

Clues in Soho

Trace how people, evidence and decisions changed an explanation.

CCSS.ELA-Literacy.RI.11-12.3 "Analyze a complex set of ideas or sequence of events and explain how specific individuals, ideas, or events interact and develop over the course of the text."

NAME _____

DATE _____

1 READ AND MARK _____ Read it twice

YOUR JOB Mark dates and connect each action to the evidence available at that time. Underline what later investigations added. Distinguish the decision to act from proof that the action ended the outbreak.

Clues in Soho: An Investigation That Continued

- ① Before cholera struck London's Soho district in 1854, physician John Snow had already proposed that contaminated water could spread the disease. The outbreak gave him a new setting in which to test that idea. In early September, he gathered death records and asked about drinking water. Many victims had used the Broad Street pump. Nearby exceptions mattered too: a brewery with its own water sources reported no severe cholera among its workers. Such contrasts supported a water-related explanation more specifically than the location of deaths alone. A theory guided Snow's questions, but the answers had to support or challenge it.
- ② Snow brought his findings to local officials on September 7, 1854; the pump handle was removed the next day. The outbreak was already declining, however, so its later decline could not by itself prove that removing the handle had stopped it. Investigation continued after the intervention. Snow presented his famous map in December, assembling a fuller picture of deaths around the pump. The map helped communicate and examine an argument developed through earlier inquiries. It was not a sudden discovery that preceded all interviews or triggered the September decision.

- ③ Reverend Henry Whitehead, who knew the neighborhood, initially doubted Snow's explanation. His intensive inquiry in the first half of 1855 checked residents' circumstances and water use, including information from people who had remained well. He also investigated a possible contamination route involving waste from an ill infant's household; a surveyor reported defective drainage and seepage into the well. These findings strengthened the connection between the pump and illness without making every detail certain. Whitehead's skeptical local inquiry complemented Snow's medical reasoning and earlier evidence. The account therefore develops through hypothesis, urgent action and continued testing, rather than ending with one persuasive picture.

2 ANSWER WITH EVIDENCE _____ Use the passage

- ① How did Snow's earlier idea influence the questions he asked in September? Why did the nearby brewery matter?

- ② Explain the relationship between the September decision and the December map. Why would reversing their order distort the account?

- ③ How did Whitehead's initial doubt and local knowledge contribute to the developing explanation?

4 Why does the author mention both the outbreak's earlier decline and the uncertainty of some details?

3 YOUR TURN _____ Your own words

Write a developed paragraph explaining how Snow's hypothesis, the officials' decision, and Whitehead's later inquiry interacted. Use the correct sequence, explain at least two connections, and include a limitation of the evidence.

Explain the developing investigation

Use dates or sequence words to clarify relationships. Explain causes, responses and later changes rather than listing events.

[illegible]

PART 1 • READ AND MARK

Mark dates and connect each action to the evidence available at that time. Underline what later investigations added. Distinguish the decision to act from proof that the action ended the outbreak. Accept any marking that follows this job and points at the right text.

PART 2 • ANSWERS

#	QUESTION	ANSWER
1	How did Snow's earlier idea influence the questions he asked in September? Why did the nearby brewery matter?	His water-transmission hypothesis directed attention to drinking sources. The brewery provided a nearby contrast with different water use and no severe cholera, helping him test an explanation beyond mere proximity.
2	Explain the relationship between the September decision and the December map. Why would reversing their order distort the account?	Officials acted on earlier inquiries in September. The December map organized and communicated fuller evidence afterward. Reversing them would incorrectly make the famous map the cause of the earlier intervention.
3	How did Whitehead's initial doubt and local knowledge contribute to the developing explanation?	Doubt prompted checks rather than automatic agreement, while local knowledge helped him obtain detailed accounts. His later water-use and contamination inquiries added evidence that complemented Snow's reasoning.
4	Why does the author mention both the outbreak's earlier decline and the uncertainty of some details?	These limits prevent a simple before-and-after causal claim and distinguish converging evidence from complete certainty. The argument is strengthened by explaining what the findings can and cannot establish.

PART 3 · YOUR TURN (SAMPLE ANSWER)

Snow's water-related hypothesis shaped his early questions, and the responses helped him make a case for officials to act. Their September decision came before the famous December map, so the map cannot explain why they removed the handle. Nor does a continued decline prove that this action alone ended the outbreak, because cases were already falling. Whitehead's later inquiry added another kind of testing: a skeptical local investigator checked detailed accounts and a possible contamination route. His findings supported connections that Snow had proposed without removing every uncertainty. Together, these interactions show an explanation developing through questions, decisions and further investigation rather than through a single moment of discovery.

Assess relationships among individuals, ideas and events, not dates alone. The famous Snow map came after the September intervention; do not imply no other map existed earlier. Whitehead's later work is not evidence that officials already possessed on September 7. The infant contamination route is presented as possible, not a conclusively identified first case. Sources: Snow, *On the Mode of Communication of Cholera* (1855), pp. 38-55, reproduced at https://epi-snow.ph.ucla.edu/Stream2_BSPoutbreak_a.html; Whitehead's later inquiry and surveyor account at https://epi-snow.ph.ucla.edu/Stream2_BSPoutbreak_e.html; Brody et al., *Map-making and myth-making in Broad Street*, reproduced at https://epi-snow.ph.ucla.edu/Stream2_BSPoutbreak_f.html. Accept other accurate accounts of interaction with an evidence limit.