

REGISTERS OF HASTINGS PARISHES.

By W. A. GREENHILL, M.D. OXON.

At the present time Hastings is known chiefly as a rapidly increasing watering-place, the population of which is about eight times more numerous now than it was at the beginning of the present century. After the Norman conquest it is known in history as the chief of the Cinque Ports, and it was for some centuries a place of considerable importance on that account. Between these two periods very little is known of its history or internal condition, as it never seems to have thoroughly recovered itself after being burnt by the French in 1378; and the notices of the town that are met with in books or MSS. (some of which are given in a previous article,) only serve to indicate that it had fallen into a state of comparative decay. Some slight idea of its population, and also of certain special periods of distress from pestilence, may be gathered from an examination of the parish registers, made some few years ago, the general results of which shall be briefly laid before the members of the Sussex Archæological Society.

Rickman states (*Census Report*, 1831, vol. 1, p. xxix.) that out of more than 11,000 parish registers in England and Wales, 2634 commence before the beginning of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, in 1558, and 2448 between that year and 1603. In Hastings there are two ancient sets of parish registers; that of St. Clement's parish commencing in 1558, and that of All Saints in 1559. They have been continued with probably at least an average degree of care and regularity down to the present time. Some of the books are made of

parchment, others of paper; some are in good preservation, others are in a very dilapidated condition; in some the writing is very good, in others it is shamefully careless. For several years about the middle of the seventeenth century, during the Commonwealth, both registers are defective, as is the case with many of the parish registers throughout the kingdom; and in some other years one or other of them is occasionally mutilated or incomplete. In all the following calculations care has been taken to select, as far as possible, those years which appear to be complete in both registers.

We will begin with the population of the place, which in 1801, as we learn from official sources, amounted to only 3175, viz. 1425 males, and 1750 females. It happens that a census of the population was made in the year 1731, which states the total number of the inhabitants at that time to have been 1636, viz. 782 males, and 854 females.¹ These numbers appear so very small that it will be desirable to test their accuracy as far as practicable, and to see how far they agree with estimates of the population derived from other sources.

These can be calculated in two ways. One of them is by simply counting the baptisms and burials, and deducting the latter from the former, thus finding out the number of persons added to the population. From January, 1731, to December, 1800, the baptisms registered in Hastings were 4935, and the burials 3710, or 1225 less than the baptisms. Deduct 1225 from 3175, the population in 1801, and the result is 1950, or the estimated population in 1731, which exceeds the number given by Dr. Frewen by 314.

The second mode of calculating the population is that which was adopted by Rickman (*Census Report*, 1841, Preface, p. 35), and is based on the assumption that the average number of baptisms, burials, and marriages, at any given period, bore the same proportion to the existing population as in 1801. Thus, if in Hastings 104.0 baptisms in the year 1801 coincided with a population of 3175, what popu-

¹ See a letter from Dr. Frewen to Dr. Jurin, dated Jan. 28, 1730-1, inserted in the *Philosophical Transactions* (vol.

xxxvii. p. 108), and quoted by Moss (*Hist. of Hastings*, p. 174), and others.

lation is indicated by 57.6 baptisms in the year 1731? The population estimated in this manner from the baptisms is 1770, from the burials it is 2194, from the marriages it is 2048; and the mean of these numbers, or 2004, may be taken (as done by Rickman, p. 36) to represent the final result of the calculation.² This number exceeds that given by Dr. Frewen by 368. When it is borne in mind that the census in 1731 was taken immediately after a long and very severe visitation of epidemic small-pox, when the population was diminished, not only by the number of deaths which had occurred, but also, probably, by the voluntary absence of such of the inhabitants as could conveniently leave the infected place, the difference between the number obtained by enumeration (1636), and those derived from the above calculations (1950 and 2004), are not so great but that they may fairly be said to confirm each other. (See Tables on pp. 204 to 206).

In order to obtain the population of 1771, we may use the same two modes of calculation.

I.—Population enumerated, 1731	1636
Add excess of baptisms over burials between			
1731 and 1770	381
			2017
Estimated population, 1771	2017
Add excess of baptisms over burials between			
1771 and 1800	844
Add probable influx of soldiers and strangers			
towards the end of the last century	...		314
			3175
			3175
Or, II.—Population in 1771, calculated from baptisms			1862
Ditto from burials	2241
Ditto from marriages	1843

² I have tested this mode of calculation in the case of the Hastings Registration District, and have made an estimate of the population in 1841, based on that of 1851, with the following results:—

	Popula- tion enu- merated.	Population calculated from		Average of 3 preceding estimates.	
	Marriages.	Births.	Deaths.		
1841	14,836	13,120, or — 1716	15,270, or + 434	14,880, or + 44	14,423, or — 413

The amount of error in this case is less than 3 per cent., which certainly may be considered a satisfactory result.

The mean of these numbers is 1982, which agrees very nearly with the number arrived at by the former calculation, viz. 2017: and the mean of these two calculations, or 2000, may be taken to represent the probable population in the year 1771.

Between the years 1701 and 1730 the baptisms exceeded the burials only by about 70;³ and if this number be deducted from 1636 (the population in the year 1731), the result is 1566, the estimated number of the inhabitants in the year 1701. The population in this year, calculated as above, from the baptisms, burials and marriages, would be 2105; and the mean of these two numbers, or 1835, is the probable number of the inhabitants in the year 1701.

Between the years 1671 and 1700 the registers of All Saints parish are nine times defective, so that it would be unsafe to base any calculation on the relative numbers of baptisms and burials. By Rickman's mode of calculation (which may be adopted for want of any more exact method) the population in the year 1671 may be reckoned at 2186.

In the same way between the years 1631 and 1670 the registers of both parishes are in too defective a condition to allow of their being used for the purposes of calculation. If we again adopt Rickman's method the population in the year 1631 may be estimated at 2083.

Between the years 1601 and 1630 the registers are unusually perfect. That of All Saints parish is defective in the year 1613, but the probable excess of baptisms over burials may be reckoned at about 200. By Rickman's calculation the population would in the year 1601 amount to exactly the number 1601, showing a much larger increase than appears from the parish registers.

Between the years 1571 and 1600 the All Saints register is defective four times, and the St. Clement's register three times: it would therefore be unsafe to use them as the basis of any calculation. By Rickman's method the population in the year 1571 amounted to 1627.

It will be borne in mind that all the above figures, except those relating to the years 1731 and 1801, are to be consi-

³ In one year, 1712, the register of burials in St. Clement's parish appears to be defective; to supply this deficiency, 13 burials have been added conjecturally.

dered as approximative only, and also are to be taken as the basis of any further calculations only until some better estimates can be substituted. Probably they are sufficiently correct for all ordinary purposes; and we shall not be far wrong in believing that in the latter part of the sixteenth century Hastings contained somewhat more than 1600 inhabitants; that at the beginning of the seventeenth century the population had slightly declined; that for 70 years it continued to increase, till it amounted to nearly 2200; that for the next 60 years it again declined, till in the year 1731, immediately after a very severe epidemic, it had sunk to 1636; that it gradually began to recover itself, and in the latter part of the last century increased more rapidly than at any former period, till in the year 1801 it amounted to 3175.

Since that time the population, total increase, and increase per cent., have been as follows:—

A.D.	Population.	Total increase.	Increase per cent.
1811.	4025	850	26.77
1821.	6300	2275	56.53
1831.	10,231	3931	62.40
1841.	11,789	1558	15.23
1851.	17,621	5832	49.47
1861.	23,443	5822	33.04

In 1731, the female part of the population out numbered the male, but not to the same extent as has since been the case. In 1731 they formed upwards of 52 per cent. of the total population; in 1801, and also in 1851 they formed upwards of 55 per cent., and in 1861 upwards of 58 per cent., the population being—males, 9,792; females, 13,651.

In going through the register of burials it is easy in some years to trace the results of various epidemic diseases that from time to time spread over different parts of the country, while in other instances we have no indications of the seasons that were so fatal in Hastings having been equally unhealthy elsewhere. The principal periods marked by the plague or other epidemic diseases were the following.

By far the most fatal year recorded in the parish registers of Hastings is 1563, when the burials amounted to 191. If the population be reckoned at 1700 in that year, the mortality must have been at the enormous rate of 112 per 1000.

The cause of this excessive mortality (which occurred chiefly in the months of August, September, and October,) is not mentioned; but it may be safely attributed to the plague, as we find that in the same year, and especially in the same three months, this disease was raging to a fearful extent in the neighbouring town of Rye. (See Mr. W. D. Cooper's *Notices of the last Great Plague, &c.*, *Arch*: vol. 37, p. 3.) In Bascome's *History of Epidemic Pestilences*, the Plague is not mentioned in connexion with this year, but we read (p. 88) that "there was a great dearth of corn and other provisions in London; famine and disease were the result, and 20,000 persons perished in consequence."

In Rye there was another visitation of the Plague, but of somewhat less severity, in 1580 (see Mr. Cooper's *Notices, &c.*); but in this year the mortality in Hastings does not appear to have been above the average.

In 1590 the burials were 110, the average number in the three previous years having been 63.

In 1592 and '93 the burials were 85 and 81, chiefly in St. Clement's parish. "During the summer of 1592" (says Bascome, p. 95) "the drought was extreme, and the autumn was sultry and variable. The river Thames was fordable at London, and epidemic pestilence destroyed 18,000 persons in that city. Various other parts of England also suffered from it." The following year (1593) was very fatal in London, where upwards of 11,500 died of the plague (*Collection of the Yearly Bills of Mortality*, 1759).

In 1597 the burials were 114, a larger number than had taken place in any year since 1563, and larger also than in any following year before 1699. The mortality was chiefly in St. Clement's parish. In reference to the years at the end of this century, Bascome states (p. 95) that "malignant fevers prevailed in England about these periods;" and it appears that in Cranbrook (which was then a larger place than Hastings,) there died in the above year 222 persons, of whom 181 were carried off by the plague (Graunt's *Natural and Political Observations on the Bills of Mortality*, Appendix).

In 1622 and '24 the burials amounted to 83 and 95. In 1622 (says Bascome, p. 100) "London was visited by epidemic pestilence, which continued for four years;" and in

1625 the Plague once more prevailed in Rye, though in a less virulent form than on the two former occasions. (See Mr. Cooper's *Notices, &c.*, p. 3.)

In August 1625, the following entry (furnished to the writer by Mr. Cooper,) appears in the Hastings town books, and shows the precautions taken by the Mayor and Jurats to prevent infection:—"This Assembly perceiving the danger of the infection of *the plague* now universally raging in divers parts of this Kingdom; Therefore with general consent, the better (with God's mercy and grace,) to avoid the same in this Town, it is decreed, and the rather to meet with the wilful obstinacy of some unruly and disobedient persons, inhabitants of this Town, That henceforth watch and ward shall be kept, and may intend at the Town's general charges in such number, and in several and needful places as Mr. Mayor and his Brethren shall think fit and appoint, to restrain all strangers, passengers and suspicious persons, repaying to the Town as they shall receive instructions from Mr. Mayor.

"And it is also decreed that no person or persons, inhabitants of this town generally, as well innkeepers, ale-housekeepers, as other housekeepers, shall receive or suffer any stranger to dwell, lodge, or remain in any, their houses, tents, or outhouses, before Mr. Mayor be truly certified of them:—any person offending to the contrary to be fined £5.

"Neither shall any person or persons, inhabitants of this town, tradesmen or others, buy, fetch, receive, or bring into this town or any part of the same, any manner of wares, merchandizes, cloth, hemp, apparel, wool, or other commodities whatsoever, from the City of London, or from any place infected or suspected of the contagion, without Mr. Mayor's privity, knowledge, and consent, under the like penalty, &c.

"Special regard is by way of advice wished to be had by Mr. Mayor and his Brethren that no persons, strangers, or town dwellers, shall be suffered to drink and tipple immoderately in this town; and if any be taken refractory in this kind, they shall be censured by Mr. Mayor and his Brethren."

In each of the years 1638, '39, and '40 the burials were above the average, and in 1641 the number reached 100. Bascome says (p. 103) that in 1639 "there was a severe frost in England, which continued for nine weeks, commenc-

ing on December 24. London was visited by epidemic pestilence of a severe type." In Cranbrook also the first three years seem to have been unusually fatal, but in 1641 the burials there did not exceed the average number.

In 1643 the burials were 83, or 16 above the average number of the previous ten years. The same year was also very fatal at Cranbrook.

The year 1653 must have been one of very great mortality. Only eleven burials are mentioned in the register of All Saints, (which is very defective from 1647 to 1653,) but the St. Clement's register contains a notice of 89, of which number no less than 39 took place in the months of April and May. No cause can with certainty be assigned for the unusual mortality of this year, which does not appear to have been equally fatal in London and elsewhere.

In 1663 "severe pestilence prevailed in England" (Bascome, p. 108). In the same year 62 burials are noticed in the St. Clement's register at Hastings, and 25 in that of All Saints, which is probably defective. The mortality occurred principally in the autumnal months (Sept., Oct., and Nov.)

In 1665 and the former half of the following year, the plague was raging in London. It is not known whether the same disease spread to Hastings, and as the register of All Saints parish is defective in those years, the number of burials is not preserved. In St. Clement's parish the mortality in these two years does not appear to have exceeded the average.⁴

In the following year, however, (1667) there appears to have been a great mortality in St. Clement's parish, chiefly in the months of April, May, and June. The number of burials in this parish was 61, in All Saints it was 29, besides those that were unregistered.

In 1686 the All Saints register is again defective, and contains only four burials, but the St. Clement's register contains 92. The mortality seems to have begun in the winter of 1685-6, and to have continued to the end of the following July, if not longer. The burials in London in 1686 were only a little above the average number.

⁴ In Oct., 1666, the *London Gazette* contained a proclamation stating that the infection being much spread about the town of Battel, though the inhabitants

were free, yet to prevent its further spreading, the fair usually kept on 11th November was directed not to be holden. See Mr. Cooper's *Notices, &c.*, p. 21.

In the years 1690, '91, and '92 the mortality was excessive, the burials being upwards of 88, (for the All Saints register is defective here,) 104, and 89. The most fatal season seems to have been the autumn (viz. Sept., Oct., Nov.) of 1691, in which three months there were 52 burials. The cause of this unusual mortality is not noticed.

The autumn of 1699 was especially unhealthy; no less than 81 burials took place in the three months of Sept., Oct., and Nov.; and the total number during the year was 134. But here also the fatal disease is not mentioned, nor is it possible to guess its nature with any degree of certainty. Bascome says (p. 115) that "fatal catarrh prevailed in England" in 1699, but this is hardly likely to have been the case in autumn.

In 1711 the burials in the four months July, Aug., Sept., and Oct. amounted to 103, and in the whole year to 160, but the nature of the fatal disease is not specified.

The former part of 1729 appears to have been unusually healthy, as only 42 burials took place in the whole year; but towards the end of the year small-pox made its appearance in the town, and continued without intermission till the beginning of the year 1731. A notice of this epidemic is to be found in the letter from Dr. Frewen mentioned above, wherein he states that 705 persons (or more than one third of the whole population of the town,) were attacked by the disease, of which number 97 died, and 608 recovered (including four that were inoculated); that 206 persons escaped it, and that 50 died of other diseases during the time. What is meant by 206 persons "escaping" the small-pox is not quite clear, but the rest of this statement is incidentally confirmed by the parish registers. In the All Saints register of burials from Nov. 8, 1729, to Jan. 5, 1730-1, the names of 41 persons are marked with a cross or asterisk, and in the St. Clement's register 48, which mark was no doubt intended to point out those who were carried off by small-pox. The disease was most fatal in August and September, in which two months the number of burials amounted to 45. With respect to the mention by Dr. Frewen of inoculation, it will be remembered that this practice was introduced into England a very few years before he wrote, viz. in 1721.

The town seems to have continued in a healthy state till the close of the century. In 1794 the burials amounted to 87, or 31 above the average of the previous ten years; and in 1797 to 113, or 51 above the average. In the latter year the whole of the excess of mortality was caused by small-pox, which began to prevail towards the end of December, 1796, and continued till the following February or March. In these three months 11 persons are stated to have "died of small-pox in the natural way," and 61 "in consequence of inoculation."⁵

This appears to have been the last really severe epidemic visitation of small-pox in Hastings; for the occasional deaths caused by this disease from time to time in the present day, which occasion great alarm when they occur, would have been reckoned a very slight visitation indeed at the end of the last century. Indeed, the whole state of things in those days appears to us so strange as to be almost unintelligible; nor can we fully realize the existence of "pest-houses," with "guards to prevent persons from improperly visiting the said houses," "the expense of guards and other things necessary to keep the said distemper out of the town," the "prosecution at the expense of the parish, or by subscription, of every person in future who shall appear to be the occasion of the small-pox being brought into this parish," the "prosecution by indictment of any persons who shall in future return into the town after having been inoculated, without a certificate first obtained from their doctor, certifying that such persons are not infectious," the "immediate application by the parish officers to the inoculating doctors earnestly entreating them not to inoculate any more persons this summer," &c., &c. (see the curious note in Moss, p. 174). From all this worry and alarm (besides the actual danger,) we have been happily delivered, and perhaps this very deliverance may be one cause why some persons are inclined to doubt the reality or the extent of the dangers they have escaped, and to undervalue the great means whereby this improvement in the public health has been effected, viz. *Vaccination*.

⁵ In this year the disease was prevalent in all the districts round Hastings, and inoculation was general amongst

all classes; houses being specially set apart for the reception of the patients.—
(Note by Mr. Cooper.)

1803. "Influenza," says Bascome (p. 147), "overspread the British Isles in the spring of this year, causing great mortality." In Hastings the burials amounted to 94, or 24 above the average of the ten previous years. The deaths occurred principally in March and April, and in the parish of All Saints, where 58 persons died in the course of the year, of whom 30 were infants.

In each of the years 1804 and 1805 the number of burials amounted to 85, the greater part of which were in the parish of All Saints. In 1804, out of 61 persons who died in this parish, 29 were infants.

In 1810 the burials amounted to 182, a larger number than had taken place in any year since 1563. It must however be remembered that in 1563 the population of the town was probably less than 1700, whereas in 1810 it was about 4000, so that the rate of mortality per 1000 in this latter year, though enormously high, was only 45, instead of 112. The cause of the mortality, which occurred chiefly in Aug., Sept., and Oct., is not known; but out of 92 burials in All Saints' parish 46 were of infants, and of 90 persons who died in St. Clement's parish 30 were soldiers.

In 1813 the new Parish Registers were adopted, and since that time there have been more than two sets in the town. As only those of All Saints' and St. Clement's parishes have been examined, the total number of burials cannot be given; but it may be mentioned that in the years 1814, 1822, 1823, 1826, 1827, 1829, 1830, the mortality appears to have been above the average.

Lastly, it is interesting to enquire whether the rate of mortality in Hastings in former times was higher or lower than it is in the present day; and it is satisfactory to be able to state that the public health must, within the last 130 years, have improved very considerably. We cannot, of course, pretend to calculate the rate of mortality from the presumed amount of the population, when we have already calculated the amount of the population from the presumed rate of mortality; and therefore we cannot say anything of the rate of mortality before the year 1731, when the earliest census took place of which any detailed record has been preserved. The burials between Jan. 1726 and

Dec. 1735 (taking the five years before and after Jan. 1731) amounted to 625, which is at the very high annual rate of 38.2 per 1000. By the beginning of the present century the rate of mortality had greatly decreased, and (calculated in the same way from the years 1796 to 1805) amounted to 23.7 per 1000. In 1851 it had been still further reduced to about 18.7 per 1000, and there is no reason to think that the state of the public health in Hastings has been less favourable since that time.⁶

The following extracts, &c., from the registers may be interesting.

Both registers appear to have been copied at first from some earlier documents, and accordingly the commencement of each shews some confusion in dates and other particulars. The All Saints' Register commences Nov., 1559, meaning probably to begin with the reign of Elizabeth, in Nov., 1558; and in the St. Clement's register the dates from June to November 1560 appear to be entered 1559, as Martin Brabon,⁷ who is said to have been bailiff in Aug., 1559, was not in office till the following year, 1560.

1574. April 4, Penance done on Palm Sunday in St. Clement's Church.

1585. Nov. 15. "The Priory" mentioned in the St. Clement's register, and again 1590, December 22, and 1601, April 19.

1609. Mention in the All Saints' register of a license to eat meat in Lent.

1620. Oct. 15, a man "slain by the halling up of his father's ship—called the Blessing upon Sunday," in All Saints.

1620-1. March 7, "died, being excommunicated, and buried out of the listes of [All Saints'] church-yard, near to the further battery, nec in præsentia Rectoris, nec cujusvis alii (*sic*)."

1621. April 18, buried in All Saints' church-yard "a

⁶ Since writing the above sentence the writer has seen an extract from the last Report of the Registrar-General, in which it is stated, that in the ten years, 1851 to 1860, the death-rate in the Hastings

Registration District was nearly 18.3 per 1000, which is a still further reduction.

⁷ He is called *Martin* in the Register, not *Mark*, as in the List of Bailiffs and Mayors.

stranger who paid me for his outward garment 2^s 6^d." A similar entry occurs Dec. 15, 1621.

1628. Aug. 4, buried in St. Clement's church-yard, a man slain by "the enemy off Shoram." This was during the war with France, which had begun in the previous year.

1639. April 23, buried "Mr. John Barley, Mayor."⁸

1641. March, "killed by a shot from sea."

1641. July, buried "William Lovell, Mayor."⁹

1654. Marriages began to be performed by the Mayor, or the Justice of the Peace, the banns having been previously published in the market-place on three market-days, or in a church on three Lord's-days.¹⁰

1658. Dec. Marriages were again celebrated by the minister of the parish.

1677. March 15, buried, a widow, belonging to St. Clement's parish, "excommunicated."

1678. June 19, buried in St. Andrew's church-yard under the Castle, a widow, belonging to St. Clement's parish, who died "excommunicate."

1700. May 29, buried a man "without the funeral office, he having hanged himself" (St. Clement).

1704. May 1, buried a woman "in a place near the Castle, she having hanged herself" (St. Clement).

1705-6. March 5, buried Mr. Richard Waller, Town Clerk (All Saints).

At the end of the third vol. of the All Saints' register (where some leaves have been cut out,) is the following note:—"N.B. This book had part thus cut out when I, Richard Nairn, received it upon the death of the late incumbent, the Rev. Mr. James Cranston. Nov. 27, 1726."

About the middle of the last century Hastings was a station for troops, as it was at the beginning of the present century. In 1747, May 11, mention is made in the St. Clement's register of General Hawley's dragoons, and in 1750-1, March 12, of Major Preston's company of dragoons. The baptism of the children of several soldiers is recorded between the years 1750 and 1760.

⁸ There is a brass in the church to another John Barley, who died in 1601.

⁹ There must be some mistake or confusion of date, in the Register here, as

William Lovell's name does not appear in the List of Mayors till 1657.

¹⁰ Under the Ordinance passed 24th Sept., 1653.

1758. May 31, buried "John Jacob Sur, the linguist, belonging to Capt. Greyling's privateer" (St. Clement).

1758. Sept. 13, buried "Jer. Wright, suffocated by the straitness of his handkerchief."

1768. Oct. 8, buried a corporal, "without the office" (St. Clement).

1805. Feb. 13, baptized "Samuel Ellis, son of Susannah, born after 13 months' absence of Charles Ellis, who is a prisoner in France." (All Saints).

The registers also contain the mention of two matters, which are found in other similar documents, and which appear strange to modern readers, viz. the enforced burial of the corpse in woollen,¹¹ and the tax on births, marriages, and burials.¹² For information on both these subjects the reader may consult the *Notes and Queries*, 1st series, vols. 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, and 2nd series, vol. 3.

AVERAGE NUMBER OF BAPTISMS, BURIALS, AND MARRIAGES,
IN THE YEARS 1571, 1601, 1631, 1671, 1701, 1731, 1771, and 1801.

A.D.	BAPTISMS.			BURIALS.			MARRIAGES.		
	All S.	St. Cl.	Total.	All S.	St. Cl.	Total.	All S.	St. Cl.	Total.
1569	19	21	40	22	24	46	3	8	11
1570	22	22	44	11	22	33	7	8	15
1571	17	27	44	13	23	36	11	10	21
1572	16	24	40	14	40	54	5	13	18
1573 ^a
Sum	74	94	168	60	109	169	26	39	65
Mean	18.5	23.5	42.0	15.0	27.2	42.2	6.5	9.7	16.2
1599	19	20	39	... ^a	5	4	9
1600	33	28	61	8	23	31	2	14	16
1601	16	28	44	15	26	41	6	13	19
1602	29	35	64	13	15	28	2	8	10
1603	27	40	67	15	21	36	7	14	21
Sum	124	151	275	51	85	136	22	53	75
Mean	24.8	30.2	55.0	12.8	21.2	34.0	4.4	10.6	15.0

¹¹ Under the Act 30 Charles II., c. 3.

¹² 6th and 7th William III., c. 6.
Bachelors and widowers were by the same Act taxed 1s. yearly.

^a Omitted, because the registers are imperfect.

A.D.	BAPTISMS.			BURIALS.			MARRIAGES.		
	All S.	St. Cl.	Total.	All S.	St. Cl.	Total.	All S.	St. Cl.	Total.
1629	31	58	89	19	34	53	13	12	25
1630	20	43	63	12	40	52	10	3	13
1631	27	35	62	14	30	44	5	7	12
1632	31	38	69	10	49	59	5	6	11
1633	23	45	68	11	46	57	9	11	20
Sum	132	219	351	66	199	265	42	39	81
Mean	26.4	43.8	70.2	13.2	39.8	53.0	8.4	7.8	16.2
1669	16	48	64	24	49	73	3	8	11
1670	14	55	69	30	53	83	5	14	19
1671	15	42	57	10	65	75	6	9	15
1672	... ^a	1	9	10
1673	21	54	75	12	39	51	3	1	4
Sum	66	199	265	76	206	282	18	41	59
Mean	16.5	49.7	66.2	19.0	51.5	70.5	3.6	8.2	11.8
1699	22	42	64	... ^b	2	12	14
1700	11	49	60	21	37	58	15	9	24
1701	24	37	61	25	18	43	9	21	30
1702	16	43	59	20	24	44	6	11	17
1703	26	29	55	22	34	56	4	18	22
Sum	99	200	299	88	113	201	36	71	107
Mean	19.8	40.0	59.8	22.0	28.2	50.2	7.2	14.2	21.4
1729	22	32	54	17	25	42	5	9	14
1730	18	36	54	... ^b	9	5	14
1731	27	39	66	25	21	46	23	10	33
1732	23	31	59	22	27	49	16	5	21
1733	27	28	55	29	20	49	10	10	20
Sum	122	166	288	93	93	186	63	39	102
Mean	24.4	33.2	57.6	23.2	23.3	46.5	12.6	7.8	20.4
1769	33	29	62	36	23	59	2	11	13
1770	32	27	59	26	17	43	6	20	26
1771	27	33	60	24	17	41	9	13	22
1772	33	31	64	28	22	50	7	4	11
1773	24	34	58	27	21	48	4	14	18
Sum	149	154	303	141	100	241	28	62	90
Mean	29.8	30.8	60.6	28.2	20.0	48.2	5.6	12.4	18.0
1799	37	58	95	34	27	61	15	25	40
1800	48	65	113	45	20	65	14	13	27
1801	46	48	94	43	24	67	8	21	29
1802	43	73	116	27	28	55	14	16	30
1803	43	59	102	58	36	94	12	17	29
Sum	217	303	520	207	135	342	63	92	155
Mean	43.4	66.0	104.0	41.4	27.0	68.4	12.6	18.4	31.0

^a Omitted, because the registers are imperfect,

^b Omitted, because the number is so

far above the average as to be useless for our purpose.

POPULATION CALCULATED FROM THE PRECEDING AVERAGES.

A.D.	Population calculated from			Average of 3 preceding columns.	Most probable amount.
	Bapt.	Bur.	Mar.		
1571	1282	1961	1638	1627	1627
1601	1679	1588	1536	1601	1601
1631	2137	2474	1638	2083	2083
1671	2014	3315	1229	2186	2186
1701	1832	2334	2150	2105	1835
1731	1770	2194	2048	2004	*1636
1771	1862	2241	1843	1982	2000
1801	*3175

* By actual enumeration.

NUMBER OF BAPTISMS AND BURIALS, FROM 1558 TO 1800.

A.D.	Number of		Excess of
	Bapt.	Bur.	Baptisms.
1558 to 1570	591	473	118
1571 to 1600	1478	1471	7
1601 to 1630	1898	1696	202
1631 to 1670	2129	2243	-114
1671 to 1700	2006	1800	206
1701 to 1730	1844	1757	87
1731 to 1770	2402	2021	381
1771 to 1800	2533	1689	844
Total ...	<u>14,881</u>	<u>13,150</u>	<u>1731</u>