

---

## Debate

### Living same-name siblings and English historical demography: a commentary

Peter Razzell

---

Chris Galley, Eilidh Garrett, Ros Davies and Alice Reid have rightly called for further research on living same-name siblings in England, including its implications for the study of mortality and historical demography.<sup>1</sup> They note three instances of living same-name siblings in the published London and Bristol 1695 Marriage Duty Act assessments, although they conclude that more data is required to establish the exact extent of the practice during the parish register period.<sup>2</sup>

What is required is a systematic study of all available data at a particular period, and fortunately there are a number of Marriage Duty Act and other enumeration listings that have survived for different parts of the country for the late seventeenth century. The following table examines all available data and summarises an analysis of eligible families with two or more siblings of the same sex, and the proportion of these families with two living same-name siblings.

There were nine same-name sibling pairs out of 6162 eligible families, 0.15 per cent of the total—an insignificant number.<sup>3</sup> With the exception of the one case in Chiseldon in 1705, there were no living same-name siblings traced in any of the rural and provincial places outside of London and Bristol. A close examination of the nine pairs of apparent living same-name siblings raises doubts about whether even these were genuine cases. The London example quoted by Galley et.al. is as follows:

St. Mary Staining Parish. Jeremiah Lammas, Ann daughter, Edward son, Ann daughter, Charles son, Peter son, Jeremiah son.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 Chris Galley, Eilidh Garrett, Ros Davies and Alice Reid, 'Living same-name siblings and English historical demography: a reply to Peter Razzell' *Local Population Studies*, 87 (2011), 77.

2 Galley et.al., 'Living same-name siblings', 72.

3 These nine cases included the three pairs noted by Galley et.al., 'Living same-name siblings', 72.

4 Galley et.al., 'Living same-name siblings', 72.

Table 1: Living same-name siblings in 1695 Marriage Duty Act enumeration listings.<sup>5</sup>

Place	Date	Number of eligible families	Number of living same-name sibling pairs	Percentage of living same-name siblings
Bristol, Gloucestershire	1696	2,282	4	0.18
City of London	1695	2,189	4	0.18
Lichfield, Staffordshire	1695	275	0	0
Stoke-on-Trent, Staffordshire	1701	177	0	0
Lyme Regis, Dorset	1695	112	0	0
Lyme Regis, Dorset	1698	118	0	0
Lyme Regis, Dorset	1703	116	0	0
Swindon, Wiltshire	1697	76	0	0
Melbourne, Derbyshire	1695	55	0	0
Wanborough, Wiltshire	1697	51	0	0
Wanborough, Wiltshire	1701	49	0	0
Wanborough, Wiltshire	1702	50	0	0
Wanborough, Wiltshire	1705	40	0	0
Chiseldon, Wiltshire	1697	41	0	0
Chiseldon, Wiltshire	1701	51	0	0
Chiseldon, Wiltshire	1702	62	0	0
Chiseldon, Wiltshire	1705	51	1	2.0
Wroughton Wiltshire	1700	41	0	0
Wroughton Wiltshire	1701	39	0	0
Clayworth, Nottinghamshire	1676	32	0	0
New Romney, Kent	1696	30	0	0
New Romney, Kent	1697	30	0	0
New Romney, Kent	1699	34	0	0
Liddington, Wiltshire	1701	30	0	0
Liddington, Wiltshire	1702	29	0	0
Goodnestone, Kent	1676	24	0	0
Southampton, Hampshire	1695	17	0	0
Elcombe, Wiltshire	1700	10	0	0
Elcombe, Wiltshire	1701	12	0	0
Bincknoll, Wiltshire	1697	10	0	0
Bincknoll, Wiltshire	1700	9	0	0
Bincknoll, Wiltshire	1701	7	0	0
Old Romney, Kent	1699	7	0	0
Uffcot, Wiltshire	1700	6	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>6,162</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0.15</b>

5 For the sources of this data see D.V. Glass ed., *London inhabitants within the walls 1695* (London, 1966); E. Ralph and M.E. Williams eds., *The inhabitants of Bristol in 1696*, Bristol Record Society, 15 (1968); D. A. Gately ed., *The Stoke-upon-Trent parish listing, 1701*, Staffordshire Record Society, Collections for a history of Staffordshire, 4<sup>th</sup> series, 16, (1994); R.E. Chester ed., 'A statutory list of inhabitants of Melbourne, Derbyshire, in 1695', *Journal of the Derbyshire archaeological and natural history society*, 7 (1885), 7-23. The Wiltshire data was taken from Beryl Hurley ed., *Local censuses in Wiltshire: surviving north Wiltshire 1695 tax censuses, Part 1*, Wiltshire Family History Society (1994), 4, 5 and Hurley, *Local censuses, Part 2*, 16-44, 46-53. All other data were taken from manuscript listings kindly supplied by the library of the Cambridge Group.

A search in the International Genealogical Index reveals the following pattern of baptisms to Jeremiah and Ann Lammas in St. Mary Staining:

Charles baptised 8/1/1676.  
Jeremiah baptised 5/2/1678.  
Edward baptised 2/8/1680.  
Anne baptised 1/9/1682.  
Jeremiah baptised 5/2/1685.  
Mary baptised 16/10/1685.  
Sarah baptised 10/2/1686.  
Charles baptised 5/6/1688.  
Peter baptised 30/1/1689.  
Jeremiah baptised 16/4/1691.  
Ruth baptised 14/1/1692.  
Joseph baptised 11/1/1694.  
Martha baptised 29/3/1698.

Some of the dates are confused possibly because of the use in some instances of the Julian calendar, but the above list of baptisms indicates that there was only one Ann born to Jeremiah and Ann, although there were three Jeremiahs, only one of whom appears to have survived until 1695. In the light of this anomaly, a search was made of the original manuscript of the 1695 Marriage Duty Act assessment, which revealed the following entry:

Jeremiah Lammas, Ann his wife, Edward son, Ann daughter, Charles son, Peter son, Jeremiah son.<sup>6</sup>

Ann had mistakenly been transcribed as a daughter in the published volume edited by David Glass, an error perhaps understandable given the large number of cases included in the edition. There are three other apparent living same-name cases in London, but it has not been possible to trace the baptisms of the three families. The first family is that of Samuel and Hannah Dangicourt, which in the published volume are listed as having three children: Peter son, Elizabeth daughter, Elizabeth daughter. In the manuscript edition, the three names—Peter, Elizabeth and Elizabeth—are listed alongside Samuel and Hannah, but with no indication of their relationship with the latter, representing another transcription error. The other two families are ones where there are two same-name siblings listed, but are stated as ‘children’, with no indication of the relationship to the man and woman associated with them in the schedules.<sup>7</sup>

---

6 London Metropolitan Archive, reference COL/CHD/LA/04.

7 London Metropolitan Archive, reference COL/CHD/LA/04.

It has not been possible to trace the baptisms of the four families listed with living same-name siblings in the 1696 Bristol published volume. However, most assessments associated with the 1695 Marriage Duty Act have survived for the city in the period 1695–1706, allowing an evaluation of the accuracy of the 1696 volume. The spelling of names varies between one listing and another, including a wife named Eleanor being listed twice as Leonard! In the following entries I have inserted commas to clarify naming patterns, which are sometimes confused by the lack of spacing between names—and many of the problems in transcripts are due to the absence of spacing or commas in the original manuscript. The four families with living same-name siblings in the 1696 published volume are as follows, contrasted with entries for relevant other years from the manuscript sources:

1. *St Nicholas parish*

1696: Peeter Wading, Leonard Wading his wife. Peeter, Philip, Elizabeth, Walter & Peeter children.<sup>8</sup>

1695: Peter Wadding and Elionor his wife. Peter, Phillipp, Eliz, Walter and Peter Worton children.<sup>9</sup>

1697: Peter Wadding, Leonard his Wife. Peter, Phillip & Walter Children.<sup>10</sup>

*Comment:* The second Peter listed in 1696 is stated as being 'Peter Worton' in 1695, and disappears in the 1697 return.

2. *St Philip & Jacob parish*

1696: William Ellis & Hannah wife. Richard, Hannah, Elizabeth, Mary, Sampson & Hannah Ellis children.<sup>11</sup>

1695: William Ellis and Hannah his wife. Richard Simson, Hannah Simson, Elizabeth Simson, Mary Simson & Hannah Ellis their children.<sup>12</sup>

*Comment:* The 1695 return makes it clear that the two Hannahs had different surnames and were presumably born to different fathers. The 1696 published listing appears to have transcribed the surname 'Simson' as the first name 'Sampson'.

---

8 Ralph and Williams, *The inhabitants*, 139.

9 Manuscript 1695 Marriage Duty Act assessment, Bristol Record Office, reference FCTax/A/17/14.

10 Manuscript 1695 Marriage Duty Act assessment, Bristol Record Office, reference FCTax/A/17/15.

11 Ralph and Williams, *The inhabitants*, 179.

12 Manuscript 1695 Marriage Duty Act assessment, Bristol Record Office, reference FCTax/A/17/17.

3. *St Stephen parish*

1696: John James & Sarah wife. Joseph, Joseph, Sarah, Elizabeth children.<sup>13</sup>

1698: John James & Sarah his wife. John, Joseph, Sarah and Elizabeth children.<sup>14</sup>

*Comment:* As Ralph and Williams the editors of the 1696 volume noted, Joseph appears as John in the 1698 assessment,<sup>15</sup> suggesting a recording error in the 1696 return, and indicating that there were no living same-name siblings in this family.

4. *St Michael parish*

1696: Roger Bagg & Grace wife. Andrew, John, Ann, Fulean & John children.<sup>16</sup>

1697: Roger Bagg deceased, Grace his wife, John and Andrew sons.

*Comment:* It is possible that the name 'Fulean' is the surname of the children Andrew, John and Ann. A burial is noted for Roger in the 1697 manuscript assessment, inasmuch a number 1 is recorded in the burial column. There is no such note for the children, and no entry for John Bagg in the burial register for 1696–97.<sup>17</sup>

The extra data available on Bristol indicates that it is likely there were no living same-name siblings in Bristol at the end of the seventeenth century. This conclusion will have to be evaluated through further research on baptisms in the families in question.<sup>18</sup>

The remaining living same-name sibling traced was for Chiseldon, Wiltshire in 1705. The father and mother were Thomas and Mary Dereham, and the entry for 1705 was as follows: Children John, Thomas, Oliver, Richard, Richard, Edmond, Marey. However, the entry for 1702 was: Children John, Oliver, Richard, Mary.<sup>19</sup> It is possible that the second Richard and Edmond enumerated in 1705 were born between 1702 and 1705, but this is questionable given the short birth intervals involved, and will have to be checked if relevant baptism data can be located.

None of the above nine cases can be unambiguously classified as being living same-name siblings. Further research might provide such evidence but we can provisionally conclude that the existence of living same-name cases did not occur to any significant extent at the end of the seventeenth century. It is probable that there were such cases in an earlier

---

13 Ralph and Williams, *The inhabitants*, 187.

14 Manuscript 1695 Marriage Duty Act assessment, Bristol Record Office, reference FCTax/A/17/18.

15 Ralph and Williams, *The inhabitants*, 187, footnote. Ralph and Williams mistakenly referred to the 1698 return as the 1689 assessment.

16 Ralph and Williams, *The inhabitants*, 131.

17 Manuscript 1695 Marriage Duty Act assessment, Bristol Record Office, reference FCTax/A/17/13.

18 The Bristol Family History Society has transcribed most baptism registers for the period after 1754, and is planning to transcribe those before that date in the near future.

19 Beryl Hurley ed., *Local censuses in Wiltshire: surviving north Wiltshire 1695 tax censuses, Part 2* Wiltshire Family History Society (1994), 10, 13.

period, particularly during the sixteenth century, but the evidence reviewed in a previous article, suggests that the great majority of these were males and that by the seventeenth century they were less than 2 per cent of the total of eligible families.<sup>20</sup> Same name research suggests that between 20 and 30 per cent of all burials were under-registered in the parish register period,<sup>21</sup> indicating that living same-name children do not pose a major problem for the same-name technique.

---

20 Peter Razzell, 'Living same-name siblings in England, 1439–1851', *Local Population Studies*, 87 (2011), 67.

21 See Peter Razzell, *Population and disease: transforming English society, 1550–1850*, 15.