers, systematic analysis is now well under way. Coroners' records can also be exploited statistically, as I have pointed out in recent articles,¹ and can provide incidences of violent death, including criminal homicide and suicide. My researches have now led me to examine a variety of printed legal records, some published by local record societies; and I report on certain points which have emerged and which might well interest other students who have access to local legal records.

In the 1880s, four volumes of summaries of Middlesex county records 1550-1700 were published.² In the first volume, the editor included 'all coroner's inquisitions resulting in verdicts of murder and homicide, and all the indictments in deeds of fatal violence of which no mention is made in what remains to us of the coroner's inquisitions' (p.1). Unfortunately, the original records were damaged and incomplete when edited (vol. 2, pp. xxxvii-ix), and the total of 169 criminal homicides for the period 1550-1603, drawn from both the extant coroners' records and the extant session rolls, is probably much less than the true number. The population of Middlesex in 1550 was perhaps around 40,000 (it has been estimated from chantry certificates that there were 24,500 'houselings' in 1545).³ Because of the rapid contemporary expansion of neighbouring London, the population in 1600 was probably at least twice as great. Let us take 60,000 as the average population 1550-1603. The incidence of criminal homicide - from the incomplete records - appears as 52 pMa (per million living per annum). But the decennial totals of homicides (1550s, 25; 1560s, 16; 1570s, 16; 1580s, 41; 1590s, 47) surely indicate an abnormal loss of records for the early Elizabethan decades.

Calculated for 1580-1603 only, on an average population of 75,000, the incidence appears as 63 pMa. Though the population estimates are shaky, these incidences are of the same order as an incidence of homicide calculated from the Nottinghamshire coroners' records 1530-1558, also incomplete, of 38 pMa.⁴ It was suggested that the true rate in Nottinghamshire might be as high as 148 pMa. Though we are nowhere near precise rates for either Nottinghamshire or Middlesex, it most probably is significant that all these incidences are very much higher than the homicide incidences recorded nationally in the last one hundred years.

In Nottinghamshire, the commonest homicide weapon was the staff. In Middlesex, half the deaths were caused by swords (rapiers, etc.) and a sixth by daggers or knives: staffs (clubs, etc.) accounted for less than a tenth (and there were only half a dozen shootings). While it may well have been the case that Tudor townspeople carried edged weapons more commonly than Tudor countrymen, the high proportion of killings by the sword indicates a distorting element in the Middlesex returns. A proportion of the deaths were the result of duels, fought by Londoners in the fields outside the city. It is not always possible to distinguish, at least in the printed record, between an affray and a duel, but probably at least one quarter of the Middlesex killings were in duels, and many of those killed were not of course Middlesex citizens.

A puzzling feature of the Nottinghamshire records was the total absence of infanticide. An extensive examination of medieval legal records has revealed very few cases of this crime. Yet, in the nineteenth century, one fifth of all recorded homicides were infanticides, and even today the figure is one eighth. While the Middlesex records provide, for the reason given above, a less than satisfactory listing of homicides, they are of some special interest in that they do record infanticides, and even infanticide in the typical form of the last hundred years, the murder of a child at birth by its mother. There are eleven infanticides recorded for the period 1550-1603, representing 7% of all criminal homicides. All but one of the infants were murdered by mothers at birth. In six of the cases, the mother was specifically stated to be a spinster, and the wording of the other entries does not rule out the possibility that all ten killings at birth were committed by unmarried mothers. A recent work on Elizabethan Essex presents a similar picture: there were 30 infanticides, apparently about one tenth of all homicides, all committed by the mothers, all but three of whom were unmarried.⁵ While the

mortality incidence of recorded infanticide in either county was negligible, it must be remembered that many more infanticides may have been successfully concealed. Infanticide seems to have been more frequently recorded in the Elizabethan period than in earlier times. This may have been because the crime was on the increase. But it is inherently unlikely that there were as few infanticides in the medieval centuries as appear to be recorded. The difference may therefore lie in the recording of the crime rather than in its incidence. If so, why did the Middle Ages conceal infanticide, and why did Elizabethan England reveal it? Is any light thrown on changing attitudes to marriage and bastardy?

The Middlesex editor failed to make it clear whether he was including all the suicides recorded in the session rolls. Only five are noted for the period 1550-1603 - far fewer than the number in Nottinghamshire 1530-1558 - and three of these occurred in the two years 1564 and 1565: this probably means that he included only a selection. In a later, more summary volume, a suicide of 1605 has a timeless ring: two lovers formed a suicide pact, one died, the other was charged with murder.

Because this Middlesex material is drawn from sessions records, it includes cases of non-homicidal assault. The editor stated that he had noted all cases of sexual assault on young females. Since this depressing manifestation of frustrated sexuality is often taken to be typical of modern times, it is worth noting that the extant records report eleven cases in Middlesex in the 45 years of Elizabeth's reign, involving girls aged 3, 6, 7, 8, 9(two), 10(three), 11 and 12. The men carrying out the assaults were generally hanged.

Infanticide and child assault, though everywhere deplored, are universal concomitants of the social regulation of sexual drives through the family. (My own attention was first drawn to the significance of child assault when examining the legal records of an urban community in Black Africa). Fortunately, these offences are not common. Their history in Britain - whether their incidence is consistent or changing - might be profitably explored through the local records of coroners and courts.

NOTES

1. P.E.H. Hair, 'A note on the incidence of Tudor suicide', Local Population Studies, 5, 1970, pp.36-43; 'Deaths from violence in Britain: a tentative secular survey', Population Studies, 25, 1971, pp.5-24; 'Accidental death and suicide in Shropshire 1780-1809', Transactions of the Shropshire Archaeological Society, 1971 (to appear).
2. J.C. Jeaffreson, Middlesex County Records, n.d. (vol. 1, 1886).
3. J.C. Russell, British medieval population, 1948, p.280. The population figures refer, as do the coroners' returns, to Middlesex without London. In 1377, the Poll Tax returns recorded 11,000 tax-payers in Middlesex (loc.cit.): this probably represented a population of about 20,000. The doubling of population between 1377 and 1545, and again (as suggested in the text) between 1545 and 1600, is plausible because of the effect of London.
4. P.E.H. Hair, 'Deaths from violence, p.17.
5. F.G. Emmison, Elizabethan life: Disorder, 1970, p.156. This work attempts to summarise Essex records in a narrative, and the statistics inserted are difficult to follow and sometimes contradictory. Thus, tables on pp. 318-9 show 71 homicides which occurred in five two-year sample periods, suggesting a total for the whole reign of forty-five years of about 320; but the chapter on homicide supplies figures for different forms of homicide which together total only about 150.

Seventeenth Century Midland Midwifery - A Comment

Janet M. Blackman

I was interested in your publication of extracts from a seventeenth century physician's Observations in Midwifery in the Spring Number this year of Local Population Studies. This collection of case histories drawn from Percival Willughby's practice in Derbyshire and elsewhere reveal the medical ideas and methods of a particular doctor in the period 1630-70 who took a special interest in obstetrics. As Christopher Charlton suggests, Willughby believed in something like natural childbirth, and condemned the brutal practises of the local ignorant midwife. The ignorance of women who attended other women of all classes as midwives is an interesting and recurring theme in histories of midwifery, especially those written during the past century or so, anxious to explain the entry of men into practice as midwives. To suggest that men had greater expertise and knowledge seemed to be the answer.

Perhaps social historians should look at this again, and put greater emphasis on the way in which women acting as midwives, and indeed men, acquired their knowledge at the time Willughby was writing, and even much later. There was no professional training as we would understand it today, and midwives "inherited" information and acquired more from their own observations. Willughby was aware of this himself; as well as the practices of some which he condemned as futile there were important lessons to be learnt from the methods of others. He in his own early ignorant days used the meddlesome forcing methods he later denounced. It was his observation of the ease of a natural birth in cases where he was late in arriving for the confinement and the midwife had not used these more primitive tactics that caused him to alter his methods. He mentions other useful techniques also which he learnt from women midwives as he watched them at their work.

In his support for more natural methods in childbirth Willughby was anxious to explain to midwives and pregnant women that the midwife's duty was "no more but to attend, and wait on, nature" as quoted in your extract on page 58 with the sub-title "Midwife's Duty". To emphasize this point he suggests that a midwife is not absolutely necessary from the point of view of the birth itself, and states that he has known women who have delivered their own child without the

help of a midwife. But the delivery of the child by its own mother raised other problems on which you ask for further information and to which Willughby himself draws the reader's attention. The problem was the possibility that the child would be born dead or die soon after birth and of suspicion of murder or manslaughter falling on the mother with no witness to speak for her. Willughby was very conscious of this danger and quotes several examples of women tried and condemned to death for the murder of their child where she had been alone at the child's birth. Therefore although he was anxious to stress the possibility of a woman delivering her child he counselled women to have some assistance to avoid suspicion. References are made to "the looser sort" of women as being particularly open to this suspicion presumably as they are more likely to try and deliver their child in secret and be under more pressure to prevent the survival of the child.

The statute law referred to by Willughby was probably therefore that appertaining to murder, manslaughter and infanticide, but I hope other readers will offer their suggestions to explain these extracts.

CORRESPONDENCE

Infant Mortality

Dear Sir,

In connection with a study of the Christ's Hospital Admission Registers, a number of questions have arisen which I am hoping you will be able to clarify.

First of all, are there such things as 'National figures' for, say, infant mortality, or even figures for London? I am particularly interested because I am supervising a short study of the Admission Registers of C.H. for the period 1550-1700, and to make the project relevant to London as a whole, one obviously would like to make comparisons.

The second point that leads on from this is what does one mean by infant mortality? In your researches I expect you have laid down various guides for this. By infant mortality I mean deaths under the age of 12, but this you probably will not agree with. There does not seem to be any sense in embarking on a study of this kind in ignorance of any research guides that may now be in operation.

Yours faithfully,

N. M. Plumley
Maine, Christ's Hospital,
Horsham,
Sussex RH137LE

Roger Schofield comments

Conventionally infant mortality is taken to mean mortality within the first year of life, and child mortality is taken to mean mortality between the ages of one and fifteen. Child mortality is often calculated separately for the three age groups 1-4, 5-9, and 10-14. The age of twelve, which Mr. Plumley mentions in his letter, is not usually taken as a limiting age for either infant or child mortality.

Infant mortality can be calculated in a number of ways depending on the kind of evidence available. If a family reconstitution

has been made of the parish register, infant mortality rates can be based on any child appearing on a Family Reconstitution Form, providing that there is some further event recorded on the form, which can be taken to imply that the family is in residence for at least one year after the birth of the child in question. The purpose of this rule is to ensure that children who do not have a date of death recorded on the forms really can reasonably be presumed to be still alive one year after their birth. Children whose families pass this observational rule are said to be 'at risk', and the infant mortality rate is calculated very simply by counting up the numbers of children at risk in this sense, and by counting up the number of these children who die within one year of their birth. The infant mortality rate is conventionally the number of deaths under age one per thousand live births, and this is easily derived by dividing the number found to die under year one by the number 'at risk' and multiplying the result by one thousand.

Most parish registers, however, record dates of baptism rather than dates of birth. If therefore one is unlucky enough to be studying a parish in which there was usually a considerable delay between birth and baptism, one year after baptism will not be the same as one year after birth, and the infant mortality rate will be that much in error. Fortunately, a number of reconstitution studies on registers which have very good baptismal registration have shown that between 50 and 60% of all deaths under age one in fact occur within the first month of life. So if one finds that one has a markedly lower proportion of deaths in the first month of life than this figure, then one can use this knowledge to correct the infant mortality rate upwards. A good example of how this was done for the parish of Colyton is given in the article 'Mortality in pre-industrial England' by E.A. Wrigley in the American periodical Daedalus (Spring 1968).

If no family reconstitution study has been done, then an infant mortality rate can only be calculated if the parish register gives age at burial. If this is so the number dying under age one in a given year or period of years is easily counted, but the number 'at risk' is a little more difficult to define. If we consider a single year, say the year from 1st January to 31st December 1800, then children dying on any day in that year under the age of one, may have been born either in that year (1800) or in the previous year (1799), depending on the date in the year 1800 on which they died and on their age at death. If we could assume that infant deaths were evenly distributed over the first year of life we could say that half of those

who died in any one year were born in that year and half were born the previous year, and we could therefore take the number of children 'at risk' as half the number of baptisms in the current year plus half the number of baptisms in the previous year. But, as we've already seen, mortality is very much higher immediately after birth than in the later months of the first year of life, so most of the deaths in any year will refer to children born in that year and relatively few to those born in the previous year. Conventionally in these circumstances the numbers 'at risk' are calculated by adding together three-quarters of the number of baptisms in the year in question and one-quarter of the baptisms in the preceding year. The infant mortality rate thus becomes the number of burials in a given year with an age at burial of under one year, divided by the sum of three-quarters of the number of baptisms in that year plus one-quarter of the baptisms in the preceding year, and the result multiplied by one thousand. In parish register studies, however, the number of events registered is usually too small to make it sensible to calculate an infant mortality rate on the basis of a single year, and groups of ten, twenty or more years, providing ages at burial continue to be universally stated, are taken instead. In this case the inaccuracy brought about by the fact that some of the burials in the first year relate to baptisms in the year before the period and some of the infant deaths in the last year are registered after the end of the period is small compared to the total number of events being considered. So with long periods it is usual to disregard the correction rule which we considered above and to calculate the infant mortality rate rather more simply as the number of burials in a period with age of burial of under one year divided by the number of baptisms in that period and the result multiplied by a thousand.

This method of calculating an infant mortality rate is inferior to the one based on family reconstitution because there is no control over migration. Indeed, it assumes either that there has been no migration, and that the children baptised in a register can be safely assumed to have been resident there for their deaths to have been recorded, or that there has been migration, and that the children who have left the parish have been replaced by children of the same age. Needless to say, in the context of a single parish in the past the chances of either assumption being correct are rather low.

This discussion of the ways in which infant mortality should be calculated from parish registers has been rather laboured, because if care is not taken, particularly over the question of ensuring

that the children are still in observation, it is easy to get quite erroneous results, as in the classic case of the article by V.M. Cowgill, "Life and death in the 16th century in the city of York" in the periodical Population Studies (1966). Given the difficulty of calculating infant mortality rates it is therefore perhaps not surprising that there is little information on infant mortality in the past. There are no "national" figures available until well into the 19th century, when the Registrar General began to publish his Annual Reports. So far as I am aware, there are no "London" figures for infant mortality for the period 1550-1700 in which Mr. Plumley is primarily interested, although there are some individual London parish registers detailed enough in the information they give about ages at burial to allow an infant mortality rate to be calculated. A good example of a very full study based on one of these registers is Chronicle from Aldgate by T.R. Forbes. In this parish of St. Botolph without Aldgate, which lay just outside the walls on the East of the city, the infant mortality rate for the period 1589-93 was 349 per thousand live births. Although this period includes a plague epidemic in 1593, the rate is still very high by rural standards, where reconstitution studies consistently give infant mortality rates of under 250 per thousand, and often in England nearer 100 to 150 per thousand.

Age at Marriage

Dear Sir,

Dr. J.A. Johnston in his article "Group Research Methods in Local History" advocates making use of the ages of spouses given on marriage bonds and allegations.

Might I suggest that these ages are liable to a high degree of error, as shown from the narrow field of my own antecedents who lived in Nottinghamshire.

In the case of one man, his age was given as 28 on the marriage bond, whereas his real age was 37. The man in this case was Samuel Need of Arnold. The marriage licence is dated 24th September 1687 and his age is given as 28. The original Arnold church registers, on the other hand, record no baptism of a Samuel Need in the region of 1659 but instead indicate that he was baptised 14th May 1650. There is no second Samuel Need of this generation

though there were two grandsons named Samuel Need.

A second man, baptised in 1699, married three times and the difference between the age declared on each marriage bond and his true age increased progressively with each marriage.

	<u>Declared Age</u>	<u>True Age</u>
1st marriage	26	27
2nd marriage	30	36
3rd marriage	40	51

This was George Machin of Eakring whose age can be traced from the Eakring parish registers and bishop's transcript. Not to be outdone, his third bride, Sarah Brett, declared her age to be 28 although the Wellow baptismal register reveals her age to have been 34. George Machin's age caught up with him in the end; his gravestone correctly records that he died in January 1765, aged 65.

Yours faithfully,

Michael L. Walker
16 Dunstall Road,
Wimbledon Common,
London S.W. 20

Pre-1841 Census Schedules

Dear Sir,

As a subscriber to Local Population Studies, I have noticed that you are asking for information as to the whereabouts of pre-1841 census schedules. You may be interested to note that the Camden Public Libraries hold the original Hampstead schedules for 1801 and 1811. They are held in the Local History collection at the Swiss Cottage Library, 88 Avenue Road, London, NW3 3HA.

Yours faithfully,

Wm. R. Maidment
Director of Libraries & Arts, London Borough of Camden,
Libraries and Arts Department, St. Pancras Library,
100 Euston Road, London NW1 2AJ.

The Exchange of Ideas

Dear Editors,

At the Weekend Conference organised by Local Population Studies in July, I expressed my disappointment that our journal was not doing more to promote the exchange of information and ideas between individuals or groups working in similar fields. You, the Editors, pointed out that facilities for this kind of exchange already exist in the 'Local Research in Progress' section of L.P.S. You made it clear that you would welcome brief accounts of work which readers have in hand, and that progress reports are just as welcome as reports of finished work. You pointed out, too, that the journal provides a 'queries' service, and that queries receive a reply even if they are not printed in the journal.

May I beg my fellow readers to make use of these facilities. It seems to me that exchanges of this kind could enormously increase the effectiveness of our researches, and I cannot imagine that there are many of us who are too proud to consider suggestions or too jealous to share our information and ideas!

Yours sincerely,

L. Bradley
Sheldon Cottage,
Elton,
Matlock, Derbyshire

An L.P.S. Society?

Dear Sirs,

As one who attended the July conference at Matlock I am writing to congratulate all concerned upon its organisation and success, and to propose that it be made a biennial event.

With regard to the matter raised at the conference concerning the finances of L.P.S., I would like to propose that the publication be backed by a society that subscribers to L.P.S. could have the option of joining. For an annual subscription of say £1.50 members would be entitled to receive the half-yearly issues of L.P.S.

plus any of the occasional supplements (such as the Glossary, etc.), free. Non-members would continue to pay for the magazine and supplements, etc. at current rates.

This idea has two obvious advantages. Firstly, those interested enough to join such a society would be providing a "bank" against future rising costs. For example 200 members each paying £1.50 p.a. would, at what I understand to be the present level of costs, produce a surplus of about £150 p.a., which would keep L.P.S. finances healthy for a while ahead. This is, or ought to be, a prime concern of many of your individual subscribers. The second advantage is that by introducing what would effectively be a two-price system the danger could be avoided of losing circulation amongst the many really interested, subscribing institutions etc., that might result if the price was put up to all. Similarly it might be easier to attract new subscribers if the price could be kept as low as possible.

Of course it does mean that those volunteering to pay extra for their own copies as society members would be subsidising others. However, if this is regarded as subsidising the expansion of L.P.S. then ultimately it would be to their own benefit, in that by helping to damp down cost increases they would ensure its continuance and perhaps help its expansion towards and, hopefully, past the 1,000 mark and a relative lessening in costs.

Finally, I cannot see that the formation of a society need produce more work for the present officers of L.P.S. The only distinction needful would be that between those subscribing at lower or higher rates, and even this would only become significant when the issue of supplements was concerned. In particular the Treasurer's task could actually be made easier in that Society subscriptions could be by Banker's Order and the surpluses obtained in the early part of any agreed period of subscription would cancel out price increases in the latter part - thus avoiding the continued need to alter authorised payments as subscriptions increase every year or so.

I would be interested to see what response this letter generates amongst L.P.S. readers. In view of the delays caused in correspondence through your columns by the half-yearly regime I venture to suggest a duplicated slip be inserted at the point at which this letter is published, which those interested enough to do so could return with comments on the above suggestion.

Yours faithfully,

D. Rickwood, 71 The Warren, Old Catton, Norwich, Norfolk, Nor320

Mr. Rickwood's letter will be discussed at the next editorial meeting and any decisions reached will be noted in L.P.S. 10. Meanwhile, as Mr. Rickwood suggests, we would welcome your views. (Editor's note).

The Use of Scalograms

Dear Sirs,

I have recently been reading an article by John Patten in Vol. 20 Pt. 1 of The Agricultural History Review in which he uses the surviving Muster Rolls of 1522 for Babergh Hundred in Suffolk to study the structure of occupations. I found both his methods and conclusions most interesting, but being an Archivist and not a professional Historian I was a little perplexed by his use of scalograms for the analysis of occupations. He does go to considerable pains to explain this technique but I am sure there must be many others like myself who would appreciate some further explanation and evaluation of this method. I wonder if the editors would consider an article in L.P.S. at some future date which would deal with this subject and indicate its possible pitfalls and its strengths, and do so in layman's language.

Forgive me if this seems a naive inquiry but I have struggled valiantly but often unsuccessfully to master the sociological methods and jargon which seem increasingly to be a part of the writing of history.

Yours faithfully,

R. J. Chamberlaine-Brothers
Flat 1, Bray House,
Jury Street,
Warwick.

Richard Wall Comments

The question you raise is an interesting one and I feel sure a detailed account of scalogram analysis would not come amiss in a future number of L.P.S. In fact all that a scalogram does is to provide a basis for scaling qualitative data. In recent years these graphs have been used not only in social history but in the analysis of voting patterns in the House of Commons and to measure the variation in peoples' attitudes towards such thorny issues as race relations. Whatever the subject, the basic approach remains the same, namely to see whether we can detect a scale underlying the information we have. We may take as an example the level of support that a political party receives from its members. Some issues are clearly going to command a great deal of support, but this support is likely to diminish as more controversial policies are adopted until one reaches a position where the party has to commit itself to a policy which is so unpopular that only the most committed members can support it. It is further assumed that those who support the party in what we might term its hour of need, will also be behind it in all less important matters. If it is true that those who support a party in controversial matters will also support it in unimportant matters then we can get some idea of the range of "controversialness" by ranking the issues according to the number of party members who support it. Our ranking, and hence our definition of "controversialness" will only make sense if less controversial issues command support from the same people who were in agreement over the more controversial issue plus at least one more. The key assumption is that it is possible to place in rank order both persons and policies - if this proves impossible then the above assumption may be judged false. Exactly the same principles are involved in assessing the varying extents to which villages acted as service centres for the surrounding countryside. This is what Patten is attempting in the article which you mention. Each village is graded according to the number of distinct occupations possessed by its inhabitants. For one village to be ranked higher than the other it must possess all the occupations to be found in the lesser plus at least one more. From the smallest settlement comprising only labourers and husbandmen there is a fairly gradual progression in the range of occupations to be found, and in Patten's article only Sudbury with a population of approximately 1,200 is really distinctive in occupational variety.

It should be emphasised that the occupational diversity of a particular area is not at issue. Rather the intention is to discover which

occupations form the essential nucleus of a village's position as a service centre as opposed to those occupations which are of a more special character and only likely to be found in the larger centres. At the same time it is possible to use the data to place the villages in a hierarchical order according to the extent to which they provide a greater range of service facilities for the surrounding area.

There are of course certain alternatives to the use of scalograms in this connection although they suffer from some important drawbacks.

(i) Total population. This gives a general idea of the importance of a particular settlement. There will be greater diversification of occupation in places possessing a thousand inhabitants than in those with only 400, but it does not follow from this that the two will always be in step. Certain villages dominated by a prospering rural industry such as cloth making may grow in importance but not in occupational diversity. In any case size of population is often known only very approximately, particularly in the sixteenth century.

(ii) Presence/absence of market. This only serves to divide the communities into two very rough groups. It can throw no light at all on the differences between the smaller villages.

(iii) The number of separate occupations to be found in each settlement, expressed as a proportion of the total occupations to be found in the region under study. Simpler than the scalograms, something can be learned about the position of villages as service centres from its use. It differs from the scalogram in that all occupations are treated as equally important. In this lies its weakness in that it is clear that certain occupations fulfilled a more essential role in supplying the needs of the inhabitants than did others. It is possible to imagine a case, therefore, where the possession of a few rather specialist occupations, perhaps even trades such as carter or pedlar which were probably not even practised in the village in question, result in a village appearing to have a rather more important service function than in fact was the case. The scalogram avoids this by its requirement that for a settlement to be ranked above another, it must possess not only an occupation, not to be found in the lesser, but at the same time must duplicate all of the latter's services. At least this is the position in theory. In practice, especially with historical data, some occupations fail to meet this requirement and are said to be 'not to scale'. There are various statistical tests available to make sure that the data are to scale, but as these are somewhat

complicated I do not intend to bore you with these here. If an occupation fails any one of these tests it should in theory be excluded from the analysis. It should be remembered, however, that there will always be a residual number of exceptional occupations turning up particularly in villages some distance from a market town. Another possible source of error is that whereas in one village inhabitants may be classified uniformly as labourers, in another, agricultural labourers, builders' labourers and so on may be separately distinguished. Even if it should be found impossible to construct a perfect scale the method is not without value as it establishes which occupations formed the corner-stone of a village's position as a service centre and which villages were more successful than others in administering to the needs of the rural population.

The standardisation of Census Analysis

Dear Sir,

Many Local History Classes, and others, are becoming more and more interested in using the 1841-1871 Census Records, and much information is being analysed. At Tonbridge I have attended a Local History Class for several years, and a small part of the work undertaken in the class has been the analysing of the 1841 and 1851 Enumerators' returns for the town, and work has now started on the 1861 Census, and the 1851 Census for the surrounding villages.

We have followed the listings of social and industrial groupings used by Dr. H.J. Dyos, but I know other listings are used in other Local History Classes. Birthplace analysis distances also vary from place to place. The results from these differing methods are difficult, if not impossible, to use for comparing one town with another. and, apart from local interest, I am wondering how useful all this data is going to be on a countrywide basis.

I would be grateful to know if any group, such as the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure, can make use of the results of the work being carried out on the Census returns throughout the country: and if so would a standard method of analysis, especially in the classification of social and industrial groupings, be possible?

Yours faithfully,

Joan Jones (Mrs.)

33 Quarry Hill Road, Tonbridge, Kent

Richard Wall Comments

Your letter raises problems which are not easily resolved. The only answer I can give here is far from complete.

The Cambridge Group is of course aware of much of the work going on in local history groups throughout the country. Many of these groups have had an important part to play in the formation of some of the most important files that we now hold. By and large, however, this co-operation has been confined to parish register analysis; although we are aware of the work being done on the 1841-61 census schedules and have sometimes been sent duplicate copies of the results, we have undertaken very little work of our own in this field. Therefore, the problem of compatibility to which you refer has never been within our direct experience - from our point of view it is a future rather than a present problem.

Of course, for historians already working on nineteenth century census data the problem is an immediate one. In recent years several have commented on the absence of a generally agreed classificatory scheme for occupational and social groupings. However, it is one thing to regret the absence of a standard terminology and quite another to persuade several historians all working independently, that they should adhere to any one particular scheme. In what follows I hope I have succeeded in making clear the major advantages and disadvantages of some of the popular approaches.

Birthplace Analysis

The question being posed here is the same as that involved in all studies of migration - how far has the person concerned travelled? Broadly speaking, there are two ways of measuring this. The first is to construct a series of concentric rings around the parish in question so that one can calculate the proportion that have come from one to four miles distant, five to nine, etc. A somewhat simpler procedure is to give the proportion born in contiguous parishes, elsewhere in the same county, adjoining counties and elsewhere in the British Isles. Neither method is entirely satisfactory. Parish and counties vary greatly in size - a serious disadvantage when it is known that much mobility took place over a very small area. The amount of inter-county mobility will also vary, not only because of the size of the county but of the position of the parish within it. Distance in miles, however, fails to take account of accessibility

(ten miles on a coastal plain is a different matter from ten miles across a mountain) or the presence in a particular mileage range of a major centre of attraction such as London. It is therefore highly desirable that each analysis should include a map showing the parish of origin of each group of migrants. Barriers to movement such as mountain ranges or less obvious ones such as unfordable rivers can be clearly indicated.

Classification of Occupations

As far as occupations are concerned there are, broadly speaking, two main types of classification that one can adopt. The first is by social class and measures the level of 'skill'. Such was the scheme proposed by W.A. Armstrong in 1966 (see E.A. Wrigley, Ed.

Introduction to English Historical Demography, p272) the five classes consisting, in descending order, of capitalists, small shopkeepers, skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled labour. The second classification is an industrial one and reflects the type of employment engaged in, for instance, agriculture, manufacturing, services, etc. It is possible to refine the latter by specifying more minutely the nature of the product involved. The advantage of such categories as textile trade, wood trade, building and mineral workers etc. is that they enable one to avoid having to draw a distinction between 'retail' and 'manufacturing', a distinction which is largely irrelevant when applied to the craftsmen of pre-industrial England.

One of the difficulties in the way of a standard classificatory scheme is that both the status and the nature of occupations have changed over time. A system which works well for the nineteenth century may break down altogether when used for earlier periods. A similar danger arises when applying to the nineteenth century, classifications derived from present day data. Armstrong's classifications for social classes referred to above suffer from this weakness as they are based on the Registrar General's occupational groupings of 1950. The classificatory scheme put forward by Dyos and Baker (see H.J. Dyos, Ed. The Study of Urban History, (1968):p100-106). was directly based on their study of nineteenth century census schedules. They attempted a more minute subdivision with 21 occupational groupings although for the purposes of comparison with Armstrong's data these were combined into six broad categories. It is important to remember however, that this scheme was conceived in connection with an analysis of the London suburb of Camberwell in 1871. Some of the classifications, for example the lumping together of agricultural self-employed

and agricultural labourers, may make sense here but would be far from correct outside the suburban area where the social gap between farmers and their labourers was considerable. No scheme is going to satisfy everybody - and the evidence is often of a kind that blunts the divisions between the classes. It may well be argued that the grouping of private and rentier income recipients by Dyos and Baker in class 3 along with skilled labourers, as they had no indication of the amount of the income of the former, does them a "social injustice". Even if from an income point of view they could be placed in this group, the possibility that they were socially superior remains.

Standardization of occupational groupings poses the most complicated problems and I would advise you to read Armstrong's latest thoughts on the matter in the forthcoming work edited by E.A. Wrigley, The Study of 19th Century Society.

Civil Registers and Parish Register: under-registration

Dear Sir,

Following the advice given in L.P.S. No. 3, I wrote to our local Superintendent Registrar and obtained his permission to inspect the Civil Registers for the several parishes in my study area. To date I have only been able to inspect the baptism registers but this has provided some interesting figures for the degree of under registration in the local parish registers. Considerable differences were found between the seven parishes studied.

Parish	Population 1841-81		Percentage Under Registration			
			1841-50	51-60	61-70	71-80
Burnham	1735 -	2130	16	16	-	-
Bradwell	1034 - (1143)	-999	12.5	6.7	12	13
Tillingham	1106 -	1012	23	43	70	65
Steeple	584 -	527	18	25	-	-
Asheldham	219 -	167	5	-2	40	56
Dengie	219 -	300	7.1	17.8	35	56
St. Lawrence	176 -	212	28.4	35	44	5

These variations can probably be correlated to the degree of non-conformity existing in each parish and to the degree of activity of the parish priest.

I should be interested to hear of other similar enquiries.

Kevin Bruce

The Poplars, Down Hall Beach, Bradwell-on-Sea, Essex

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
- J. F. Phillips TOWN AND VILLAGE IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY NOTTINGHAM AND NOTTINGHAMSHIRE VILLAGES: SOME SUGGESTED LINES OF ENQUIRY. 1972. Illus. £1.00
- 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. Illus. £0.45
- A. Rogers (ed.) APPROACHES TO NOTTINGHAM'S HISTORY: A reprint of the three 'Radio Nottingham' Local History Booklets. 1972. Illus. £0.95
- A. Rogers (ed.) EAST MIDLAND 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

SOME RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Books

Anderson, Michael

Family Structure in nineteenth century
Lancashire.

Cambridge University Press, 1971. £5.

An investigation of the function of the kinship system of the working classes in the industrial centre of Preston with some comparable information on the social structure of the rural areas of Lancashire and Ireland, which provided Preston with most of its immigrants. Subjects for which detailed figures are given include occupational and age structure, migration, incidence of poverty, proximity of kin. The role of the latter is stressed both for the home (care of the aged and of young children of working mothers) and in the field of employment (finding jobs for unemployed or prospective migrant relatives in their own trade).

Clark, P and
Slack, P. (eds.)

Crisis and order in English towns 1500-1700
Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972, £4.75p

A series of local studies - the principal towns covered are Coventry, York, Salisbury, Chester, Norwich, London and a group of 3 in Kent (Canterbury, Maidstone and Faversham). The aspects of town life under consideration are equally diverse ranging from A.M. Johnson on Civil War politics in Chester to M.J. Power on the type and quality of housing in East London. Historical demographers will be particularly interested in Peter Clark's description of migration into the three Kent towns which is based on a much neglected source, the depositions to ecclesiastical courts. Clark distinguishes between "betterment migration" which was largely short distance, rural-urban and prompted by a desire for

social and economic advancement and "subsistence migration" which was often urban-urban with more frequent moves over greater distances.

Forbes, Thomas Rogers

Chronicle from Aldgate. Life and death in Shakespeare's London. Yale University Press, 1971, \$10.0 (approx. £4).

The rough books kept by the clerks of the parish of St. Botolph without Aldgate between the years 1558 and 1625 provide the principal source for this account of birth, sickness and death in late sixteenth and early seventeenth century London. In contrast to the parish registers which are customarily limited to the names of the persons involved, the St. Botolph records give remarkably full details of age, occupation and cause of death.

Habakkuk, H.J.

Population growth and economic development since 1750. Leicester University Press, 1971. 90p.

This book is based on the Arthur Pool memorial lectures delivered at the University of Leicester in 1968. It contains chapters on population change in pre-industrial Europe; the nature and the causes of the population increase of the late eighteenth century; the decline in fertility at the end of the nineteenth century and finally, the present position in the Western and the underdeveloped areas of the world.

Most of the unresolved and critical issues of recent population history receive careful and often detailed attention. For all serious students of population history this will be essential reading.

Mols, Roger

Population in Europe 1500-1700. The Fontana Economic History of Europe, volume II, section I, 1972, 50p.

Describes the principal sources used in the study of Europe's population (parish registers and various fiscal and religious censuses). Details not only their weaknesses from the point of view of the present day historical demographer, but also the reasons for their collection and the use made of them by humanists, geographers and political arithmeticians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. For the most part, however, Mols concentrates on summarising the results of recent research. Separate sections are devoted to the more reliable estimates of the total population of the major European cities and countries, migration, and variations (urban-rural and over time) in marital fertility and life expectancy. Epidemics and high infant mortality are seen as checking the growth of population in the sixteenth century and resulting in near stability in the seventeenth, when a rise in the age at marriage and in the proportion of the population never marrying caused a reduction in numbers of births.

Neuberg, Victor E. Literacy and Society Volume 5. Comprising, W.H. Reid: The Rise and Dissolution of Infidel Societies, and W.J. Linton: James Watson A Memoir. The Woburn Press, 1971, £4.

W.H. Reid in a work first published in 1800 was concerned to check the progress of atheism amongst the poorer inhabitants of London. At the opposite end of the political spectrum was James Watson, publisher of radical and free-thinking works some years later. The catalogue of books offered for sale by Watson in 1840 shows that some were available for as little as one penny. By itself this is no proof that these tracts were now reaching a wider audience, and it is interesting that Reid focused as much attention on non-literary radical activities such as debates, clubs and meetings, as on the sale of radical literature.

Rogers, A. "This Was Their World," Approaches to Local History, B.B.C. Publications, 1972. £2.40p

This book was written as an accompaniment to a series of radio programmes but is complete in itself as a basic and often detailed survey of many of the themes and processes of local historical study. For students of population studies, chapters two and three, 'The size of the community' and 'The structure of the community' provide much useful information not easily available without access to a range of books and periodicals. Topics include; an outline of population growth; sources of population estimates and their use; nineteenth century sources; migration; marriage and size of family.

Stephens, W. B. Sources for the History of Population and their Uses. The University of Leeds Institute of Education, 1971. 50p.

This booklet consists of sixteen extracts from sources likely to be useful in the study of population history. All the source material comes from Yorkshire. It is intended for use by teachers in schools, colleges, and in Adult Education and contains a brief introduction to the sources and a section devoted to suggestions for their use in the classroom. The sources include Domesday, a Manorial Extent, various sixteenth and seventeenth century taxation returns, a religious census, besides the more familiar parish register and census enumerators material.

Willughby, Percivall Observations in Midwifery. S.R. Publishers Ltd., and Thornton, J. L. 1972. £3.50.

Percivall Willughby was a seventeenth century physician who compiled a substantial collection of case histories from his experience of midwifery in London, Derby and Stafford. His work does not appear to have been published until 1863 and it is this first edition which is here republished with

the addition of a brief introduction by John L. Thornton. The book contains many detailed descriptions of midwifery as practised both by the country midwife and, in contrast, by Willughby himself.

Pamphlets

Wrigley, E.A. Population: Private Choice and Public Policy.
The Essex Hall Lecture (1972) 20p.

A discussion of present day population problems in the light of what is known of the ability of the population of pre-industrial Europe to control its fertility and so avoid catastrophic high mortality. Whereas this equilibrium was previously achieved unconsciously by, for example, social mores relating to age at marriage which responded flexibly to social and economic pressures, the whole question of family size is now a matter of personal choice on the part of each married couple. If the population of Great Britain were to increase at the rates current in the late 1950's and early 1960's (which is by no means certain) then this novel parental power is likely to be in conflict with a desire on the part of society to preserve the quality of the environment by restricting growth.

Articles

Gooder, A. 'The Population Crisis of 1727-30 in Warwickshire'
Midland History, vol. 1, No. 4, Autumn 1972.

An examination of the population crisis of the years 1727-30 based on the information available in the registers of twenty three Warwickshire parishes, and the relationship between the high mortality of these years revealed by the registers and grain prices. A number of causes of mortality which might account for these burial peaks are discussed,

such as smallpox, influenza and other fevers, but the author concludes that the real cause was a subsistence crisis. This paper is one of the products of an Extramural class and as such may be of particular interest to many L.P.S. readers.

Holderness, B.A. "Personal Mobility in some Rural Parishes of Yorkshire 1777-1812". Yorkshire Archaeological Journal (1971).

A study of both social and geographic mobility based on exceptionally detailed entries in the baptism registers of 9 parishes in the vicinity of York. Just under 40% of all parents baptised their children in the same parish as they themselves had been born in and a further 38% had been born within a 10 mile radius with something over 20% coming from further afield. Further conclusions are that women were more mobile than men and labourers more mobile than either farmers or tradesmen.

Huzel, J.P. "Population Change in an East Sussex Town: Lewes 1660-1800". Sussex Industrial History, 3 (Winter 1971/2).

A study based on an aggregative analysis of the parish registers of a town whose primary function throughout the period was to act as a service centre for the surrounding countryside. Having inflated by varying amounts the totals of baptisms, marriages and burials to take account of under-registration, particularly of non-conformists, and estimated the total population at various dates from lists of communicants and families, Huzel calculates and discusses significant variations in crude birth, marriage and death (including infant mortality) rates. He concludes that whereas in a town influenced by industrial developments the bulk of any increase would be due to immigration, in Lewes over 60% of the growth after 1724 could be ascribed to natural increase and only somewhat under 40% to immigration.

Jones, A. "Land and people at Leighton Buzzard in the later 15th century". Economic History Review, XXV (February 1972).

A study of the late fifteenth century land market in Leighton Buzzard based on extant court rolls, revealing that about two-thirds of all recorded changes in tenancy involved the alienation of land from one "family group" to another by individual members of these "families", i.e. in these cases the new owner possessed a different surname from that of his predecessor. Overall, 11% of the transfers occurred when the first tenant was on his death bed. Many transfers, particularly of arable, involved only small amounts of land (under 3 acres) although there are some signs of a growing tendency towards the transference of larger holdings and for certain people to build up quite large farms of 40 acres or more. The reasons for this are not entirely clear but the post Black Death situation of a more mobile rural population and a rise in agricultural wages coupled with the growth of non-agricultural occupations in the "town" of Leighton are advanced as possible explanations.

Norton, S.L. "Population growth in Colonial America: a study of Ipswich, Massachusetts." Population Studies, XXV (November 1971).

On the basis of a partial aggregative analysis and family reconstitution the growth of population in Ipswich, Massachusetts, is traced from its founding in 1633 until 1790. The writer concludes that the different physical environment and new economic and social opportunities open to the colonists had significant effects on the structure of the population, notably causing a somewhat lower age at first marriage for men and a markedly lower age for women, with less severe mortality than in Europe. The latter was the prime factor behind the rapid increase in population in the seventeenth century (later growth slowed as mortality rose) and is thought to follow from low population density which helped to limit the spread of infectious disease.

Patten, J.

"Village and town: an occupational study".
Agricultural History Review, 20, 1 (1972)

Uses a Muster return of 1522 to examine the occupational structure of 32 settlements in the Suffolk hundred of Babergh. The distribution of occupations is analysed first by size of settlement, for which a rough approximation is obtained from comparison with the tax payers listed in the Subsidy Returns of 1524 and 1525 and a series of arbitrary corrections to allow for omissions, particularly of married women, children under 16 and the poor of all ages. This is followed by a detailed examination of the occupational complexity of each settlement by means of scalograms. A short account of this technique for scaling qualitative data appears elsewhere in this Issue in answer to a letter from Mr. R. Chamberlaine-Brothers

Razzell, P. E.

"The evaluation of baptism as a form of birth registration through cross-matching census and parish register data". Population Studies, XXVI (March 1972)

An attempt to measure the completeness of Anglican registration in a sample of 45 parishes by trying to identify in the register of baptisms, individuals described in the enumeration schedules of the 1851 Census as born in the various parishes. Comparison with the 1861 Census and with data about births collected under civil registration from 1837 confirm the reliability of the 1851 Census as far as age and birth place information are concerned. Therefore, Razzell argues, the fact that taking one parish with another, one third of all individuals said to be born in a particular parish cannot be traced in the appropriate baptism register must mean that between 1760 and 1834 one third of all births were simply not registered by the Anglicans. In addition he uses literary evidence to suggest that a similar degree of under-recording was true of earlier periods.

Schofield, R.S.
and
Berry, B.M.

"Age at baptism in pre-industrial England"
Population Studies, XXV (November 1971)

An analysis of 43 printed registers giving dates of birth as well as of baptism in order to establish the great variety in baptismal practice between parishes, and over a period of time within the same parish. In some parishes it is clear that baptism was more delayed as the eighteenth century progressed; in others, however, the increase was interrupted or reversed, and at the end of the century there were still a number of parishes which were baptizing early, even by the seventeenth century standards.

Sheail, J.

"The distribution of taxable population and wealth in England during the early sixteenth century".
Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers,
55 (March 1972).

A study of the distribution of population and wealth in England in the years 1524-25 and 1543-45 based on the list of taxpayers and tax paid according to the lay subsidy returns of these years. Certain weaknesses in the data - for example religious persons were excluded - mean that the source must be used with care and Sheail admits that this may affect the validity of his conclusion that the East Midlands and East Anglia were more densely populated than the West Midlands and Central Southern England. He also notes other ways in which the Returns can be utilised. These include an analysis of the relative size and prosperity of the major towns, and at the opposite end of the spectrum a count at both dates of the numbers of tax-payers in settlements which have since disappeared.

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. They cordially invite readers to submit brief details of work which they have in progress.

Mr. R.N. Edrich, Wrekin College, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire TF1 3BH is investigating population trends in Norfolk during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, using the parish registers of Great Yarmouth, Kings Lynn and a number of rural parishes.

Mr. Derek Turner, Northgate, Christ's Hospital, Horsham, Sussex, is making an analysis of the Protestation Returns of 1642 and is also studying geographical mobility in the early seventeenth century, commencing with Sussex.

Mrs. J.D. Young of 8 Pateley Road, Mapperley, Nottingham NG3 5QF is engaged in a reconstitution for the parish of Gedling, Notts. and in a study of 'Effective Families' as outlined by Mr. Derek Turner in L.P.S. No. 2

Mrs. Jean Moore, 17 Park Road, Audenshaw, Manchester M34 5QW, is researching on Literacy in the parish of Ashton-under-Lyne, Lancs.

Mr. Barry Stapleton, 9 Cheriton Close, Horndean, Portsmouth P08 9PG is engaged on a family reconstitution for Odiham, Hampshire, covering the period 1539-1851. He is supplementing the reconstitution, using other local records, in an attempt to produce a survey of the social structure of the parish and a comparison of the vital statistics of couples who are mobile when married with those of couples who are static.

Mrs. D.M. McLaren, Luthrie, Blagrove Lane, Caversham, Reading, Berks, is working on social and economic change in the Thameside parish of Caversham, South Oxfordshire 1597-1714 and is carrying out a family reconstitution of Caversham and, probably, the neighbouring parish of Mapledurham.

AGGREGATION, LISTINGS, etc. known to the CAMBRIDGE GROUP

* Denotes analysis completed

COUNTY	PARISH	NAME	ADDRESSES
<u>STAFFORDSHIRE</u>			
<u>Aggregative</u>			
	Alstonefield*	F. Marston	1 Mount Pleasant Rd., Trent Valley, Lichfield
	Audley*	R. Speake	123 Slyne Road, Bolton-le-Sands, Carnforth, Lancs.
	Barton-under- Needwood*	Mrs. I. M. Woods	Dunstone Cottage, Widecombe-in-the- Moor, Newton Abbot Devon
	Burslem*	Mrs. P. G. Wain	53 Queensville, Stafford
	Burton-on- Trent	A. R. Higgott	B-on-T Natural Hist. & Arch. Soc., The Museum, 19 Alexandra Rd., Burton-on-Trent
	Eccleshall*	Mrs. I. Cooper	Woodley Cottage, Bunny's Hill, Cardinham, Bodmin, Cornwall
	Ellastone*	Mrs. P. G. Wain	
	Norton-in- the-Moors*	G. A. Tatchell	
	Rocester*	Mrs. P. G. Wain	

Sedgley*	F. A. Barnett	Ashley House, 46 Catholic Lane, Sedgley, Dudley
Stone*	Mrs. E. Key	34 Wincanton Road, Noakhill, Romford, Essex
Stowe-by- Chartley*	F. Marston	1 Trent Valley Road, Lichfield
Tatenhill*	A. R. Higott	

Literacy

Audley	R. Speake	
Cheadle	R. S. Schofield	20 Silver St., Cambridge
Sedgley*	F. A. Barnett	
Stone*	Mrs. E. Key	

Listings

Bilston 1695*
 Burton-on-Trent 1555*
 Lichfield 1692*
 Stafford 1622, 1698*
 Stoke-on-Trent 1701*

Reconstitution

Sedgley	Cambridge Group
---------	-----------------

SUFFOLK

Aggregative

Aldeburgh*	F. R. Grace	50 Temple Road, Ipswich
Carlton*	Mrs. R. Barker	Stuart House, Peasenhall, Saxmundham, Suffolk
Cavendish*	G. C. Whitehouse	Western House, Cavendish, Sudbury, Suffolk
Denston	J. R. Moeller	The Crown, Denston, Newmarket, Suffolk

Long Melford	Mrs. P. Goodfellow	Parsonage House, Helions Bumpstead, Haverhill, Suffolk
Marlesford*	Brig. J. J. Packard	
Mendlesham*	D. F. Lawton	Brockford, Stowmarket
Mildenhall*	Miss E. M. Jaggard	Lynton Farm, Beck Row, Bury St. Edmunds
Peasenhall*	Mrs. R. Barker	
Rattlesden*	P. Northeast	The School House, Rattlesden, Bury St. Edmunds
Saxmundham*	Rev. F. W. Moyle	The Rectory, Saxmundham
South Elham St. Peter*	Miss Le Grys	Flixton Grange, Bungay, Suffolk
Southwold*	Mrs. M. E. Egan	28 East St., Southwold, Suffolk
Stradbroke*	Mrs. J. K. Patey	Church House, Stradbroke
Walsham-le- Willows*	Miss J. Martineau	The Lawn, Walsham-le-Willows
Wickhambrook*	Mrs. E. Hodgson	The Vicarage, Wickhambrook, Newmarket
Woodbridge*	Mrs. A. Leach	10 Magdalen Drive, Debenrise, Woodbridge
Wortham*	Rev. E. V. Rees-Thomas	The Rectory, Wortham, Diss, Norfolk

Literacy

Blundeston*	Miss L. Mayes	'Micawber', Hall Lane, Blundeston, Lowestoft
Boulge*	G. A. Coulson	Yaxley Hall, Eye, Suffolk
Clare*	Dr. R. S. Schofield	Cambridge Group

East Bergholt*	F. W. Grace	
Easton*	Brig. J. J. Packard	The Cottage, Easton, Woodbridge, Suffolk
Eye*	Miss O. W. Riches	Wyncroft, 10 The Close, Royden, Diss, Norfolk
Framlingham*	Brig. J. J. Packard	
Fressingfield*	R. E. Emms	The Red House, Brockdish, Diss, Norfolk
Hadleigh*	K. P. Boulton	28 George St. , Hadleigh, Ipswich
Horringer*	J. Ridgard	12 Brefield Rd. , Melton, Woodbridge, Suffolk
Ipswich		
St. Clement*	M. Reed	421 Park Road, Loughborough, Leics.
St. Helen*		
St. Lawrence*	-do-	
St. Margaret*	-do-	
St. Mary Elm*	-do-	
St. Mary Quay*	-do-	
St. Mary Stoke*	-do-	
St. Mary Tower*	-do-	
St. Matthew*	-do-	
St. Nicholas*	-do-	
St. Peter*	-do-	
St. Stephen*	-do-	
Nonconformist*	-do-	
Kelsale*	Mrs. R. Barker	
Lavenham	Mrs. K. M. A. Carter	The Crooked House, Lavenham, Sudbury
Laxfield*	Rev. R. A. Marchant	Laxfield Vicarage, Woodbridge, Suffolk

East Bergholt*	G.A. Coulson
Eye*	G.A. Coulson
Great Bricet*	G.A. Coulson
Hopton*	Mrs. B. Cornford
Hoxne*	G.A. Coulson
Ipswich	
St. Margaret*	G.A. Coulson
Metfield*	G.A. Coulson
Oakley*	G.A. Coulson
Preston	
St. Mary*	Dr. R.S. Schofield
Rendlesham*	Dr. R.S. Schofield
Sternfield*	Dr. R.S. Schofield
Stoven*	G.A. Coulson
Thornham	
Magna*	G.A. Coulson
Thornham	
Parva*	G.A. Coulson
Wickhambrook*	Mrs. E. Hodgson
Woodbridge*	G.A. Coulson
Yaxley*	G.A. Coulson

Listings

Bury St. Edmunds	
St. James	1695

Reconstitution

SURREY

Aggregative

Abinger*	A. J. Fletcher and class	Kings College School, 9 Woodhayes Road, London, S.W. 19
Ash with Frimley	Miss P. Miller	63 Seaforth Gardens, Stoneleigh, Epsom

Ashtead*	J. R. Hardy	Kinross, Highfield, Ashtead, Surrey
Beddington*	A. J. Fletcher and class	
Betchworth*	Miss B. K. Barnardiston	20 Graham Terrace, London, S.W. 1
Burtsow*	Mrs. M. Morley	26 Careys Rd. , Smallfield, Nr. Horley, Surrey
Carshalton*	Mrs. J. E. Fox	57 Harestone Valley Rd. , Caterham, Surrey
Caterham*	Mrs. J. E. Fox	
Cobham*	J. J. Chadwick	37a Lower Teddington Rd. , Hampton Wick, Kingston, Surrey
Cranley*	Miss P. Miller	
Ewell*	G. T. Wignall	105 Kingston Rd. , Ewell. Surrey
Gatton*	Miss Wenham	Pilgrims, Upper Gatton, Reigate
Horley	Mrs. J. E. Fox	
Limpsfield*	Mrs. K. Percy	Vellan, Park Road, Limpsfield
Nutfield*	C. A. Brown	Ben Mohr, Barfields, Bletchingley, Surrey
Putney*	A. J. Fletcher and class	
Reigate*	Miss D. M. Bartholomew	31 Spring Copse Rd. , Reigate

Walton-on-
the-Hill* Mrs. J. E. Fox

Wimbledon* A. J. Fletcher
and class

Wotton* A. J. Fletcher
and class

Literacy

Camberwell* Mrs. J. E. Fox

Reper-Harrow* Dr. R. S. Schofield Cambridge Group

Reigate* Miss D. M. Bartholomew

St. John H. Carter 44 Lindfield Gardens,
Horselydown Guildford, Surrey
Southwark*

Stoke next H. Carter
Guildford*

Listings

Oxted 1821, 1811, 1801*

Epsom 1795

Reconstitution

Limpsfield Mrs. K. Percy

Nineteenth Century Society

Essays in the Use of Quantitative Methods for the Study of Social Data
Edited by E. A. WRIGLEY

'During the nineteenth century all economically advanced countries gathered more information about their subjects than ever before. These essays concentrate on the census, and examine the opportunities and difficulties presented by this data in the study of nineteenth century society. For nineteenth-century quantitative social historians, the book will . . . be indispensable.

The Times Higher Education Supplement
£8.00 net

Household and Family in Past Time

Comparative Studies in the Size and Structure of the Domestic Group over the last three centuries in England, France, Serbia, Japan and colonial North America, with further material from Western Europe.
Edited with an introduction by PETER LASLETT
With the assistance of RICHARD WALL

The first attempt to examine the general belief that in the past families were larger than they are today. Examined in historical and comparative terms, the evidence points to the nuclear family, or simple family household, as the normal arrangement well before the onset of industrialization.

£12.00 net

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

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.

Population and Social Change

Edited by D. V. GLASS and ROGER REVELLE

An important new collection of demographic studies by distinguished contributors reappraising social and economic change through study of the small community and social group. Essential reading for all concerned in the field of historical research these illuminating essays will prove to be of great interest in many related disciplines. £7.50 net

Demographic Analysis

ROLAND PRESSAT

Translated by Judah Matras

This book is a long-awaited translation of what has been acclaimed as the best text-book on its subject, embodying the most recent developments and analytical techniques for the study of mortality, marriage, fertility, reproduction, population structure, and the preparation and use of population projections. £6 net

EDWARD ARNOLD