Société Jersiasise Bulletin, 1991

NEW EVIDENCE FOR THE POPULATION OF JERSEY IN THE SEVENTEENTH AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES

by

JASON ST JOHN NICOLLE

Attempts to quantify the total population of Jersey in the centuries before the census of 1821 have been hampered by the scarcity of contemporary estimates and by over reliance on one type of evidence: lists of the number of households in each parish.[1] Nevertheless, three additional sources are available: a census from 1788 has already been published,[2] an apparently unknown manuscript census of 1737 has recently come to light in Cambridge University Library,[3] and there is the militia roll of 1617.[4] Used in conjunction with other sources, the militia roll and the census of 1737 can provide us with significant new information on the population of Jersey in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, although a satisfactory and authorative account of our island's demographic history must await a thorough analysis of the parish registers and careful back projection from the early census records, along the lines pioneered, in England, by the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure.[5]

When the Royal Commissioners, Conway and Bird, reviewed the island militia in 1617, they recorded that there were some 2,675 men on the muster roll, adding that the existence of earlier rolls, "which doe specifie more men" led them to believe that "the island undoubtedly hath 3,000 men at least able to carry arms".[6] A total population figure can be extrapolated from this in two different ways. If one assumes that the 2,675 on the roll are virtually all the males over the age of 14, as listed in the census of 1737, and that the age structure of the population in 1617 was identical with that one hundred and twenty years later, it is simply a matter of multiplying 2,675 by the ratio of adult males to total population derived from the later census. If these large but not unreasonable assumptions are accepted, a total population of *c.* 9,900 is generated.[7] The other method of extrapolation produces a remarkably similar estimate. The survival of matching militia and population totals for eighteenth-century Guernsey allows us to calculate a ratio between the two, and if we assume that this is also applicable to her sister isle a century earlier, we can apply it as a multiplier to the militia figure from 1617 — although in this case, the appropriate figure is not the theoretical total entered on the muster roll, but the number actually reviewed.[8] Applying the average multiplier of 5.14 produces a total population of *c.* 10,000.

The population figure derived from the number of houses recorded in 1685 cannot

corroborate this estimate for 1617, as the demographic history of the intervening years is unclear, although it does rest on a secure foundation. There seems no reason to think that the average house/inhabitant ratio derived from the census of 1737 would not be applicable half a century earlier, especially as contemporaries thought 5 to be a reasonable multiplier and that the consequent total, of *c.* 16,200, fits in with Philip Falle's estimate of between 15,000 and 20,000 for 1694.(9)

By the time Falle came to write the second edition of his history, he saw fit to note a marked increase in population in Saint Helier, and the census of 1737 indicates a rise in the total population of the island as a whole over the last fifty years.(10) The manuscript gives a total of 13,642 inhabitants for ten parishes, including those out of the island at the time of the census, but excluding the largest parish, Saint Ouen, and the most populous, Saint Helier. These spaces can be filled if we assume that their population in 1737 was half way between what it had been in 1685 and what it would be in 1788, multiplying households by 5.32 to work out the former, whilst taking the latter from the figures in the census of that year. This generates an estimated total population for the island of *c.* 18,400 in 1737, *c.* 2,400 less than it was fifty years later.(11)

As far as I have been able to discover, this census of 1737 survives in a single, contemporary manuscript copy: Cambridge, University Library, Additional MS. 2766(15). It consists of a single paper folio, twelve and three-quarters inches wide and seventeen inches tall, written in a neat eighteenth century hand. It was bound up with a miscellaneous collection of twenty-seven printed pamphlets, poems and parliamentary petitions covering the years 1728–1740, which probably explains why it seems to have lain unnoticed. The volume as a whole came into the University Library collection through purchase, in 1890, but there seems to be no record of the dealer involved. As it lacks any inscription or bookplate, discovering the volume's provenance must remain a matter of guesswork, but I suggest that it was owned by John, Lord Carteret and Earl Granville, who was Bailiff of Jersey from 1715 to 1763. The contents of the collection reflect the interests of a Whig peer in the House of Lords, a man whose dislike of Walpole's policies had become clear by 1730 at least and whose mind was troubled over the effect of excise duties on the British woollen and textile trade, especially between Ireland and Britain, the problems of public finance, the likely effects on English trade of peace with Spain and the omnipresence of political bribery.(12) Concerns about placemen, the textile trade, the National Debt, together with a dislike of Walpole, were shared by many, although it is suggestive that Carteret took a prominent part in debates over the National Debt in 1720, "identified himself with Irish interests", trying to reduce the excise paid in England on Irish produced cloth during the six years he spent in Dublin as Lord Lieutenant, and, from 1730, played a prominent rôle in the struggle against Walpole, moving a resolution in the Upper House in 1741, requesting George II to remove the Minister from his "presence and counsels for ever".(13) What is more, the thirteenth item in the collection confirms that its owner had a specific interest in Jersey: it is a printed copy of the respondent's case, following the coinage riots of 1731, presented to the Council in 1733, and it is the only printed document in the collection to contain a hand-written emendation of the printed text, an emendation which seems to show a familiarity with the relevant Order in Council.(14) One of the respondents, Abraham Richardson, had already written to Carteret, as well as to the Governor,

Viscount Cobham, in 1732, and Carteret's interest in coinage had been shown eight years earlier, when he had campaigned successfully against William Wood's similarly unpopular copper half pence.[15] The weight of evidence seems to suggest that this was Carteret's book, but the other Whig politician with a Jersey connection, Viscount Cobham, cannot be ruled out, as he too broke with Walpole, opposed his plans for the excise and had received a letter from Richardson — although he does not seem to have had any particular interest in the textile trade in general or as it affected Ireland and at least a third of the items in the collection are concerned with this trade.[16]

Having possibly unravelled the mystery of the collection to which the census of 1737 belonged, we can concentrate our attention on the document itself; what was its origin and purpose?

The manuscript as it stands seems to have been a private record, constructed by totalling vingtaine by vingtaine the numbers given in each category in the returns from each parish, which was included subsequently among a collection of documents which were bound up together some time in the mid eighteenth century, probably by Carteret, the principle guiding the selection of material being the inclusion of whatever he would have found interesting and important, rather than merely useful.[17] It is clear that the Cambridge manuscript, apparently the only form in which the census of 1737 survives, is not an administrative document: it is free from the finger marks and scribblings which tend to be a feature of any document which is regularly consulted; the volume which contained it gives no indication of its presence; and, as to the document itself, the parishes are arranged without any apparent order, and two are left out entirely — Saint Ouen and Saint Helier — in contradiction to what would seem to have been the very purpose of the census, the provision of a total population for the island. When the scribe of the Cambridge manuscript approached the end of his sheet, he does not seem to have considered starting a new one: instead, he ceased copying down totals for all the different sorts of information contained in the parish returns, and from then on gave the totals which he must have considered the most important for the purpose of his record — the number of inhabitants and the numbers of fishermen away from the island engaged in the Newfoundland Fisheries.[18] The fact that there was still room to include totals for the houses, men, women and children in each parish, but that the appropriate boxes had been left empty, with a line of dots to indicate that something had been left out, strongly suggests that they had been included for the seven previous parishes merely as a matter of curiosity. The census of 1788, the only extant Jersey document before the census of 1806 which I know to contain demographic information similar to that in the manuscript of 1737, supports these suppositions. There were originally full parish returns listing both men, women and children, whether present or absent, as shown by the chance survival of such a return from Saint Lawrence, but as the intention of the census was the "*Denombrement des habitans de Isle*", any information other than the numbers of inhabitants per parish was ephemeral and no attempt was made to record it in a more permanent fashion.[19]

What was the purpose behind the census which had generated the parish returns that were subsequently copied to produce a private memorandum such as the Cambridge manuscript? As there are, so far as I have been able to discover, no references to the census from any period, or from any source, the answer must involve a high degree of speculation.

Viscount Cobham, in 1732, and Carteret's interest in coinage had been shown eight years earlier, when he had campaigned successfully against William Wood's similarly unpopular copper half pence.[15] The weight of evidence seems to suggest that this was Carteret's task, but the other Whig politician with a Jersey connection, Viscount Cobham, cannot be ruled out, as he too broke with Walpole, opposed his plans for the excise and had received a letter from Richardson — although he does not seem to have had any particular interest in the textile trade in general or as it affected Ireland and at least a third of the items in the collection are concerned with this trade.[16]

Having possibly unravelled the mystery of the collection to which the census of 1737 belonged, we can concentrate our attention on the document itself; what was its origin and purpose?

The manuscript as it stands seems to have been a private record, constructed by totalling vingtaine by vingtaine the numbers given in each category in the returns from each parish, which was included subsequently among a collection of documents which were bound up together some time in the mid eighteenth century, probably by Carteret, the principle guiding the selection of material being the inclusion of whatever he would have found interesting and important, rather than merely useful.[17] It is clear that the Cambridge manuscript, apparently the only form in which the census of 1737 survives, is not an administrative document: it is free from the finger marks and scribblings which tend to be a feature of any document which is regularly consulted; the volume which contained it gives no indication of its presence; and, as to the document itself, the parishes are arranged without any apparent order, and two are left out entirely — Saint Ouen and Saint Helier — in contradiction to what would seem to have been the very purpose of the census, the provision of a total population for the island. When the scribe of the Cambridge manuscript approached the end of his sheet, he does not seem to have considered starting a new one: instead, he ceased copying down totals for all the different sorts of information contained in the parish returns, and from then on gave the totals which he must have considered the most important for the purpose of his record — the number of inhabitants and the numbers of fishermen away from the island engaged in the Newfoundland Fisheries.[18] The fact that there was still room to include totals for the houses, men, women and children in each parish, but that the appropriate boxes had been left empty, with a line of dots to indicate that something had been left out, strongly suggests that they had been included for the seven previous parishes merely as a matter of curiosity. The census of 1788, the only extant Jersey document before the census of 1806 which I know to contain demographic information similar to that in the manuscript of 1737, supports these suppositions. There were originally full parish returns listing both men, women and children, whether present or absent, as shown by the chance survival of such a return from Saint Lawrence, but as the intention of the census was the "*Denombrement des habitans de Isle*", any information other than the numbers of inhabitants per parish was ephemeral and no attempt was made to record it in a more permanent fashion.[19]

What was the purpose behind the census which had generated the parish returns that were subsequently copied to produce a private memorandum such as the Cambridge manuscript? As there are, so far as I have been able to discover, no references to the census from any period, or from any source, the answer must involve a high degree of speculation.

Nevertheless, there does seem to be sufficient indirect evidence at least to suggest a connection between the desire for a census and a perceived need to protect Jersey's exemptions from the restrictions which usually applied to subjects of the Crown engaged in the import and export of goods. The States in 1788 certainly thought that presenting an accurate total of population to Parliament would secure, or perhaps improve, their privileged trading position: the preamble to the return from Saint Lawrence says that the Constable is sending it, in response to the States' order of the 1st of April, "*pour sérvir d'information devant le Parlement d'Angleterre touchant les affaires des Laines etc, & pour faire partie du Denombrement des Habitans de Isle de Jersey*".[20] These *affaires des Laines etc* presumably refer to the recent statute, 28 George III. *c.* 38 § 16, 17, 18, which regulated the quantity of wool which could be exported each year from Southampton to the islands. Although I can find no explicit evidence that the quantities of wool allowed to be exported were fixed with reference to the island population, a numerical confirmation of its populousness might be used to argue that the privileges it enjoyed were entirely necessary. In this context, the numerous bills and petitions presented to Parliament in 1734 and 1735, with the aim of preventing the export of wool from Britain or Ireland, might well have been a spur to get a census drawn up, and, given Carteret's position as Bailiff and the fact that the only record of the census survives in a collection of assorted documents, probably owned by him, indicating an interest in Jersey affairs and, more generally, in the production and export of wool and other textiles, it is not unreasonable to suggest that he was behind the enterprise.[21] As for the inclusion of those away in Newfoundland in the census of 1737, a statute of 1774 not only confirmed the islanders' right "to import whatever quantity of grains required for the sustenance and use of the inhabitants", but also their right to export whatever amount of grains, bread and biscuit, "fit and necessary for the Fishery in these parts, or for the use and support of the Mariners, or other Persons employed . . . in carrying on the said Fishery", and it is clear that some records of the numbers of men and of the shipping involved were kept by the island authorities, suggesting that this information was useful to them.[22]

Many of the conclusions arrived at in this article are clearly speculative, based on assumptions of varying degrees of probability. This reflects the indirect nature of the evidence that has been available, and the fact that certain knowledge of the demographic history of Jersey in the eighteenth and seventeenth centuries can be based only on a thorough analysis of the surviving parish registers, supplemented by careful back projection from the earliest census records. Nevertheless, it does not seem unreasonable to suggest the following totals: a population of about 9,900 in 1617, rising to about 16,100 in 1685, and *c.* 18,400 in 1737. These are compatible with contemporary estimates, and with the population totals given in the earliest of the later censuses, namely about 20,800 in 1788 and 22,855 in 1806. Although the earlier totals are clearly provisional, they are an improvement on the estimates that have been available previously. As for the census of 1737, which seems to have escaped attention entirely, it perhaps results from a desire to protect the island's import and export privileges in the face of hostile Parliamentary bills and, possibly, represents the initiative of the Bailiff, Lord Carteret, who seems to have been the most probable owner of the miscellaneous collection of pamphlets and poems which included the only extant reference to its existence in the form of an incomplete

private summary of the returns for each of the parishes.

Interest in the population of Jersey in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries will not abate when definitive totals have been produced. After growth, marriage and fertility rates have been calculated, these figures will need to be integrated into the social, economic and cultural framework of contemporary island life. What were the effects of Jersey's high population density on its economy and agriculture, on island politics, on the quality of life and the standard of living? Did housing and opportunities for employment keep up with a rising population? Our own problems in these areas will trouble Jerseymen increasingly in the 1990s, as the island population continues to rise. Historians may work in the past, but they live in the present, and it will be interesting to see how these concerns will be reflected in the historical demography of the next decade.

Acknowledgement

I am grateful to the Syndics of Cambridge University for permission to publish this transcript.

Notes

1. The fullest treatment of the subject to date is B. J. R. Blench, *La population et le peuplement de Jersey*, Norois XIV (1967), pp. 227-239 and pp. 459-471. I am grateful to Mr Ian Monins for drawing my attention to this article. Two lists of households have survived. The first can be deduced from the hearth tax returns included in the *Extente de L'Isle de Jersey 1331 – Edward III* (Jersey, Société Jersiaise, 1876), having made allowance for the clergy, seigneurs and poor widows who were exempted from this *fouage*, for which see C. Le Quesne, *The Constitutional History of Jersey* (London, 1858), p. 79-80; Blench, *op. cit.*, p. 232. The second, for 1685, is given in (P. Dumaresq), *A Survey of Ye Island of Jersey*, Bull. Ann. Soc. Jersiaise, 1935, **12**(4), 444-446. These are available also in T. Quayle, *General View of the Agriculture and Present State of the Islands on the Coast of Normandy* (London, 1815), pp. 319-323 which gives them alongside a census of the number of families in each vingtaine, made in 1807; pp. 315-318 of the same work gives the much fuller census returns of 1806. For three late seventeenth century estimates, see W. Nicolle, (ed.) *Caesarea or A Discourse of the Island of Jersey par Le Lieutenant-Bailli Jean Poingdestre* (Jersey, Société Jersiaise, 1889), p. 5 ("not past Twenty Thousand" c. 1680); *A Survey of Ye Island of Jersey*, *op. cit.*, p. 418 ("hardly exceed Fifteen thousand" in 1685); P. Falle, *An Account of the Island of Jersey* (London, 1694), p. 82 ("betwixt 15 and 20 Thousand" in 1694).
2. M.-L. Backhurst, The 1788 Census of Saint Lawrence, Jersey, *The Channel Islands Family History Journal* No. 8 (Autumn 1980), pp. 82-85. This is printed from Société Jersiaise Library, D8, X33; a xerox of an eighteenth-century copy of the census returns. The original document is in private hands.
3. Cambridge, University Library, Additional MS. 2766 (15), originally part of a book entitled *Pamphlets*, with the Library reference 7500 a1. I am grateful for the courteous and efficient assistance which I received from the library staff during my research there.
4. The roll is printed in P. Falle, *An Account of the Island of Jersey*, edited by Edward Durell (Jersey, 1837), pp. 405-408. For the militia in general, see *Ordres Pour La Milice*, Bull. Ann. Soc. Jersiaise, 1894, **3**(5), 274-287; F. A. L. de Gruchy, *The Royal Jersey Militia and the Military Role of Jersey in History*, Bull. Ann. Soc. Jersiaise, 1956, **16**(4), 365-372; Le Quesne, *op. cit.*, pp. 482-501; Falle, *op. cit.* (edition of 1837), p. 141-143; *A Survey of Ye Island of Jersey*, *loc. cit.*, pp. 420-422. I have been able to discover only two militia rolls for individual parishes in this period:

Etats de la Compagnie De La Paroisse De St. Sauveur En 1617 D'Après L'Original Conserve au Bureau Des Roles à Londres, Bull. Ann. Soc. Jersiaise, 1885, **2**(1), 11-29; *Les Etats de la Compagnie de St Pierre en 1692*, Bull. Ann. Soc. Jersiaise, 1888, **2**(4), 356-359. Doubtless there are more

5. The fruit of the Group's work on English demographic history has been printed in E. A. Wrigley and R. S. Schofield, *The Population History of England 1541-1871. A Reconstruction* (London, 1981).

6. Falle, *op. cit.* (edition of 1837), p. 406.

7. For the seven parishes for which the census of 1737 provides both pieces of information, the ratio of *habitants* to *hommes* is 9,381 to 2,559, or 3.67 to 1.2675 multiplied by 3.67 is 9,817. Unfortunately, it is unclear whether this total of 2,675 represents males over the age of 14 or males over the age of 16, and the number of *hommes* who were not on the militia roll, by design, accident, poverty or occupation, is similarly hard to know: Falle, *op. cit.*, (edition of 1837), p. 407 and p. 141, and Le Quesne, *op. cit.*, p. 498, provide some relevant information. These two problems remain unsolved, but it is reassuring that the suggested multiplier falls well within the range of values suggested for England by R. S. Schofield: "total population (lies) somewhere between 3½ and 4½ times the number of males aged 16-60 listed in the muster returns" (*Local Population Studies*, **6**, (Spring 1971), p. 64).

8. For Guernsey's population in general, see G. H. Dury, *The Population of Guernsey: An Essay in Historical Geography*, Geography XXXIII (1948), pp. 61-69; A. C. Robin, *Notes on Population of Guernsey*, Rep. and Trans. Soc. Guernesiaise, 1947, **14**(2), 181-194; G. H. Dury, *Land Use Statistics for Guernsey in the late Eighteenth Century*, *ibid*, 1953, **15**(4), 258-265; E. C. Barrington, *The Human Geography of Guernsey*, *ibid*, 1935, **12**(2), 352-426, especially p. 407-416. For the Guernsey militia, see L. J. Marr, *A History of the Bailiwick of Guernsey*, (London and Chichester, 1982), pp. 164-167; E. B. Tupper, *The History of Guernsey and its Bailiwick: With Occasional Notices of Jersey*, (Guernsey, 2nd edition, 1876), pp. 545-565. Four ratios can be calculated. The population of Guernsey in 1800 was 16,155 (Tupper, *op. cit.*, p. 428), and in the same year there were 3,158 militiamen, with an additional 455 aged 14 to 16: this produces a ratio of either 5.12, or 4.47, depending on whether these youths are included in the total. In 1727, the population was 10,500 (Tupper, *ibid*, p. 253-254, quoting unspecified document in the Guernsey Greffe, dated 13th February 1727), which is 5.52 times the 1,902 men reviewed in 1680 (Tupper, *ibid*, p. 555), and 5.46 times the 1,924 men reviewed in 1750 (Tupper, *ibid*, p. 556). Applying an average multiplier of 5.14 to 1,954, the number of Jerseymen reviewed in 1617, produces a total population of 10,044. The number actually reviewed, rather than the number entered on the rolls, needs to be taken in order to make the Jersey figure compatible with the Guernsey evidence, where the militia totals refered to above all fall short of the theoretical total of 1,956 given in the roll of 1615, printed in G. S. Syvret's *Chroniques Des Îles*, (Guernsey, 1832), p. 225.

9. There were 3,049 houses in Jersey in 1685. *A Survey of Ye Island of Jersey*, *op. cit.*, p. 446, where the total is given mistakenly as 3,069. For the seven parishes for which figures are available in 1737, the total number of *maisons* was 1763, the total number of *habitants* 9,381, producing an average ratio of 5.32, which, when multiplied by 3,049, generates a population for 1685 of 16,221. For Falle's estimate, see Falle, *op. cit.*, (edition of 1694), p. 82; for a multiplier of 5, *A Survey of Ye Island of Jersey*, *op. cit.*, p. 418, where the fact that more than one family can live in the same house has been taken into account. Laslett's figures for seventeenth and eighteenth century England are smaller than these Jersey multipliers, suggesting a mean household size of 5.073 for 1564-1649 and of 4.502 (4.696 for London) for 1650-1749, which perhaps would fit in

with the island's higher population density, although this begs questions about the relationship between housing stock and local population levels as well as about the social, economic and cultural factors affecting household formation: P. Laslett and R. Wall, *Household and Family in Past Time* (Cambridge, 1972), p.138, Table 4.4.

10. Falle, *op. cit.*, (edition of 1837), p.119.

11. The population of Saint Ouen in 1788 was 2,025 (Backhurst, *op. cit.*), and the estimate for 1685, 1,628 (5.32 x 306 houses: *A Survey of Ye Island of Jersey*, *op. cit.*, p. 446), producing an estimate for 1737 of 1,826. The comparable figures for Saint Helier are 4,064 and 1,883 (5.32 x 354 houses), which produce an estimate for 1737 of 2,974, which, when added to the totals for the other eleven parishes, produces a population for the island as a whole of 18,424. Backhurst gives 20,825 for the population in 1788, allowing 1,611 for Saint Peter which is left blank in the manuscript.

12. Seven of the collection have a specific Irish connection, five concern the woollen and textile trade, and three refer specifically to the trade in the latter commodities between Britain and Ireland. Five proclaim Whig views, two of which contain a strong attack on Walpole. Four show a concern with public finance, and six concern for the damage being done to British trade as a result of Walpole's foreign policy, notably the Convention treaty, while four attack political bribery practiced by Walpole. Seven have a connection with the House of Lords, one with the House of Commons, and an additional four concern both the Upper and the Lower House.

13. B. Williams, *Carteret & Newcastle. A Contrast in Contemporaries* (Cambridge, 1943), pp. 72-76 for the six years Carteret spent in Dublin between 1724 and 1730, Dictionary of National Biography IX, pp. 210-215 (London, 1887). See also W. B. Pemberton, *Carteret* (London, 1936), and A. Ballantyne, *Lord Carteret. A political biography* (London, 1887). Unfortunately, I have been unable to examine the Carteret Papers, London, British Library, Additional MSS 22511-22545, for relevant material.

14. On p. 3, where the sentence "It is to be observed that as to the Orders in council that regulate the Cause, they don't inflict any Pains or Penalties on Disobeyers" has been changed to "It is to be observed, that as to the Orders of Council that regulate the Coin, they don't inflict any Pains or Penalties on Disobeyers" — surely not a correction which one less than fully acquainted with the case would feel obliged to make. For the riots, see E. T. Nicolle, *Les Émeutes de 1730*, Bull. Ann. Soc. Jersiaise, 1903, 5(2), 158-162, and for the petition in this collection, *Pétition De Jean Le Hardy, Écr., Procureur-Général Du Roi George II Au Conseil Privé De Sa Majesté*, Bull. Ann. Soc. Jersiaise, 1895, 3(6), 307-339. See also, *Pièces Diverses: II: Pétition aux États relative à la Monnaie D'Ordre*, Bull. Ann. Soc. Jersiaise, 1896, 3(7), 415-417, of which Carteret must surely have been aware in his capacity as Bailiff.

15. For the letters, see *Pièces Diverses: III: Deux Lettres Aux Lords Cobham et Carteret*, Bull. Ann. Soc. Jersiaise, 1896, 3(7), 417-423. For the campaign against Wood's copper coinage, see Williams, *op. cit.*, pp. 72-3, and a pamphlet published in Dublin in 1724, *A Letter to the Lord Carteret, in answer to some arguments lately advanced in favour of Mr. Wood's copper money*, by a member of the Irish parliament. The Bodleian copy of this has the shelf mark Don f.331 (6).

16. My information on Richard Temple, Viscount Cobham, Governor from 1723 to 1749, comes from the Dictionary of National Biography, LVI (London, 1898), pp. 38-39.

17. This would be consonant with the general principles in the light of which an eighteenth-century gentleman regulated his life, and the lack of a list of contents at the beginning of the volume, or an index at the back, suggest either that its owner was familiar with all that it contained, or that the volume was not intended for ready reference.

18. Clearly it is necessary to look at the original manuscript, rather than the transcript: a photocopy has been deposited in the Société Jersiaise Library. Much has been written on Channel Island involvement in the Newfoundland Fisheries: see, inter alia, A. C. Saunders, *Newfoundland and the Channel Islands*, Rep. & Trans. Soc. Guernesiaise, 1933, **12**(1), 42-56; C. R. Fay, *Newfoundland and the Channel Islands*. Based on the papers of H. W. Le Messurier, *ibid*, 1955, XVI, pp. 76-84; and, more generally, ed. A. G. Jamieson, *A People of the Sea* (London, 1986).

19. For the parish totals in 1788, and a transcript of the individual return from Saint Lawrence, see Backhurst, *op. cit*. Attention must be drawn to two additional documents which are relevant to the census of 1737. The first is described as a 'List Roll of the Inhabitants of Jersey 1739, being the rates delivered in by the Constables under seal': ed. J. Le Patourel, et al., *List of Records in the Greffe Guernsey*, Volume I, List & Index Society Special Series Volume 2 (London, 1969), p. 73, referring to Saint Peter Port, The Greffe, Manuscript Collection in the Bailiff's Room, No. 106. The other document, dated the 7th of July, 1737, is the return made by the Constable of Saint Clement of the number of people living in his parish, to which is added a list of the names of all men between 16 and 60: Saint Helier, Société Jersiaise Library, Scrapbook 6, p. 26. The Cambridge manuscript is independent of this return from Saint Clement, being dated the previous month, and giving slightly different totals for each vingtaine: 204 for Samarès, rather than 213; 215 for La Grande Vingtaine rather than 206; and 112 for Rocquier rather than 118. These differences can be accounted for probably by births and deaths, movements in and out of the parish, and differences in the numbers who were absent, mostly being at sea, when the census was actually taken. The Saint Clement census is clearly intended to provide information for the militia rolls: the Constable mentioning that he was acting "*en conformité a l'ordre de son excellence Major Gen(eral) Edmund Fielding*", who as Governor, had overall responsibility for the militia, and the document itself being endorsed in a contemporary hand, "*Liste des Hom(m)es de la P(aroi)sse de St. Clem(en)t depuis 16 à 60 ans. 7e. juillet 1737*".

20. Backhurst, *op. cit.*; Saint Helier, Société Jersiaise Library, D8 x 33, f. 3 r.

21. See *Journals of the House of Commons*, vol. 23 (covering 1732-1737), (London, 1803), index under 'wool' and 'woollen manufacture'.

22. For a calculation of the numbers involved in the Newfoundland trade, see Falle, *op. cit.*, (edition of 1837): 17 ships and 1,500 men in 1731 (p. 122). See also the comments by Durell, *ibid*, p. 384, and in *A Survey of Ye Island of Jersey*, *op. cit.*, pp. 418-420. The statute of 1774, 14 George III c 5, s IV and V, confirmed an earlier one: 9 George III, c 28, s I.

Appendix

A Transcription of Cambridge, University Library, additional ms 2766 (15)

Jour 1737 'Nombre des Maisons & des Habitans dans chaque Paroisse de L'Isle de Jersey'

Paroisses Vintaines	Maisons	Hommes	Femmes	Sous L'age de 14 ans	A Terre-Neuve	A la mer & en Service	Habitans	A Terre Neuve
Grouville								
V. des Marés	92	143	171	115	19	6		
V. de La Rue	61	84	110	76	(-)	6		
V. de Longville	51	84	106	57	12	(-)		
V. de La Rocque	38	61	68	58	6	(-)		
	242	372	455	306	37	12	1,182	37
Ste Marie								
V. du Nord	78	97	161	101	31	14		
V. du Sud	101	133	236	148	39	12		
	179	230	397	249	70	26	972	70
St Jean								
V. du Nord	110	126	230	181	24	2		
V. du Douët	75	102	158	98	17	12		
V. de Herrupe	68	112	141	103	19	(-)		
	253	340	529	382	60	14	1,325	60
Trinité								
V. de la ville a L'evêque	72	106	149	122	13	1		
V. de Rosel	93	146	210	155	22	5		
V. du Rondin	84	134	193	119	10	1		
V. des Augres	73	116	153	127	5	3		
V. de la Croiserie	54	84	118	113	12	(-)		
	376	586	823	636	62	10	2,117	62
St Pierre								
V. du Douet	69	79	145	112	26	4		
V. du Coin Varin	45	49	78	67	26	(-)		
V. de St Nicholas	84	95	162	114	28	4		
V. des Augres	61	83	126	113	19	2		
Grande V.	63	68	117	66	33	(-)		
	322	374	628	472	132	10	1,616	132
St Laurent								
V. du Coin Tourgis	80	148	167	131	30	5		
V. du Coin Mottier	68	126	173	110	19	4		
V. de la Vallée	74	121	132	94	16	7		
V. du Coin Hattain	64	112	134	104	15	6		
	286	507	606	439	80	22	1,654	80

Appendix — *continued*

Paroisses Vintaines	Maisons	Hommes	Femmes	Sous L'age de 14 ans	A Terre-Neuve	A la mer & en Service	Habitans	A Terre Neuve
St Clement								
V. de Saumares	37	63	75	50	9	7		
Grande V.	45	59	86	47	4	3		
V. du Rocquié	23	28	49	33	2	(-)		
St Martin	105	150	210	130	15	10	515	15
St Sauveur	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	1,510	33
St Brelade	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	1,316	(-)
	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	1,435	156
							13,642	645