

## The Stoke-upon-Trent Parish Listing 1701

by

David Alan Gatley

with

Margaret Midgley and Sheena Bateman

As is well known the first national census which recorded the names of people nation-wide was that of 1841. What is less well known is that similar, but less detailed, lists of each individual residing in particular communities in earlier years were occasionally drawn up for a variety of reasons.<sup>1</sup> One such listing, dated the 2nd June 1701, exists for Stoke-upon-Trent.<sup>2</sup>

This listing is here reproduced in full. First we shall seek to place it in its context, discussing briefly what is known<sup>3</sup> about pre-census listings, why they were drawn up and what they show. We then go on to examine the uses to which these listings have been put, and we present a brief statistical summary of the population of Stoke-upon-Trent in 1701 based upon the listing.

Writing in 1842 John Ward described the ancient parish of Stoke-upon-Trent as 'exceeding thirty square miles in extent, consisting of more than twenty villis or hamlets ...'.<sup>4</sup> By 1701, however, the area over which the rector held sway was smaller than this because the parish had been subdivided into a number of chapelries with their own churches: Whitmore, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Burslem and Norton-in-the-Moors.<sup>5</sup> Even so the area over which the rector of Stoke church was directly responsible covered at least 18 square miles (c. 5,000 hectares) and included at least ten townships.<sup>6</sup> In the early eighteenth century the area was still largely rural. Hanley, for example, was just 'a humble collection of dwellings'<sup>7</sup> and there was little at Stoke itself apart from the church and rector's house.<sup>8</sup> Economically the area was still largely agricultural. Its pottery industry was, however, beginning to expand at this time and there was also a small mining industry.<sup>9</sup>

In a chapter written in 1966 P. Laslett<sup>10</sup> discussed why these early listings were drawn up and

---

<sup>1</sup> M. Medlycott, 'A Survey and Guide of Listings of Inhabitants', in *Local Population Studies* (No. 46, 1991), 50-51.

<sup>2</sup> The document is in Staffordshire County Record Office: Ref. D(W) 1742/55.

<sup>3</sup>

<sup>4</sup> J. Ward, *History of the Borough of Stoke-Upon-Trent* (London, 1843; reprinted Hanley 1984), 449.

<sup>5</sup> R. Talbot, *The Church and Ancient Parish of Stoke-upon-Trent* (Stoke-on-Trent, 1969), 66.

<sup>6</sup> Penkull and Booth, Shelton, Hanley, Fenton Vivian, Fenton Culvert, Longton, Meir Lane End, Botteslow, Clayton, Seabridge, (Bucknall and Eaves, and Bagnall) Ward, *Stoke*, 449.

<sup>7</sup> Ward, *Stoke*, 348.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid. 498.

<sup>9</sup> J.G. Jenkins (ed.), *Victoria County History of Staffordshire*, viii (London, 1963), 160-8.

<sup>10</sup> P. Laslett, 'The Study of Social Structure from Listings of Inhabitants', in E.A. Wrigley, *An Introduction to English Historical Demography* (London, 1966), 160. See also K.W. Wachter, E.A. Hammel and P. Laslett, *Statistical Studies of Historical Social Structure* (London, 1978), 66-7; R. Wall (ed.) *Family Forms in Historic Europe* (Cambridge, 1983), 34-5.

examined their format and content. He concluded that they were compiled for a variety of reasons. Some were, no doubt, drawn up out of idle curiosity. Others, such as that of Clayworth (Nottinghamshire) were compiled in conjunction with the Compton Census of 1676, which sought to estimate the inhabitants of each parish together with the numbers of Roman Catholics and dissenters.<sup>11</sup> Others were drawn up following the Marriage Duty Act of 1695<sup>12</sup> and some, such as that of Lichfield, were compiled by the seventeenth-century demographer Gregory King.<sup>13</sup> Parish listings differ greatly in the information recorded. Many simply contain the names of individuals, others contain people's occupations, but few include their ages. Many are partial insofar as they include only part of a community, others include the names of men, adults or communicants only. That for Stoke-upon-Trent, however, is considered one of the best in existence.<sup>14</sup> It covers only a part of the ancient parish of Stoke-upon-Trent, but the area enumerated included six liberties (or townships)<sup>15</sup> and approximately 1,629 individuals residing in 373 families. Separate families are for the most part clearly distinguished. The names and ages of all but a handful of individuals are given in full, as are the numbers of communicants (those aged 16 and over who were considered eligible to partake of Holy Communion) in each family.<sup>16</sup> The listing is deficient in that the occupations of only eleven people are given, but it is possibly unique in identifying both paupers and the illegitimate.

The listing is dated the 2nd June 1701 but it is unlikely that it was completed entirely on that date.<sup>17</sup> However, an examination of the exact ages of infants given in the listing and of their baptismal dates in the parish register suggests that it was compiled over a short period in May and June 1701. There is, however, evidence that one family (HA70) may have been added to the list some time after the document was compiled.<sup>18</sup> We do not know if the parish listing is an *ideal* or *actual* listing, to use Laslett's terminology.<sup>19</sup> If it is an ideal listing than it would have included all those people who were *normally* resident in the parish *including* those who were absent on the day that the listing took place, while an actual listing would have included only those who were present on the day that the listing was made. Nor is it known how the listing was compiled. One possibility is that it was compiled from another document such as an *Easter Book*.<sup>20</sup> Easter Books were lists of people liable to pay the annual Easter offerings to the parson. The few examples that survive from this period vary greatly in the information which they record but some, such as those for Ludlow (Shropshire) list all inhabitants of the parish.<sup>21</sup> No matter how the listing was compiled, however, whether from another document or for its own sake, it is highly likely that its compilers undertook a house to house survey of the parish. Nevertheless, an examination of the listing suggests that, if a house by house survey was attempted, then not all households were visited. On occasion first names, surnames or ages, and on several occasions complete names are omitted, an unlikely occurrence were all householders interviewed. Such omissions may, of course, have resulted from houses being empty when the compiler called, and

---

<sup>11</sup> Laslett, 'Social Structure', 169. See also A. Whiteman, 'The Compton Census of 1676', in K. Schurer and T. Arkell (eds.), *Surveying the People* (Oxford, 1992), 78-96.

<sup>12</sup> Laslett, 'Social Structure', 163-71; 139-41.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid. 177.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid. 171.

<sup>15</sup> The six liberties are Penkull, Clayton, Seabridge, Shelton, Hanley and Fenton Culvert. The liberties not included in the listing were Fenton Vivian, Longton, Meir Lane End and Botteslow (Bucknall and Eaves, and Bagnall). It is unlikely that the listing covered the virtually independent chapelries.

<sup>16</sup> Whiteman, 'Compton Census', 81; A. Whiteman, *The Compton Census of 1676: A Critical Edition* (London, 1986), xxx-xxxiii.

<sup>17</sup> Laslett, 'Social Structure', 171, argues that the listing is a copy of an earlier one which has been lost. There is, however, little to support this contention and it is suggested here that the copy now in existence was drawn up in June 1701. One explanation for Laslett's contention is that it is due to an erroneous reading of the note '1785 TH' on the front cover of the booklet.

<sup>18</sup> See below.

<sup>19</sup> Laslett, 'Social Structure', 161.

<sup>20</sup> S.J. Wright, 'A Guide to Easter Books and Related Parish Listings', in *Local Population Studies* (No. 42, 1989), 18-28.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid. 20.

therefore the listing may then have been filled in from memory or perhaps with the help of an inquisitive neighbour.

We move on to discuss the format of the document. The listing is written on the first 40 pages of a 72-page quarto paper booklet. At the time the listing was written, or shortly afterwards, the booklet was bound in two sheets of coarse greyish-brown paper with, as an outer cover, a parchment deed of 12th May 1691 concerning the Ward family of Newcastle-under-Lyme. Parties to the deed include John Ward and his father Michael, almost certainly the John Ward who was curate of Stoke in 1701 and the aged Michael Ward who was living with him at the time of the listing (PE3). Pages 2-71 of the booklet were ruled uniformly into columns for the listing. The listing begins on page 1, with the date and a brief description at the beginning of the area included and the format of the entries.

2nd June 1701

A collection of the names of every particular and individual person in the parish of Stoke-upon-Trent, in the County of Stafford, as they are now residing within their respective Liberties and Families within the said parish; together with the age of every such person, as near as can conveniently be known, as also the number of families and souls qualified (as to their ages) for communicating, in each family.

From this description it is clear that the listing was intended to cover the whole of the parish of Stoke-upon-Trent, but it is unlikely to have included the virtually independent chapelries.<sup>22</sup>

In the listing families are arranged according to liberty (or township). Families, consisting of two or more persons, are numbered in sequence. Persons living alone are not numbered but they are listed in sequence between families. The information recorded for most people is as follows: their full names, their relationship to the first person listed in each family (assumed here to be the head) and their ages. Additional information is also given for some individuals relating to their occupations, illegitimacy and aliases. Finally, the number of communicants residing in each family is shown. Figure 1 shows household PE17 in the format given by the listing: the family consists of Elizabeth Hatton, widow, her two children Jane and Elizabeth and two illegitimate grandchildren Abigail and William. There were three communicants in the family.

---

<sup>22</sup>

The six liberties surveyed fell under the direct jurisdiction of the rector of Stoke-upon-Trent parish.

Figure 1: Penkhull Household 17 (PE17)

Elizabeth Hatton	Widow	64	3 Com.
Jane Hatton	) Children	31	
Elizabeth Hatton	)	20	
Abigail Hatton	) Spurious	5	
William Hatton	) Jane's children	2 Wks	

All families in the six liberties of Penkhull, Clayton, Seabridge, Shelton, Hanley and Fenton Culvert are presented in sequence. The following page (41) is headed 'Fenton Vivian' but no families are shown and the listing comes to an abrupt end.

On page 72 of the document there is a curious reference, written by Thomas Allen the rector,<sup>23</sup> and dated the 22nd June 1706, to John Sutton of Standley Moor<sup>24</sup> who visited the parish church in 1701 to have his youngest daughter christened. The full passage can be found transcribed at the end of the listing. Suffice to say here that John Sutton claimed in 1701 that he was 97 years old, that he had been born at Longnor, and that he had spent most of his life working in husbandry.<sup>25</sup> He married three times, the last time at the age of 90, and he fathered nine children. He was in good health and enjoyed both drinking and smoking. In the parish register we find that John Sutton's child Anne was baptised on the 18th September 1701.

The rest of the booklet is blank, apart from two eighteenth-century scribbles relating to Harry Allen (a note of his baptism on the 23rd April 1743, taken from the Stoke parish register, and a memorandum of the price of a joint of meat he bought on the 10th July 1786). One of the paper wrappers has an undated note written by Thomas Allen, concerning ten Shelton and Longton people accused of breaking the Sabbath.

The reason for compiling the listing is unknown, although it was almost certainly compiled, at least in part, for ecclesiastical reasons. As mentioned earlier it details the numbers of communicants in each family. More importantly, however, from what is known about the history of the document it seems almost certain that the document was prepared by or on behalf of Thomas Allen, who was rector of Stoke from 1697 to 1732.<sup>26</sup> Thomas Allen was a local man. His father, another Thomas, who presented him to the rectory, lived at Great Fenton House, in Fenton Culvert, which eventually passed to Thomas Allen.<sup>27</sup> The rector was a young man at the time of his appointment and seems to have been active and able. He became archdeacon of Stafford in 1722 and in the same year he was

---

<sup>23</sup> The reference to John Sutton is unsigned but the handwriting matches that of Thomas Allen in his account book: Staffs. County Record Office: Ref D.(W.)1742/46. See below.

<sup>24</sup> Standley Moor was a part of Bagnall Liberty which was not included in the listing.

<sup>25</sup> There are two Longnors. One of them is a parish in Shropshire and its registers survive from 1586. The other was in 1701 a parochial chapelry in Alstonefield (Staffordshire). It had its own register from 1691; before that the baptisms, marriages and burials of Longnor people were entered in the Alstonefield registers, which survive from 1538. Neither the Alstonefield register nor that of the Shropshire Longnor supports Sutton's claim that he was born in c. 1604. See *Alstonefield Parish Register, part I* (Staffs. Parish Registers Society, 1902); *Shropshire Parish Registers: Lichfield Diocese, v* (Shropshire Parish Register Society, 1905).

<sup>26</sup> The jottings in the document show that in the later eighteenth century it belonged to Harry Allen, who was Thomas Allen's grandson. Harry's father Thomas had succeeded as rector of Stoke (Ward, *Stoke*, 544). Harry presumably inherited the document from him. On the death of Harry's son, another Thomas, the Allen estates and muniments passed to his Simkin relatives. The Stoke listing formed part of the Allen-Simkin collection of family papers placed in the William Salt Library, Stafford, in 1949 by the late Major C.J.Jacobs on behalf of his wife, who was the heir of a Miss Simkin. In 1966 the Allen-Simkin collection was transferred to the Staffordshire County Record Office (Correspondence file in the Staffordshire County Record Office relating to the collection).

<sup>27</sup> Ward, *Stoke*, 544; *V.C.H. Staffs.* viii. 214; *Stoke-upon-Trent Register, part II* (Staffordshire Parish Registers Society, 1918), 216.

appointed dean of Chester cathedral,<sup>28</sup> a post he held with the rectory until his death in 1732. Although Thomas Allen was probably the person who inspired this information-gathering activity the work of sorting out and writing up the listing was evidently left to his curate, John Ward, and the parish clerk, John Poulson. At the time of the listing they were living together, with a female servant (Margaret Elkin) and the aged Michael Ward (PE3), who was almost certainly the curate's father.<sup>29</sup> Ward became curate early in 1698,<sup>30</sup> and may have sympathised with the idea of investigating the parishioners; he was from a local, Newcastle-under-Lyme, family, which may have helped with the fieldwork, and he surely provided the parchment deed that was used to bind the listing.<sup>31</sup> Poulson was evidently the man who wrote out the listing in its present form. He was the parish clerk, as his father had been before him,<sup>32</sup> he is known to have helped local people to draw up their wills, and he acted as an appraiser of wills for the church authorities at Lichfield.<sup>33</sup> Poulson was one of the few inhabitants whose occupation is recorded in the listing, and the handwriting of the listing is that of the register at the time<sup>34</sup> and the churchwarden's accounts of 1699, which he signed.<sup>35</sup> Rector, curate, and parish clerk were all local men, young, and with all the advantages that youth, local knowledge (and in Allen's case wealth and social status) gave them. Moreover - a point easily forgotten - they all probably spoke with the local accent and would have little difficulty in understanding what people told them. Finally, the role that Ward's servant Margaret Elkin might have played in the preparation of the listing should not be overlooked. She was the daughter of Thomas Elkin (PA59), a blacksmith and alehousekeeper.<sup>36</sup> As a child she would, through her father's clients, have almost certainly gained a great deal of local knowledge that would have been to invaluable to Ward and Poulson in their compilation of the listing.

What motivated Allen to have the parish listing compiled is a mystery, but it should be noted that Allen, who lived at Stoke during his early years as rector,<sup>37</sup> was particularly methodical in recording details of his parishioners. It must have been with his approval, and perhaps at his instigation, that the parish register suddenly became more informative. In November 1698, just under a year after Allen's induction, the register started to give a child's date of birth as well as the date of its baptism.<sup>38</sup> From March to October 1701 and again from April 1702 it regularly recorded the township in which those people buried at Stoke had lived.<sup>39</sup> In April 1701 it started to note the trade or occupation of bridegrooms,<sup>40</sup> and in April 1702 it began to give the same information about people who were buried, supplementing earlier brief notes such as 'widow' or 'child'.<sup>41</sup> The enthusiasm gradually died away after a few years. The occupations of the deceased were not given after March 1705,<sup>42</sup> and those of bridegrooms after January 1706,<sup>43</sup> the birth dates of children cease to be given in June 1706, apart from two instances the following August,<sup>44</sup> and after December 1710 the practice of giving the home township of the deceased begins to peter out.<sup>45</sup> The entries in the register return to their brief pre-

---

28 Ward, *Stoke*, 489.

29 See above.

30 Staffs. Record Office, D.(W.) 1742/46.

31 See above.

32 *Stoke Par. Reg. II*, 189, 256, 283.

33 I am indebted to Andrew Dobraszczyc for pointing out Poulson's role in drawing up and appraising wills. See, for example, the will of William Shawe (PA40) proved 20th November 1723, in Lichfield Joint Record Office.

34 Staffs. Record Office, D.1188/2.

35 William Salt Library 14/46, Churchwarden's Accounts, 1699.

36 Will of Thomas Elkin, proved 20th October 1720, in Lichfield Joint Record Office.

37 *Stoke Par. Reg. II*, 220, 247.

38 *Ibid.* 220.

39 *Ibid.* 239-40, 248.

40 *Ibid.* 248.

41 *Ibid.* 248.

42 *Ibid.* 269.

43 *Ibid.* 278.

44 *Ibid.* 280-1.

45 *Ibid.* 304.

1698 format. The listing of 1701 thus falls into place as a part of a short campaign to accumulate information about the parishioners - their families, where they lived, when their children were born, and what they did for a living.

Why Allen should have taken such an interest in his parishioners is unclear. There is, however, some evidence that suggests that the population of the parish had increased markedly in the last thirty or so years of the seventeenth century. Evidence from the Stoke-upon-Trent parish register<sup>46</sup> suggests that there were far more baptisms than burials in the parish in most years in this period.<sup>47</sup> Similarly a comparison of the numbers of families enumerated in the parish listing with the 1666 Hearth Tax returns<sup>48</sup> suggests that the number of houses in the area surveyed rose substantially, which in turn suggests that the population was increasing.<sup>49</sup> Moreover, the bulge in the numbers of 25-34 year olds evident in the age/sex pyramid (see Figure 5) suggests that people may have been moving into the area, possibly in search of employment in the growing pottery industry.<sup>50</sup>

Allen may, therefore, have had the listing compiled simply because he wanted to know more about his expanding community, and it is possible that he was also influenced by the work of Gregory King<sup>51</sup> and Bishop Lloyd.<sup>52</sup> Gregory King was one of the pioneers of the study of demography and one of the first people to estimate the population of England and Wales. To arrive at this figure, King estimated the average number of people living in each household from a series of listings of both urban and rural communities, and then multiplied this figure by the estimated number of households in England and Wales derived from the Hearth Tax returns. King, who was born in the Staffordshire cathedral city of Lichfield, compiled a listing of the town in 1695, and he is known to have undertaken other work in the county.<sup>53</sup> William Lloyd, who was bishop of Lichfield and Coventry between 1692 and 1699, had organized lists of communicants when he was bishop of St Asaph,<sup>54</sup> and undertook a survey of Eccleshall, situated barely 20 kilometres (12 miles) from Stoke.<sup>55</sup> Although it is unlikely that King or Lloyd were directly involved in the compilation of the Stoke-upon-Trent listing, it should be stressed that both men had strong connections with Staffordshire. Their work could, therefore, have conceivably inspired Thomas Allen to survey his parish.

Another factor that may have influenced Allen may have been a concern for the poorer inhabitants of his community. If, as seems likely, the population of the parish was increasing then this may have meant that the area was experiencing some difficulty in meeting the needs of its poorer inhabitants. Some support for this view is contained in the Stoke poor law accounts cited by Ward<sup>56</sup> and now lost, which show us that expenditure on the poor law rose markedly in the late seventeenth century. Moreover, in the late sixteenth century the parish of Stoke-upon-Trent was divided into five units for poor law purposes, and it is interesting to note that the liberties included in the listing all fell within

---

<sup>46</sup> Ibid. 92-243.

<sup>47</sup> Between 1670 and 1701 there were approximately 2,440 baptisms but only c. 1,790 burials in Stoke church.

<sup>48</sup> William Salt Archaeological Society (now Staffordshire Record Society), *Staffordshire Historical Collections 1921* (London, 1921), 151-7, 163-7.

<sup>49</sup> It is not possible to give precise figures of the number of households in the area in 1666 when the Heath Tax returns were compiled due to the possible under-enumeration of the exempt. But a rough estimate suggests that the numbers of houses in the six liberties could have risen from under 250 in 1666 to over 370 in 1701.

<sup>50</sup> The bulge in the numbers aged 25-34 might also be explained by the out-migration of 15-24 year olds from the area in search of employment elsewhere.

<sup>51</sup> P. Laslett, 'Natural and Political Observations on the Population of Late Seventeenth-Century England: Reflections on the Work of Gregory King and John Gaunt', in Schurer and Arkell, *Surveying*.

<sup>52</sup> A. Tindal Hart, *William Lloyd* (London, 1952).

<sup>53</sup> Schurer and Arkell, *Surveying*, 173.

<sup>54</sup> Whiteman, *Compton Census*, 492.

<sup>55</sup> Tindal Hart, *William Lloyd*, 139.

<sup>56</sup> Ward, *Stoke*, 467.

the same unit.<sup>57</sup> The listing may, therefore, have been drawn up to help in the administration of the poor law. Some of the entries in the listing lend support to this view. Paupers, parish boys and parish girls are shown. The parish overseers would have been concerned to list the names of illegitimate children lest they became an additional burden on the parish. Again, there is a reference to John Lummas Jnr (HA70) having been brought back to the parish by order from Newport. Why he was 'brought back' is not clear. One possibility is that he fell into financial difficulties in Newport and was returned to his parish of birth under the terms of the various Acts of Settlement then in force.<sup>58</sup> If this was so then his plight would have concerned the local overseers.

Another, if unlikely explanation, for the compilation of the listing is that it was influenced by the Marriage Duty Act of 1695.<sup>59</sup> Under this Act fees were charged for the registration of vital events (births, marriages and deaths), and bachelors and childless widowers were subject to what was in effect a poll tax.<sup>60</sup> The Act, which remained in force until 1706, also stipulated that lists were to be drawn up of those who were eligible to pay the tax. However, the information given in the listing is considerably more than was required by the Marriage Duty Act.<sup>61</sup> There was, for example, no reason to record ages, illegitimacy and the numbers of communicants. Thus, although the listing was compiled when the Marriage Duty Act was in force, it seems highly unlikely that it was drawn up to comply with the requirements of the Act.

We move on to examine how the document was transcribed for this paper. I typed the parish listing straight on to computer from photographs of the original. I then compared this transcript with two written transcripts of the document made independently of one another by the Cambridge Group<sup>62</sup> and the late Margaret Midgley. Differences in the transcripts were noted and the original document was consulted to correct any errors that had occurred. Where several interpretations of an entry are possible, this is noted. The original document is written in a mixture of English and abbreviated Latin. For example, the term 'vidua' is occasionally used to refer to widows, and 'spur' and 'spurius' to refer to the illegitimate. To simplify the transcription and to make it easier to read all such entries have been translated into English, and the word 'single' is used to refer to both 'spinsters' and 'bachelors'.

To produce a computer-readable version of the document each individual's details were typed into nine separate columns or fields (see Figure 2). Column 1 was used to transcribe the family numbers shown on the original document. To distinguish between families in the separate liberties the following two-letter codes were prefixed to each number:-

PE: Penkull  
CL: Clayton  
SE: Seabridge  
SH: Shelton  
HA: Hanley  
FC: Fenton Culvert

Single-person households, which were not numbered in the original document, have been numbered in sequence by the addition of the letters 'a' and 'b' to the preceding family number.

Column 2 was used to record the number of communicants in each family. Columns 3 and 4 were used for the first and second names, and columns 6, 7 and 8 were used to record the marital status, sex and age (in years) of each person.

---

<sup>57</sup> J.G. Jenkins (ed.), *V.C.H. Staffs.* viii. 80.

<sup>58</sup> P. Slack, *The English Poor Law* (London, 1990), 36-38.

<sup>59</sup> R. A. Houston, 'Parish Listings and Social Structure: Penninghame and Whithorn (Wigtownshire) in Perspective', in *Local Population Studies* (No. 23, 1979), 27.

<sup>60</sup> Schurer and Arkell, *Surveying*, 168.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.* 168.

<sup>62</sup> The author is indebted to the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure for their help and assistance.

Column 5 was used for recording each individual's relationship to the head of family. It was assumed that the first listed individual in each family was the head. Some relationships have, however, been imputed. In the example shown in Figure 1 (PE17) Jane Hatton is shown as the daughter of Elizabeth Hatton, and Abigail and William are shown as Jane's children. In column 5 of this edition they are shown as Elizabeth's grandchildren. The name of the children's mother is given in column 9.

Column 9 has been used to record additional information about each individual shown in the original document. The information recorded includes: a) the ages, in weeks and months, of infants under one year, b) illegitimacy and additional information about parentage, c) occupations, d) aliases, and e) paupers. In addition, this column has been used to record any problems that occurred in transcribing the original document.

Figure 2: Transcript of Family PE17 (Shown in Figure 1)

PE17	3	Elizabeth	Hatton	Head	Widow	F 64
		Jane	Hatton	Daughter		F 31
		Elizabeth	Hatton	Daughter		F 20
		Abigail	Hatton	Gd Dau		F 2 Illegit/Jane's daughter.
		William	Hatton	Gd Son		M 0 2 weeks/Illegit/Jane's son.

It should be mentioned that on three occasions the compiler of the document left blank spaces that may indicate the presence of unnamed individuals (PE85, HA56 and FC4). I have treated these 'individuals' differently from Midgley and the Cambridge Group. Midgley and the Cambridge Group have included in their transcripts the unnamed individual in family FC4, presumably because four communicants are shown as living in the family but only three individuals are listed by name. They have, however, omitted the 'individuals' in families PE85 and HA56. I agree that there was an unnamed individual living in family FC4 but am uncertain as to the existence of the other individuals. In family PE85 no figure is given for the number of communicants. This may suggest that there was an unnamed individual in the family but that the compiler was uncertain about whether to include him or her in the listing. Possibly this person, if he or she existed, died on the day that the listing was compiled<sup>63</sup> or perhaps he or she spent part of the year residing elsewhere. The unnamed 'individual' in family HA56 is more interesting. The compiler used brackets to group children together, but in this instance his bracket extends some distance below the last named child, which suggests that there may have been an unnamed child residing in the family. It is interesting that the head of this family was John Lummas, aged 58. He was almost certainly the father of John Lummas Jnr who, it will be recalled, was 'brought back from Newport'. John Lummas Jnr and his wife are shown living nearby in family HA70, but it is possible that the space left in HA58 was intended to record John Lummas Jnr, who on his return to Hanley found accommodation elsewhere. If this is so then John Lummas and his wife, who resided in the last listed family in Hanley, may have been added to the listing some time after it was compiled. Returning to our original point, it is clear that there was at least one, probably two and possibly three unnamed 'individuals' in the parish listing. In the transcript three spaces have been left to indicate the possible existence of these people.<sup>64</sup>

Before looking at what the listing tells us about life in Stoke in 1701 we discuss, briefly, the accuracy of the listing. This is a difficult matter to discuss, the more so because, as was mentioned earlier, we do not know how the listing was compiled. If, as seems likely, the compilers undertook a house-to-house survey, then one might expect most of the names to be correct. Moreover, some entries are incomplete which suggests that the compilers may have gone to some lengths to eliminate errors. A more fundamental problem concerns the accuracy of people's ages. Before the advent of the compulsory registration of births last century, many people simply did not know their dates of birth. To examine the accuracy of peoples' ages an attempt was made to trace the baptisms of children aged ten and under in the listing.<sup>65</sup> The ages of the majority of children traced in the baptismal register

<sup>63</sup> However, the parish register does not support this suggestion.

<sup>64</sup> In the statistical analysis of the listing that follows the three unnamed individuals are included in the statistics.

<sup>65</sup> Lack of time prevented a more detailed survey. The writer is indebted to Sheena

were found to be within twelve months of the ages given in the listing. However, studies based upon the mid-nineteenth-century censuses suggest that discrepancies in age reporting tended to increase markedly with age.<sup>66</sup> To the extent that valid comparisons can be drawn, this would suggest that the ages of those under twenty are reasonably accurate, while those of people aged fifty and over should be treated with some caution.

Finally, we look at what the listing tells us about life in Stoke-upon-Trent in the early 1700s. Table 1 shows the numbers of people and families in each liberty. From this we see that Shelton with 500 individuals living in 108 families had the largest population and Seabridge with 77 individuals in 19 families had the smallest population. The average (or mean) family size in the area as a whole was 4.4 people, but this figure varied from 3.9 in Fenton Culvert to 4.6 in Shelton.<sup>67</sup>

Figure 3 shows the distribution of family sizes in the area. From this we see that over half the families (57.4%) contained fewer than five persons. There were 23 individuals living alone and at the other extreme one family contained thirteen people. Work by the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure<sup>68</sup> suggests that family size in Stoke-upon-Trent did not differ markedly from that revealed in other parish listings carried out in England and Wales at this time. The mean family size for Stoke-upon-Trent, of 4.4 people per family, is very similar to the figure of 4.3 people per household calculated by Arkell for England outside London for the period 1662-1712.<sup>69</sup> Perhaps the most interesting finding of the Cambridge Group was their discovery that the nuclear family (consisting of a husband, wife and children) was the predominant type of family in pre-industrial England. Extended families, containing grandchildren and aunts and uncles, were comparatively rare although many families contained boarders and servants. Detailed analysis of the Stoke listing shows us that this was true of Stoke-upon-Trent also.<sup>70</sup> In all some 70.2% of families were nuclear in form and only 13.9% contained three generations.

**Table 1: Population of Each Liberty**

	Population	Families	MFS*
Penkhull	420	95	4.4
Clayton	105	26	4.0
Seabridge	77	19	4.1
Shelton	500	108	4.6
Hanley	327	74	4.4
Fenton Culvert	200	51	3.9
Total	1629	373	4.4

\* Mean (or average) family size.

Table 2 and Figure 4 show the numbers of females and males residing in each liberty. In the area as a whole there were 848 females and 770 males.<sup>71</sup> The sex of eleven individuals is unknown because their first names did not appear in the listing. The two smallest liberties (Clayton and Seabridge) had roughly equal numbers of males and females. The other four liberties had more females than males.

Figure 5 shows the age/sex pyramid of the area as a whole. From this we see that, as in Britain as a whole at this time, nearly four out of ten people were children under fifteen years of age. Exactly half the population were aged under 21 years, and the mean (average) age of the population was 25.8. What is particularly interesting about the age/sex pyramid is the bulge in the numbers aged 25-34

---

Bateman for her help in this exercise.

<sup>66</sup> A. Perkyns, 'Age Checkability and Accuracy in the Censuses of Six Kentish Parishes 1851-81', in *Local Population Studies* (No. 50, 1993), 33.

<sup>67</sup> The modal (or most frequent) family size was 3 and the median family size was 4.

<sup>68</sup> P. Laslett (ed.), *Household and Family in Past Time* (London, 1972), 130-7.

<sup>69</sup> T. Arkell, 'Multiplying Factors for Estimating Population Total from the Hearth Tax', *Local Population Studies* (No. 28, 1982), 55.

<sup>70</sup> K.W. Wachter *et al.*, *Statistical Studies*, 72.

<sup>71</sup> It was not possible with certainty to determine the sex of a few individuals from the information given in the listing.

years. This was alluded to earlier when it was suggested that it might be explained by outsiders moving into the parish in search of work. However, the relatively small numbers of males aged 15-19 evident in the age/sex pyramid might also suggest that young men in this age group had a tendency to leave the area for short periods, perhaps to serve apprenticeships elsewhere.

Table 2: Liberty by Gender

	Female	Male	Missing	Total
Penkhull	230	189	1	420
Clayton	53	52		105
Seabridge	38	38	1	77
Shelton	257	243		500
Hanley	168	153	6	327
Fenton Culvert	102	95	3	200
Total	848	770	11	1629

The listing also tells us a great deal about naming practices in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. A glance at the listing reveals that most people named their children after biblical characters. It is also evident that the stock of names used by parents was much smaller than it is today. Thus, nearly half the females and more than half the males were known by just three names. The most popular female names were Mary (20.8%), Elizabeth (14.0%) and Anne (13.6%), and the most popular male names were John (23.6%), Thomas (16.5%) and William (12.6%). Among the more unusual names were Merab, Damaris, Segreaves and Newton.

Finally, the listing has much information of interest to the genealogist researching his or her family roots. One specialist application to which it readily leads itself is that of family reconstitution, in which parish listings are used in concert with parish registers and other contemporary materials such as wills to study completed family sizes, fertility, the life-cycle and inheritance patterns.

In the following pages we reproduce the document in full together with its preamble describing the scope of the document.<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>72</sup>

The writer is indebted to Douglas Johnson, Tom Arkell and Anne Whiteman for their help and encouragement in writing this paper.