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All articles reviewed were published in 1999 unless otherwise stated.


During 1999 the journal History and Computing made a welcome return to the shelves, with the long-delayed publication of volume 9, which ‘officially’ bears the date 1997! These two articles concern the ‘multiple pass’ strategy in automatic linkage of historical records advocated by Harvey, Green and Corfield in History and Computing, 8 (1996), 78–89. Perhaps the most interesting point Adman makes in his paper is to note the ‘apparent lack of progress’ in record linkage since the publication of E.A. Wrigley ed, Identifying people in the past, (London, 1973). Despite three decades of effort, no generally accepted approach to the record linkage of data from the census enumerators’ books (CEBs) has emerged. Much effort has been expended on the use of computers to speed up the procedure, but there is still debate about whether it is best entirely to automate the process, or whether to use computers as an aid to manual identification of links. The paper by Tilley and French reports a test of the entirely automatic ‘multiple pass’ approach using CEB data from Kingston, Surrey, and Microsoft’s Access database. The sections of the paper dealing with the application are thorough and will assist others in trying out the approach for themselves. The authors come down quite firmly against fully automatic linkage. They conclude that ‘multiple pass algorithms ... have a value but only in establishing potential links’ and that ‘true matches must be confirmed by a human researcher, not just within the multiple pass approach but with all techniques that incorporate some form of algorithm’ (pp. 131–2).


In this paper, Anderson attempts to correct the impression given in a number of recent studies that the reporting of married women’s employment in the nineteenth century census enumerators’ books (CEBs) is seriously deficient. He points out that it is ‘fast becoming a new orthodoxy’ that ‘the reporting of married women’s employment in the CEBs is so bad that the data are almost useless for serious analytical purposes’ (p. 10). After analysing data from
Lancashire and Cheshire on textile employment and the employment of the wives of craftsmen, traders and labourers, Anderson reaches the view that the CEBs give about as fair a reflection as could have been expected of the gainful employment of married women. Seasonal agricultural work is under-recorded, but this is not surprising given that the census took place in the spring. His conclusion is that ‘the census enumerators’ books must remain, for many parts of the country at least, the best indicator that we have of variations in married women’s gainful work activity in the mid-nineteenth century’ (p. 27)


This is a short history of inoculation and vaccination against smallpox, focusing on whether and to what extent vaccination alone was responsible for its decline in England and Wales. It also discusses the history of the arguments for and against compulsory vaccination.


Proofs of age survive in England from 1272 to the end of the Middle Ages, generated by the need to establish exactly when a ward of the king should receive his inheritance, and this was achieved through an inquest involving a jury of 12 men. They were required not only to tell the judge whether the heir was of age, but also how they knew, providing an unusual insight into the sorts of things that medieval men remembered as significant events. Bedell examines those proofs that survive between 1272 and 1327, encompassing memories of 1,371 separate events recalled by over 1,000 men, mainly in their forties and fifties but ranging widely across the social spectrum. Those which survive from the reign of Edward I (to 1307) are the more reliable, for thereafter Bedell detects a tendency for them to become formulaic. He finds that the events commonly remembered were overwhelmingly personal and family events, births, marriages and deaths accounting for fully 65 per cent of the total, followed by other life-cycle events, and land transactions. Concern with broader issues, such as the weather, warfare or political milestones feature rarely, suggesting an insularity in the horizons of medieval men whether they were barons or carters.


Boothman’s study employs the partial enumerations of the population of Long Melford contained in the Easter Offering books alongside a reconstitution of its parish registers to estimate mobility and stability in the parish. Almost as if in answer to Rollinson (reviewed below), she finds surprisingly high levels of stability compared to many other extant studies, a stability that was more marked in the ‘urban’ parts of the parish compared to the more ‘rural’ areas. In 1684 compared with 1676, 75 per cent of those who had not been buried in
Long Melford remained in the parish. Those who could be identified as poor were slightly more mobile, but this was a difference of degree rather than of kind, and amongst all social groups there was a large stable core exhibiting a rootedness that spanned several generations. Whilst the period studied was one in which migration had slackened compared to the later sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, Boothman suggests that the range of economic activity found in Long Melford may have provided an incentive to stay rather than leave, although she also notes that the size of the parish, at around 5,000 acres, must have a bearing upon the contrast found between Long Melford and other less extensive parishes.


Both these papers are based on Broad’s study of a number of parishes in North Buckinghamshire. In the first, he argues that a full understanding of the operation of the Old Poor Law in individual parishes requires the historian to consider each parish’s peculiar characteristics, such as the availability of other charitable funds. He maintains that up until the late eighteenth century, each parish was able to use these funds, together with common rights and other measures, to mount a flexible approach to poor relief which best suited its situation. Thereafter, however, this system was progressively overwhelmed by increased demand for relief. The second paper is a study of landownership in the contrasting Buckinghamshire villages of Steeple Claydon and Middle Claydon, focusing on the situation of the small to middling farmer. The paper has some interesting observations to make on the process by which parishes became ‘open’ or ‘closed’.


In a salutary attempt to refine our understanding of the double standard of sexual morality, Capp demonstrates both the importance of male sexual reputation to the respectable classes and the various ways in which some women were prepared to turn this to their own ends. Respectable men could thus be vulnerable to wronged or calculating women, who cannot be universally regarded as passive and helpless victims despite the undeniable balance of power that men held. Numerous examples, admittedly mainly from London sources, are given of women attempting or threatening to shame men, to blackmail them into marriage, to gain compensation and financial support, and to extort money cynically or for the purpose of revenge. Quantification is beyond reach, as Capp acknowledges, though one might ask for some clarification of phrases such as ‘quite often’ (p. 79) or ‘a significant number’ (p. 80) that implicitly quantify. But if the ‘sub-culture of semi-professional sexual extortion’ was most probably confined to London, there is no doubt that
sexual reputation was an issue of importance to men across the country, and its exploitation was a potential weapon available to the weak.


This article describes a method for estimating the proportion of any set of numbers which are exact counts and the proportion which have been rounded (for example to the nearest five, ten or hundred). The method is quite general and may be applied to any historical set of numbers, for example a set of ages drawn from a census enumerators’ book. The authors apply the method to a set of reported numbers of people attending religious services in the 1851 Religious Census. They conclude that just over half the returned congregations seem to have been rounded, suggesting the possibility that the total number recorded as attending divine service on the appointed Sunday in 1851 was overestimated. The authors attempt to work out the degree of overestimation, and arrive at a figure somewhere between two and four per cent. Readers should note that the proposed method is statistical in nature, and its application requires a certain level of numeracy. However, the description given is fairly clear, and the method may easily be carried out using standard spreadsheet packages.


In this paper Drake uses the census enumerators’ books (CEBs) to examine domestic service. He stresses regional and local differences in the ways servants were recorded in the CEBs, and in the proportion of kin-servants. He joins in the general encouragement (to which many other authors have given voice) to future researchers to link the CEBs to other sources, but points out that institutional servants may be more fruitful subjects for this kind of study, as more documentation is likely to survive for them than for household servants. This paper should be read in conjunction with that by Hancock reviewed below.


A valuable addition to the sparse literature on medieval demography is our own Martin Ecclestone’s analysis of the Glastonbury head-tax lists, lists of men aged 12 and over who were regularly recorded until they either died or acquired land, thus encompassing a lowly social group for which evidence is generally unattainable. Whilst most lists allow only the calculation of crude death rates, and not surprisingly produce very low figures given the age bias of the evidence, the detailed court rolls for the manors of Longbridge Deverill and Monkton Deverill allow, with the help of model life tables, the estimation of expectation of life at age 20. He concludes that this stood at 26 to 29 years,
excluding the high mortality during the famine of 1315–1317, figures that are only slightly below those calculated by Razi for the richer tenants of Hale-sowen and by Hatcher and Harvey for early fifteenth century monks. Mortal-
ity in the Black Death was, however, high, averaging 57 per cent overall, with a range between 36 and 76 per cent across the various manors.


This article examines the economic and social relations between the stone workers of the Isle of Purbeck in Dorset and the co-resident agricultural population during the nineteenth century in the light of Newby’s idea of the ‘occupational community’. Evidence is produced to demonstrate that the stone workers were part of a distinctive and exclusive ‘economic community’, the geographical extent of which stretched far beyond the boundaries of Purbeck. Recruitment to this community was strictly controlled through an apprenticeship system operated by a centuries-old trade organisation. Once recruited, stone workers were extremely reluctant to leave the trade, moving away from the Isle of Purbeck in order to pursue it rather than becoming farmers or farm workers in Purbeck. A belief that they possessed ancient privileges (which they were prepared to defend in court) encouraged the stone workers to maintain their exclusivity. In the non-economic spheres of life, however, it seems the stone workers and agricultural workers interacted as if they were a single community.


This paper reports a study of 1,685 Irish-born inhabitants of Hammersmith and Fulham listed in the 1851 census returns. As with the Irish elsewhere in London at that time, these people were mostly born in south-western Ireland (especially the counties of Cork and Limerick). They generally had poorly-
paid, casual employment, many of them working in the market gardens which were numerous in this locality at that time. They lived, typically, in crowded and insanitary conditions. Some, though not all, were refugees from the Irish Famine of 1845–1849, and these refugees were living in conditions even more marginal than the rest – although of course, this may simply have been because in 1851 they were all recent migrants.


This paper is an analysis of the populations of the 11 Hertfordshire work-
houses in 1851. Nigel Goose shows that these workhouses contained a propor-
tion of children which was close to that in the population as a whole. People of working age, and married people in general, were under-represented, and the elderly over-represented, especially poor old men. The fact that children were not over-represented in the Hertfordshire workhouses may be due to the
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availability of employment in the straw plaiting and hatmaking trades. An implication of the article is that an understanding of the composition of workhouse populations requires a good deal of knowledge about the local economic situation within each Poor Law Union.


This is a study of the structure of middle-class households in a small area of west-central Glasgow between 1851 and 1891, using the census enumerators’ books. The results show that nuclear families only constituted 66 per cent of households in 1851, falling to 59 per cent in 1891. Non-nuclear families were mostly extended laterally (that is, they contained siblings, nieces and nephews of the head) rather than vertically. In this, they were not the same as the extended working-class households noted by Michael Anderson in his famous study of Preston (*Family structure in nineteenth century Lancashire*, (Cambridge, 1971)). The proportion of households which was extended did not vary clearly with wealth or status within this middle-class group: thus the hypothesis outlined by Steven Ruggles in his recent book *Prolonged connections: the rise of the extended family in nineteenth century England and America*, (Madison, 1987) is not supported by this evidence.


The first of these articles is a detailed critique of a paper published by Komlos in 1993 (*Economic History Review, 46*, 768–82). In the latter paper, Komlos argued that the nutritional status of English men declined in the mid-eighteenth century, at the same time as rapid population growth began, because of Malthusian-style pressure of population on resources. He based his analysis on the reported heights of runaway servants whose masters advertised in newspapers in the United States. Grubb takes issue with Komlos’s analysis for a variety of reasons, many of which are technical and rather arcane. In the second paper, Komlos resoundingly defends his earlier analysis, backing up his argument with a further barrage of statistics and technical points. Most readers of *Local Population Studies* will probably be less interested in the debate about analytical techniques than in the question at issue: whether the second quarter of the eighteenth century was a time of declining nutrition associated with rapid population growth.

R. Hancock, ‘In service or one of the family? Kin-servants in Swavesey 1851–81, Ryde 1881 and Stourbridge 1881’, *Family and Community History, 2*, 141–8.

This paper analyses data from the census enumerators’ books (CEBs) for
the three places mentioned in the title. The object of this exercise is to examine the prevalence of ‘kin-servants’, these being persons described in the ‘relationship to head of family’ column of the CEBs as kin, but who, according to the ‘occupation’ column, were working in domestic service. The proportion of all domestic servants who were ‘kin-servants’ varied from about 20 to 40 per cent (30 to 50 per cent if only servants aged 20 years and older were considered). An apparent increase in this proportion in Swavesey between 1851 and 1881 was apparently due to an increase in the proportion of persons working as domestic servants but living in their own homes.


This study of a Cambridgeshire village shows that emigration from rural England in the nineteenth century was not simply a matter of people being pushed out by poverty. It has been well known for many years that a ‘friends and relatives’ effect operates to encourage the migration of those familiar to previous migrants, a process often termed chain migration. This study shows that it can also work in origin communities to influence emigration patterns. Most migrants from Melbourn were from the agricultural working and labouring class, who were more likely to emigrate than other classes. Finally, the importance of the energy and enthusiasm of the person charged with recruiting potential emigrants is stressed.


The north of Kent is becoming one of the most intensively studied areas of the country from a local demographic perspective, as demonstrated, for example, by Perkyns’s paper reviewed below and Barry Reay’s book *Microhistories: demography, society and culture in rural England, 1800–1930*, (Cambridge, 1996). This paper tries to assess the impact of the agricultural depression on employment patterns in the parish of Borden, near Sittingbourne, by using record linkage on census data for male heads of household between 1851 and 1891. Compared with other decades, the depression decade 1871–1881 saw a greater movement out of agriculture, mainly into ‘general labouring’ occupations, which may reflect the impact of the depression in agriculture. The article also describes an attempt to trace male out-migrants from Borden during the 1870s by using the machine-readable 1881 Census data. Only two out of every five of the out-migrants who had been in agriculture in Borden were still in agriculture in their destination parishes; most of the rest had gone into mining or ‘general labouring’ occupations.

This short article emphasises the fact that many early feminists opposed abortion on the grounds that it epitomised the male domination of women. It also makes the interesting point that many pioneers of the birth control movement (such as Annie Besant in England) made a clear distinction between contraception and abortion, approving of the former and disapproving of the latter.


This important paper analyses local-level migration in six parishes in northern Kent, close to the River Medway. Perkyns shows that short distance migration was extremely common, and formed the majority of all migration. She also points out that many recent studies using aggregate data (for example Dudley Baines, Migration in a mature economy: emigration and internal migration in England and Wales, (Cambridge, 1985)) focus on long-distance migration; it is unwise to infer the age structure and death rates of short distance migrants from the results of such analyses. In her study area, she finds that migrants tended to concentrate in ‘newer’ occupations, rather than in long-established ones, like agriculture. Economic opportunities (or lack of opportunities) were important in driving migration flows. The paper includes a wide range of detailed analyses that will repay close scrutiny. Its results should also be compared with those reported in the paper by Jackson reviewed above.


This is a fascinating and entertaining piece, which, as its introduction claims, shows that Malthus was ‘not the cold-hearted monster that was often portrayed’ (p. 47). It includes a brief biography of Malthus, and a good deal of material on the people with whom he associated. The different views which his contemporaries held of the great man are described, though the overall tone is very sympathetic. It is highly recommended to readers of Local Population Studies.

J.C. Riley, ‘Why sickness and death rates do not move parallel to one another over time’, Social History of Medicine, 12, 101–24.

B. Harris, ‘Morbidity and mortality during the health transition: a comment on James C. Riley, “Why sickness and death rates do not move parallel to one another over time”’, Social History of Medicine, 12, 125–31.

J.C. Riley, ‘Reply to Bernard Harris: morbidity and mortality during the health transition: a comment on James C. Riley’, Social History of Medicine, 12, 133–7.

In the first of these contributions, Riley uses Friendly Society data for Morcott in Rutland, Ashbourne in Derbyshire, Llangeitho in Cardiganshire and Abthorpe
in Northamptonshire to show that trends in mortality and morbidity did not move in parallel during the nineteenth century. While mortality declined as the century progressed, the duration of periods of sickness tended to increase, implying an increase in sickness prevalence. Riley accounts for these divergent trends in morbidity and mortality by suggesting that the disease profile was changing from acute infections to respiratory and degenerative diseases, which lasted longer. Harris is sceptical about both Riley’s data and his interpretations. He says that Friendly Society records are dependent on definitions of sickness and attitudes towards the use of the Societies by their members. He also suggests that improved childhood health (resulting, for example, from the decline of infectious diseases) may have affected adult health years later. The nature of any such effect may, of course, be complex.


In this paper, Rogers tackles two questions: first, was the landed elite in the eighteenth century closed to new money? Second, did the prosperous merchants and businessmen treat their wives more generously than did the landed aristocracy? The answer to the first question seems to be ‘no’. The fact that many businessmen did not spend their newly-made pile on a country ‘pile’ was because they were not really interested in becoming landed gentry. A fair proportion of those who were interested managed to find a country seat. The answer to the second question is probably ‘yes’. Businessmen did treat their wives more generously, and this was because ‘fewer businessmen were interested in creating and sustaining landed estates through patrilineal male descent’ (p. 30).


In a fascinating discussion of different ways of conceptualising space, settlement and migration which roams over eight centuries despite its early modern focus, Rollinson not only re-emphasises the importance of movement, but argues that it should be given primacy in an understanding of the development of early modern English society. The empirical content of the article focuses upon Cirencester, a town of some 2–3,000 people which relied heavily upon immigration even to maintain its size in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century, as evidenced by both aggregate analysis of its parish registers and nominal linkage between baptismal registers and a ‘census’ of 1608. Not surprisingly, it was the poorer craftsmen and tradesmen that showed the greatest mobility. The typicality of Cirencester’s experience must, however be questioned, for much of its natural decrease was due to a devastating mortality crisis that carried off a third of its inhabitants. Far from all towns, and particularly far from all small towns, were so unfortunate, and recent work by Goose, Galley, Dobson and others demonstrating that even far larger towns
could and did achieve natural increase in this period is ignored. Movement, both permanent and temporary, was of course the life-blood of early modern towns both large and small, but corporation records also reveal evidence of remarkable stability, of both personnel and structures, a stability that one expect to be even more marked in the English countryside, which is where most people lived.


Like the article by David Levine reviewed in *Local Population Studies* **63** (1999), 78, this is an extended review of the Cambridge Group’s recent book on family reconstitution (E.A. Wrigley, R. Davies, J. Oeppen and R.S. Schofield, *English population history from family reconstitution 1580–1837*, (Cambridge, 1997)). While regarding the book as of great importance, admiring the effort it represents, and accepting the general story of English population history told in the book, Ruggles is critical of several aspects of the work. First, the parishes used by the Cambridge Group are larger than average. Hence they were more ‘urbanised’ and likely to have experienced faster growth and have a higher population density than the average parish. The representativeness of the parishes also varies over time, and this problem is not resolved by the weighting scheme used in the book. Ruggles also feels that an opportunity to assess how local conditions affected demographic behaviour was missed. Second, Ruggles is still concerned about selection bias arising from the fact that only a minority of the population is reconstitutable. Third, he feels that the problem of censoring results in an underestimate of measures like the expectation of life at birth and the length of birth intervals. Because of these problems, and also because of linkage failures, the under-registration of vital events and random error, Ruggles thinks that we should be ‘wary of the precision of virtually every estimate in the book’ (p. 127). He does not mean that they are ‘necessarily wrong ... [but he is] ... unpersuaded that they are right’ (p. 127). He also stresses that much more could be done if and when the original data are made freely available to researchers.


These two papers are both concerned with parishes in Cumbria. The first analyses population cycles between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries. The authors show that mortality crises in these communities could trigger a set of cyclical oscillations in numbers of births and deaths, often with a period of about 43–46 years. The persistence of these cycles was greatest where a ‘density-dependent check’ (that is, a check arising from pressure of population on resources) was operating most strongly. The second paper focuses on the
parish of Penrith. It analyses infant mortality using the Bourgeois-Pichat
method of estimating its exogenous (due to infections, etc.) and endoge-
nous (due to congenital malformations, birth complications, etc.) compo-
nents. The decline in infant mortality in Penrith between 1550 and 1800
was mainly due to a fall in endogenous mortality, and this fall was
sustained throughout this 250-year period. In this, Penrith was unlike the
16 parishes studied by E.A. Wrigley (see his paper in Population Studies,
31 (1977), 281–312), in which endogenous infant mortality rose until
about 1700 and then declined. Penrith, however, lies in that area of north-
west England which suffered from periodic subsistence crises during the
late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, and it may have been that
poor maternal nutrition during pregnancy during this period led to levels
of endogenous infant mortality being unusually high in that region.

P. Sharpe, ‘The female labour market in English agriculture during the
Industrial Revolution: expansion or contraction?’, Agricultural History
Review, 47, 161–81.

This article reviews the literature on women’s farm work during the
eighteenth century. Sharpe notes that there are opposing views on this
topic: some argue that the adoption of improved farming methods led to
an increased demand for female labour; others take the view that during
the second half of the eighteenth century the sexual division of labour on
farms became more marked, and that this was associated with a decline
in the amount of work women did. Having re-evaluated the evidence,
including some new sources not apparently used by historians in this
context before, Sharpe concludes that there is little evidence for any
change in the sexual division of labour. It does seem that female wages
fell during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, but this is
not necessarily evidence of reduced opportunities for female labour.
Finally, there is evidence of regional differences in trends over time.

G. Sheeran and Y. Sheeran, ‘Reconstructing local history’, Local Histori-
an, 29, 256–62.

The authors of this short but thought-provoking piece want local histori-
ans to engage with the debate going on among historians in general as to
whether history is about a search for ‘objective truth’ or whether it is
about the writing of narratives. Local historians, they say, tend to take the
aim of ‘objective truth’ for granted. In other words, they are empiricists,
or modernists, the object of research being to get as close as possible to
this ‘truth’ (I suspect that this is true also of historical demographers
working on local communities). This paper argues that this will not do.
Local historians must engage with the debate if they are not to become
increasingly marginalised within the discipline of history. Local Popula-
tion Studies readers might also be interested in the two replies to this

There seems to be a veritable flood of regional or local studies of small owners or occupier of land (see the papers by Brumhead, Hallas, and Moore-Colyer reviewed in *Local Population Studies* 63, 72, 75 and 79–80 and the paper by Broad reviewed above). This very detailed paper stresses the ‘fluid and complex nature of the structure of landownership’ (p. 184) in the part of Cumbria studied. Customary tenure survived into the twentieth century in several townships. Many of Shepherd’s observations echo those made in Hallas’s aforementioned study of landownership in the north Yorkshire Pennines, especially the way in which owners often let out part of their own property while simultaneously taking a tenancy in order to occupy the right ‘mix’ of land types.


Barry Stapleton will be familiar to many readers of *Local Population Studies* because of his work on Odiham, one of the parishes contributing to the Cambridge Group’s recent family reconstitution volume (see the article by Ruggles reviewed above). This is the latest paper to result from his work. It is a study of 43 families who persisted in the parish for three or more generations during the period from 1525–1850. It relates persistence to family strategies concerning inheritance and to social mobility. Stapleton finds few general rules by which these interrelationships can be summarised. Partible inheritance, for example, sometimes made for downward mobility but not always. However, it does seem that low fertility and high infant mortality, leading to a greater chance of only one son or daughter surviving their parents, did help to maintain the family property (whether farm or business) intact. High fertility and low infant mortality over several generations was eventually associated with a decline in a family’s fortunes.


In another paper discussing the Cambridge Group’s reconstitution volume (see Ruggles’s paper reviewed above), Vann focuses on the findings about fertility. He is particularly interested in the conclusion that a rise in marital fertility contributed to the overall rise in fertility during the eighteenth century, (see the article by Wrigley reviewed in *Local Population Studies*, 63 (1999), 84). Since it seems that this rise was largely due to early-marrying women continuing childbearing for longer, this raises the question as to why they did not go on having children for so long in the seventeenth century. Vann suggests that it is at least possible that family limitation (possibly through *coitus interruptus*) was being practised in
this earlier period, as Wrigley himself suggested many years ago in his famous article on Colyton (Economic History Review, 19 (1966), 82–109). According to Vann, family limitation is ‘a repressed theme in the book’s treatment of changes in fertility, so that it leaves the question of its prevalence still open’ (p. 93).


The population of the Sheffield suburb of Attercliffe increased from about 4,000 to about 36,000 between 1841 and 1891. This increase was due to the growth of iron and steel manufacture in the area. This study focuses on tracing the populations of four streets over this 50-year period. Despite the rapid growth of heavy industry, the population was dominated by families (not groups of unmarried men). Among these families, extended kinship networks were important (indeed a high proportion of between 13 and 20 per cent of households were ‘extended’ in some way). Prior to the arrival of the iron and steel industry, the population of Attercliffe had been occupied in ‘light trades’ such as the manufacture of cutlery and edge-tools. Families engaged in these light trades lived in and amongst the iron and steel workers, but were reluctant to marry members of the newly arrived iron and steel working families. The study also examines residential persistence (from census to census), showing that persistence in the same street was low, but that persistence in the same locality was considerably higher.


This article is a study of some 50 detailed settlement examinations from Cumbria, which give detailed residential and occupational histories. Many of the examinants moved from place to place frequently, although mostly within a fairly circumscribed area. Maps of several representative histories are presented. The high mobility was true not only of those who were servants, but also of tenant farmers (and even owner-occupiers). The occupations reported by the examinants ‘were not always clearly defined at a particular moment in time and were liable to change even in the short term’ (p. 245).


Although this paper was published in 1997, it has hitherto escaped notice by these review articles, and is of such direct relevance to local population studies that it is worth a mention here. The paper compares population totals from several parishes in north Wiltshire derived from the
Compton Census of 1676 and the Marriage Duty assessment lists of 1697–1700, also using for comparison Hoskins’s ‘rule of thumb’ that the population total is roughly equal to the average annual number of baptisms multiplied by 30 (see W.G. Hoskins, *Local history in England*, (London, 1959), 143.). The author reviews the limitations and difficulties with both her sources. She concludes, surely correctly, that it is unwise to use a single set of figures taken in isolation to estimate population totals. Her results seem to suggest, though, that the Marriage Duty assessment lists are more reliable than the Compton Census as guides to the populations of these parishes.


This short paper describes one of Malthus’s less well-known contributions to population studies: his explanation of why bread prices in England increased so markedly in 1800 and 1801. Malthus’s argument is that the English poor relief system allowed the poor to retain purchasing power even in times of dearth and thus increased the effective demand for bread, spreading the shortage through the majority of the population. The poor relief system thus in a sense bound together the fortunes of rich and poor. Put another way, it ‘democratised’ the dearth. In other places, for example Scandinavia, the lack of a similar system meant that in hard times the poor could not possibly enter the market for grain and bid up the price. Malthus’s analysis prefigures more modern analyses of famine, notably the ‘entitlement approach’ of Amartya Sen described in *Poverty and famines: an essay on entitlement and deprivation*, (Oxford, 1981).