

Canterbury Visitations and the Demography of Mid-Tudor Kent

JOHN S. MOORE*

1. Introduction

The crucial importance of ecclesiastical records as sources for the historical demography of Tudor England has long been recognised. Indeed, apart from the Tudor lay subsidy rolls of 1524–46 and the preceding ‘military survey’ of 1522 so well exploited by Julian Cornwall, and perhaps the later muster-rolls,¹ all the available source-materials are of ecclesiastical origin: the wills used to estimate trends in mortality by F.J. Fisher,² the chantry certificates utilised by J.C. Russell and others,³ the parish registers notably analysed by Wrigley and Schofield,⁴ and the visitation records and ecclesiastical censuses of 1563 and 1603.⁵ Despite this apparent wealth of material, demographic trends in Tudor England are still in dispute. In particular, my application of Fisher’s methodology – using probate-records to measure epidemic mortality – to all the available English probate series has shown that the drop in population as a result of the great influenza epidemic of 1557–59 was about 16 per cent, rather than approximately 20 per cent as Fisher calculated it. I have also shown that there was considerable contemporary awareness of the ‘new disease’ or ‘new ague’, and I have shown, from an analysis of detailed civil registration data for 1846–48 (which witnessed a combination of influenza and typhus very similar to the epidemics of 1557–59) that the age-distribution of mortality did not alter significantly during the epidemic, whilst trends in the mortality of males over 25 closely paralleled those of the population as a whole. Consequently, I concluded that trends in mortality indicated by sixteenth-century probate records (in the main, the mortality of males over 25) are reasonable indications of trends in general mortality.⁶ Nevertheless, my estimated population-decrease of about 16 per cent is considerably greater than the 5.5 per cent estimated by Wrigley and Schofield.⁷ Given this large discrepancy, we need to enquire whether the visitation records and ecclesiastical censuses could throw any light on this dispute. Such an enquiry is particularly feasible for Canterbury diocese, for which an exceptional amount of documentation survives.

It has long been known that the Elizabethan Privy Council in July 1563 required diocesan bishops to answer a wide-ranging questionnaire into the state of the church, of which a major article of enquiry was 'V. How many households are within each parish . . .'⁸ Although not all the bishops answered the fifth article about the number of households, Matthew Parker as archbishop did make a return for Canterbury diocese which survives both as a draft and in its final form.⁹ Some bishops in excusing their inability to provide numbers of households for parishes in their dioceses had stated that such information had not been previously required at visitations, hence more time was needed for further enquiries to be made,¹⁰ but 1563 was not the first occasion that such information had been requested for Canterbury diocese, nor was it to be the last. Though the existence of the additional returns for Canterbury diocese has been known for some time,¹¹ they have not been critically examined as sources for historical demography despite their very considerable importance. In the first place, they enable some assessment to be made of the accuracy of the main series of 1563 returns. Secondly, they throw some light on how the required demographic information was obtained. Thirdly, they make possible a comparison of population levels in 1557, 1563, 1565 and 1569, i.e. before and after the influenza epidemic, thus providing an independent check on the estimates of mortality caused by the epidemic which have been calculated from either probate records (Fisher and Moore) or parish registers (Wrigley and Schofield).

At two earlier dates, 1546 and 1548, details of 'houseling people' ought to have been given in the chantry certificates for many of the parishes which had one or more chantries at the dissolution of those institutions. Unfortunately, not all the chantry certificates survive – in Kent, those for Ashford, Bekesbourne, Bredgar, Charing, Great Chart, Elmstone, Headcorn, Hope, Ivychurch, Kingston, Littlebourne, Murston, Saltwood, Selling (near Faversham), Smarden, Tenterden, Tonge and Waltham in 1548 have been lost – and by no means every parish had a chantry in the 1540s.¹² However, none of the surviving chantry certificates for Kent in 1546 provide the numbers of 'houseling people'. Much use has already been made of chantry certificates for demographic purposes, the major problems being the non-random distribution of parishes with chantries and the determination of a suitable 'multiplier' to convert 'houseling people' into total estimated population.¹³ Although the meaning of 'houseling people' has been queried in the past, the word 'houseling' has no connection with 'house'; it is derived from the verb 'to housel', i.e. 'to partake of Communion'.¹⁴ The appearance in the chantry certificates of synonyms such as 'people that receyve the Blessed Communyon' (at Hitchin in

Hertfordshire), 'parishioners communicating' (the general term used in the Lincolnshire returns) or 'Partakers of the lordes Holy Sooper' (consistently employed in the Somerset returns) puts the equivalence with 'communicants' beyond all reasonable doubt.¹⁵ Moreover, the data on communicants in the chantry certificates of 1546–48 and the Canterbury archdiaconal visitation of 1557 are sufficiently close in date to provide a mutual check on the quality of the data in these various sources. It is especially worthwhile undertaking this comparison for Canterbury diocese, since for all other dioceses (apart from Gloucester for which a visitation of 1551 provides the number of communicants for most parishes)¹⁶ the only possible comparison is between the chantry certificates and the 1563 returns.

2. The Canterbury visitations

Because of the importance of the Canterbury visitation-material for Kentish demography in the period from 1557 to 1569, it is desirable to review it as a whole before proceeding to analyse the results obtained. There are four separate visitations surviving for the period 1557–69: the first, made by Archdeacon Harpsfield in 1557, endeavoured to record the number of both households and of communicants in each parish, but in many parishes one of the figures and in some parishes both figures were never entered; a further problem is that the returns for Canterbury deanery are now missing from the surviving volume.¹⁷ The second visitation was Archbishop Parker's return to the 1563 Privy Council enquiry, giving the number of households for most but not all parishes, which survives in two versions: a draft, styled '1563 (a)' in my tables, and a final version, styled '1563 (b)': for a few parishes the draft return also supplies the number of communicants.¹⁸ The third visitation, made in 1565 by the archbishop's commissary-general, tried, as in 1557, to record the numbers of both households and communicants per parish; returns now exist among the archepiscopal records only for a few parishes in most deaneries, nearly all being the parishes exempt from the archdeacon's jurisdiction.¹⁹ But this enquiry also appears to have inspired a few incumbents to make detailed 'listings' for their parishes which are among the earliest such records for Tudor England.²⁰ The last visitation, for 1569, again endeavoured to record parochial totals of both households and communicants: returns exist for all deaneries but they exclude the parishes exempt from the archdeacon's jurisdiction.²¹

Since the 1563 returns were requested in July and nearly all were sent to London in or before September, most of them do not seem to

have been affected by the outbreak of plague in the autumn of that year, which was in any case mainly an urban phenomenon.²² The principal diocese to suffer from the plague was London, where no return of households was made, probably because the bishop and his officials and clergy were fully occupied coping with the plague outbreak already apparent by July.²³ In general, however, the diocesan returns of 1563 ought to provide a reasonably satisfactory basis for determining the level of population in 1563 provided that there is a satisfactory 'multiplier' for converting households into estimates of total population. But this conclusion cannot be taken for granted. Dr Goose has demonstrated that Professor Palliser's estimate of the total population of England in 1563 based on the surviving diocesan returns, 2.6 millions, is well below that calculated by 'back-projection', 2.98 millions, and that some returns for parishes in 1563, particularly for urban parishes, are almost certainly understated.²⁴ Notwithstanding my later argument that enumerations of households are likely to be more accurate than enumerations of communicants, in view of the doubts raised it is worth enquiring what empirical checks can be made on the 1563 data, given the fact, already observed, that some bishops could not reply to the fifth article about the number of households in 1563 because such information had not been required in previous visitations.

In addition to the gaps in the returns for each of the Canterbury visitations and the consequently incomplete overlap between visitations, the significance of the comparisons which can be derived from this data, and the validity of the figures, are not easy to assess. We cannot assume that the statistics presented by our sources are necessarily correct, even though the source material is undoubtedly genuine. The contemporaries who supplied the information may have been lazy or muddled or honestly mistaken; the scribes who entered the information can often be shown to have made copying errors. Despite the ease with which numerical data can be manipulated on a modern computer, this does not absolve the historian from employing his or her critical faculties: the statistics must be carefully scrutinised and where necessary corrected if it is possible to do so; if this is not possible, they must be discarded. Equally, the historian must not be afflicted by delusions of arithmetical precision: all my population estimates have been rounded to the nearest digit and only indicate approximate orders of magnitude; percentage comparisons have similarly been rounded to one decimal place.

Nearly all the 'raw data' from the Canterbury visitations between 1557 and 1569, together with the available figures from the chantry certificates of 1548 for those Kentish parishes in Canterbury diocese, are given in Appendix 1. Because the order both of deaneries and of

parishes within deaneries differs at each visitation, deaneries have been arranged alphabetically after Canterbury, and parishes have been arranged alphabetically inside each deanery, with chapelries (indented) following their mother-parishes. Seven places for which one figure only is given in 1563 and no figure is given in any other year – Canterbury (Castle chapel), Nonnington, ‘Popishall’, Poulton, Stonar, Womenswold and Wood – and three more places for which only one figure is given in 1569 and no figure is given in any other year – Blackmanstone, Eastbridge and Orgarswick – have been omitted from Appendix 1, since they contribute neither to comparison at different dates nor to comparison of data derived from different criteria at the same date.

In order to facilitate demographic comparisons at different dates, the data are presented together with estimates of population, derived by using well-known ‘multipliers’. I have assumed, following Wrigley and Schofield, that the age of first communion in 1548 and 1557 was probably about ten, and that children under ten comprised 25 per cent of the population; consequently the numbers of ‘houseling people’ in 1548 and of communicants in 1557 have been multiplied by 1.33 to produce estimates of total population in those years.²⁵ Allowing for a rise in the age of first communion to about sixteen after 1559, and for children under sixteen comprising 35 per cent of the population, the numbers of communicants in 1563, 1565 and 1569 have been multiplied by 1.54 to produce estimates of total population in the fifteen-sixties.²⁶ Throughout the period I have adopted Laslett’s well-known figure of 4.75 for average household size, since the figure does seem to be broadly valid for England throughout the period from 1066 to 1871.²⁷

3. Scrutinising the original data

But the ‘raw data’ must first be scrutinised parish-by-parish to eliminate figures which appear to be erroneous for a variety of reasons. To begin with, though the figures in the Canterbury visitations of 1565 and 1569 appear in the main to be independent both of each other and of the 1563 returns, the two sets of figures for 1563 are not of equal contemporary authority. For a large number of parishes (50 out of 159 parishes for which data is reported both in 1557 and in 1563), the number of households forming the basis of one of the two sets of data for 1563 is the same as the number of households in 1557.²⁸ Since it is highly improbable that there was actually no population-change in nearly a third of all the parishes in observation, it seems obvious that

for these parishes the 1557 figure has simply been copied without updating. In a further seven parishes the number of households reported in 1563 differs by only one final digit from that of 1557, and it seems clear that these minor differences are the result of miscopying the 1557 figure in 1563.²⁹ At Eastling the 16 households reported in 1563 may similarly be a miscopying of the 26 households returned in 1557. Unless there is either another source of data for estimating population (i.e. the number of communicants in 1557 or a second household number in 1563) or another return for 1563 which can be plausibly referred to 1557 (as will be seen, a probability in many cases), all these parishes must be discarded for purposes of comparative analysis.

Besides this obvious recopying of demographic data from a previous visitation, less apparent errors can be found only by examining the figures for each parish at every date for which they exist and eliminating those which seem to be wrong because comparison between different dates produces results which are implausible if not impossible. In general, given the short time-intervals involved, calculated changes by a factor greater than two (i.e. increases of more than 100 per cent and decreases of more than 50 per cent) have been regarded as very unlikely. Where possible corrections can be suggested (allowing for the form in which the original figures were presented, since roman numerals are much more subject to copying error than arabic numerals), the amended figures have been substituted before further calculations were performed: where no plausible corrections could be suggested, the data were discarded. This analysis, arranged by deaneries in the same order as in Appendix 1, is to be found in Appendix 2.

To conclude this section, two more general possibilities for correction should be noted. The first is that for many parishes (besides those in Canterbury deanery for which no 1557 figures survive) it is likely that, where one of the 1563 household figures is well above the other, the higher figure in fact refers to 1557. In some parishes this possibility can be strengthened by comparison with estimates for 1557 derived from numbers of communicants, e.g. Cranbrook, Kennington and Pluckley in Charing deanery. But such evidence, noted under the appropriate deanery, has only been used as additional evidence for the population decline between 1557 and 1563, and has been analysed separately from the figures directly attributable to 1557 and 1563. The second general point is that, both in 1565 and in 1569, there are several parishes where the number of 'communicants' may in fact be total populations, as noted in Appendices 3.2 and 3.3. Fortunately we can see how this error arose. In 1565 the ecclesiastical authorities appear to have put considerable pressure on incumbents and churchwardens to

produce accurate figures of communicants and households, and lists of communicants survive for thirty Kentish parishes; in addition, however, for five parishes complete lists of inhabitants were compiled and for a further five parishes lists of householders were produced with the numbers in each household.³⁰ Confusion between inhabitants and communicants is therefore entirely understandable: it was not, incidentally, a confusion confined to the 1560s.³¹

4. The reliability of the Canterbury visitation data

Accepting the results of the scrutiny of the original data in Appendix 2, what positive conclusions can be stated? Firstly, the number of suggested emendations is actually rather small as a proportion of all the citations in Appendix 1: approximately 60 out of nearly 1200, i.e. 5 per cent, of the original figures appear questionable. Secondly, if we ask how far contemporary estimates were internally consistent, we may incline to place greater reliance on the ability of contemporaries to assess local populations. Table 1 below provides a comparison of estimates based on households with estimates based on communicants for the 91 parishes in Canterbury diocese in 1557 for which both sets of information were given, applying the conventional 'multipliers' of 4.75 for households and 1.33 for communicants. It may be noted that not only in 1557 but also in 1563, 1565 and 1569, where numbers of both communicants and households are available, the population estimates for each parish sometimes vary quite widely. In some cases this may result from variations around the mean household size of 4.75,³² or from rounded approximations in the original data, especially the figures for communicants – '300' thus standing for 300+. Many of the estimates for communicants ending in 0 may well mean, as in medieval 'proofs of age', 'upwards of' that figure.³³ In other instances, consideration of the whole set of available figures for an individual parish in the light of likely scribal errors as shown in Appendix 2, can suggest probable emendations. Where parishes are small (with estimated populations under about 70) wider variations between estimates derived from different sources may be expected. Nevertheless, analysis of the 'raw data' shows that the difference between the total estimated population of 91 parishes in 1557 derived from the number of households and the total estimated from the number of communicants is only 2.6 per cent: this difference alters only marginally to –3.3 per cent for 78 parishes, if we omit obvious scribal errors, and to –3.9 per cent after correcting such errors, as Table 1 shows:

Table 1: Comparison of Population Estimates from Households and from Communications, Canterbury Diocese, 1557:

Deanery	(Number of parishes/ chapelries)	Pop (Hholds X4.75)	Pop (Comm X1.33)	Difference in estimates	
				N	%
RAW DATA:					
BRIDGE (12)		2827	2646	181	6.4
CHARING (12)		6690	7521	-831	-12.4
DOVER (2)		81	74	7	8.6
ELHAM (6)		1260	1223	37	2.9
LYMPNE (15)		1797	1498	299	16.6
OSPRINGE (17)		3025	2732	293	9.7
SITTINGBOURNE (15)		2192	2174	18	0.8
SUTTON (12)		3146	2601	545	17.3
TOTALS (91)		21018	20469	549	2.6
OMITTING DOUBTFUL DATA:					
BRIDGE (11)		2495	2459	36	1.4
CHARING (10)		6319	6939	-620	-9.8
DOVER (1)		67	67	0	0
ELHAM (6)		1260	1223	37	2.9
LYMPNE (11)		937	928	9	1.0
OSPRINGE (14)		2369	2278	91	3.8
SITTINGBOURNE14)		2083	1991	92	4.4
SUTTON (11)		1721	1934	-213	-12.4
TOTALS (78)		17251	17819	-568	-3.3
REVISED DATA:					
BRIDGE (12)		2851	2779	72	2.5
CHARING (12)		6690	7339	-649	-9.7
DOVER (2)		81	83	-2	-2.5
ELHAM (6)		1260	1223	37	2.9
LYMPNE (15)		1607	1638	-31	-1.9
OSPRINGE (17)		2882	2799	83	2.9
SITTINGBOURNE (15)		2192	2082	110	5.0
SUTTON (12)		2210	2601	-391	-17.6
TOTALS (91)		19773	20544	-771	-3.9

Abbreviations

Comm: Communicants.

N: Number.

Hholds: Households.

Pop: Estimated population.

Source

Revised data from Appendix 2.

The low (and similar) levels in the calculated differences, whether employing all the 'raw data', the 'raw data' but omitting obviously erroneous figures, or the 'raw data' with these obvious errors replaced by revised figures, incidentally demonstrate two important points. The first is that the omission of obvious errors from the data does not affect the results to be drawn from the whole body of evidence; the second is that my attempts at revising these errors also do not significantly affect these results and therefore do not show any systematic bias in favour of the conclusions I shall later argue. But the attempt to eliminate errors and replace them with more acceptable estimates can be justified by a perhaps pedantic desire to achieve the greatest possible recovery of accurate data.

Table 2: Comparison of Population Estimates from Households and from Communicants, Canterbury Diocese, 1563 and 1565:

1563:

Deanery	(Number of parishes/ chapelries)	Pop (Hholds (a)X4.75)	Pop (Comm X1.33)	Difference in estimates	
				N	%
BRIDGE (1)		428	452	-24	-6.0
CHARING (1)		2375	2660	-1163	-49.0
SITTINGBOURNE (2)		333	337	-4	-0.1
SUTTON (1)		276	200	76	27.5
TOTALS (5 parishes):		3412	3649	-1115	-6.9

1565:

CANTERBURY (1)	67	59	8	11.9
BRIDGE (5)	804	880	-76	-9.5
CHARING (2)	1264	1358	-94	-7.4
DOVER (5)	869	882	-13	-1.5
ELHAM (7)	1426	1562	-136	-9.5
LYMPNE (8)	1719	1757	-38	-2.2
OSPRINGE (5)	912	933	-21	-2.3
SANDWICH (5)	874	1032	-158	-18.1
SITTINGBOURNE (2)	361	359	2	0.6
SUTTON (3)	2337	2433	-96	-4.1
WESTBERE (2)	356	426	-70	-19.7
TOTALS (45 parishes):	10989	11681	-692	-6.3

Abbreviations

Comm: Communicants.

N: Number.

Hholds: Households.

Pop: Estimated population.

Source

Appendix 1.

The same comparison between estimates based respectively on households and on communicants can also be made for 1563, 1565 and 1569. For five parishes the draft return '1563 (a)' gives the number of communicants as well as the number of households: Table 2 demonstrates that the difference between the population estimated from households and from communicants is -6.9 per cent.

For 45 parishes in 1565 the overall difference between estimates from households and communicants is of the same order, -6.3 per cent after eliminating two parishes (Newchurch and Woodchurch) where scribal errors seem likely and five parishes (Birchington, Monkton, Norton, Tunstall, Worth) where totals of 'communicants' may well be totals of all inhabitants. Table 3 shows that for 183 parishes in 1569 the overall difference between these estimates is -6.5 per cent after omitting seven parishes with obvious scribal errors and a further 25 parishes where totals of 'communicants' again may well be totals of all inhabitants. This high level of consistency in the results obtained for each of the years 1557, 1563, 1565 and 1569 suggests that considerable trust can be placed both in the data as a whole and in the modern multipliers used to convert the original data into population-estimates.

Table 3: Comparison of Population Estimates from Households and from Communicants, Canterbury Diocese, 1569:

Deanery	(Number of parishes/ chapelries)	Pop (Hholds X4.75)	Pop (Comm X1.54)	Difference in estimates	
				N	%
CANTERBURY (20)		5082	4729	353	6.9
BRIDGE (22)		3616	4042	-426	-11.8
CHARING (17)		7657	8337	-680	-8.9
DOVER (9)		815	843	-28	-3.4
ELHAM (9)		1702	1832	-130	-7.6
LYMPNE (23)		3213	3297	-84	-2.6
OSPRINGE (18)		3528	3648	-120	-3.4
SANDWICH (17)		2853	2988	-135	-4.7
SITTINGBOURNE (22)		3898	4304	-406	-10.4
SUTTON (19)		5623	6517	-894	-15.9
WESTBERE (7)		2016	2074	-58	-2.9
TOTALS (183 parishes):		40003	42611	-2608	-6.5

Abbreviations

Comm: Communicants.
N: Number.

Hholds: Households.
Pop Estimated population.

Source

Appendix 1.

Confidence in the 1563 data is further increased by a comparison of the estimated parochial populations in 1563 with those in 1565 and 1569 for which this is possible. (Those parishes with identical data in 1557 and in 1563 have naturally been excluded from this analysis,

Table 4: Comparison of Population Estimates, Canterbury Diocese, 1563–1569:

	1563	1563	1563	1565	1565	1565	1563/1565
Deanery	(Number of parishes/ chapelries)	Pop (Hholds (a)X4.75)	Pop (Hholds (b)X4.75)	Pop (Preferred value) X4.75)	Pop (Comm X1.54)	Pop (Preferred value)	Percentage difference
1563–1565:							
CANTERBURY (1)		76	143	76	59	63	–17.1
BRIDGE (5)		N/A	779	811	804	843	3.9
CHARING (1)		N/A	333	333	380	398	19.5
DOVER (5)		740	713	777	869	908	16.9
ELHAM (2)		N/A	162	162	210	237	46.3
LYMPNE (4)		N/A	756	804	821	837	4.1
OSPRINGE (4)		N/A	595	595	660	656	10.8
SUTTON (1)		1672	1425	1549	1995	2002	29.1
WESTBERE (4)		632	N/A	590	627	854	25.6
TOTALS (27 parishes):		N/A	N/A	5697	6433	6884	17.3
	1563	1563	1563	1569	1569	1569	1563/1569
Deanery	(Number of parishes/ chapelries)	Pop (Hholds (a)X4.75)	Pop (Hholds (b)X4.75)	Pop (Preferred value) X4.75)	Pop (Comm X1.54)	Pop (Preferred value)	Percentage difference
1563–1569:							
CANTERBURY (21)		4568	3346	3346	4674	4592	38.6
BRIDGE (11)		N/A	1298	1291	1368	1514	14.8
CHARING (9)		N/A	3468	3511	3648	4080	10.1
DOVER (6)		N/A	580	586	500	518	–12.8
ELHAM (1)		67	67	67	76	89	23.9
LYMPNE (16)		N/A	1969	2025	2338	2378	16.7
OSPRINGE (14)		N/A	2730	2730	2658	2770	0.5
SANDWICH (4)		N/A	177	178	172	179	–1.1
SITTINGBOURNE (10)		N/A	1545	1545	1669	2034	20.0
SUTTON (10)		N/A	2414	2477	2743	3134	18.7
WESTBERE (3)		395	423	410	424	487	11.5
TOTALS (105 parishes):		N/A	18017	18166	20270	21775	15.9

Abbreviations

Comm: Communicants.

Hholds: Households.

N/A: No data for some or all parishes in the deanery. Pop: Estimated population.

Source

Appendix 1.

along with those parishes where either the data appears erroneous or where the 1563 data may well refer to 1557.) The remaining data and calculations based on them are summarized in Table 4: it may be noted that for some parishes in all three years the numbers of either household or communicants is missing whilst for most parishes where both figures are given the derived estimates differ. In order to allow a consistent basis for comparison between years and the calculation of overall totals for each year, a 'preferred value' has been calculated for each parish for 1563, 1565 and 1569 before differences and overall totals were computed. The 'preferred value' was obtained by taking the average of two estimates where neither appeared problematic: if one of the two estimates did appear dubious it was discarded. Table 4 summarises the results by deanery.

For 27 parishes the overall difference between the average estimated populations in 1563 and 1565 is 17.3 per cent; for 105 parishes the overall difference between the average estimated populations in 1563 and 1569 is 15.9 per cent; in both 1565 and 1569 there are of course some wide variations around the general trend, but these are to be expected. Allowing for a probable swift recovery after 1563, such results seem quite acceptable: Wrigley and Schofield's 'back-projection' estimates suggest a national population increase of 9.59 per cent between 1561 and 1571, an increase which would have been higher if it had been reckoned after the plague-mortality of 1563.³⁴

5. General reliability of visitation-data

All the empirical tests that we can apply to the Canterbury visitation records suggest that they are at least as reliable, in general terms, as any other records of economic and social events produced in the period. But we can take this analysis rather further. We may reasonably suspect that contemporary estimates of households were much more likely to be accurate than contemporary estimates of communicants. It is difficult to conceal the physical existence of houses from any conscientious enquirer, and we know that the early modern household normally inhabited a single house.³⁵ Indeed, although the fifth article of the 1563 inquiry referred to 'households', some bishops and their officials made returns of 'families'.³⁶ The likelihood that household statistics were more accurate than figures for communicants is strengthened if we consider the nature of the numerical data in Appendix 1. Table 5 displays the distribution of the last digit of the numbers in columns 4 (communicants) and 6 (households) of this appendix, including only original data regarded as accurate. Although

the data for both communicants and households have a disproportionate number of counts ending in 0, the relative proportion is far higher for communicants (79.3 per cent) than for households (43.4 per cent), which confirms the suggestion that the household data are likely to be more accurate than those for communicants. I have already suggested that many of the estimates for communicants ending in 0 may well mean 'upwards of' that figure.

Table 5: Distribution of Final Digits in Numerical Data, Canterbury Diocese, 1557:

Figure ending in:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
Households (N)	3	7	7	10	7	9	0	6	3	40
Households (%)	3.3	7.6	7.6	10.9	7.6	9.8	0	6.5	3.3	43.4
Communicants (N)	3	1	0	3	4	1	1	6	0	73
Communicants (%)	3.3	1.1	0	3.3	4.3	1.1	1.1	6.5	0	79.3

Source

Appendix 1.

Incumbents, on the other hand, might not know the exact number of communicants, especially if they themselves were non-resident, or, even if they were resident, unless they performed an exact count. They may well have wished to inflate figures somewhat to allow for non-attenders at Mass (before the Reformation) or Holy Communion (afterwards), as a protection against possible accusations of negligence or heresy.³⁷ Nevertheless, all parishioners over eighteen were required pay tithes and offer 'oblations' at Easter.³⁸ To judge from surviving accounts, many clergy by the fifteenth century were keeping accounts itemizing both tithes and Easter offerings paid by individual parishioners,³⁹ so that incumbents, if they were efficient, should have been able to provide accurate figures for communicants, at any rate those over eighteen. From the 1540s, if not earlier, more incumbents were keeping lists of communicants or 'Easter Books',⁴⁰ again suggesting that they ought to have been able to answer enquiries about the numbers of communicants in their parishes with ease. Since most incumbents derived the bulk of their income from Easter dues and tithes, they had an obvious interest in having accurate information on the names of individual parishioners and communicants, from which numbers could be calculated. Indeed, the accounts for Hornsea (Yorks) contain several lists of tithe-payers and two estimates of the parochial population.⁴¹ Finally, churchwardens and other local officials from the fifteenth century at the latest were also keeping accounts which included rates levied on occupiers of land in their parish (effectively

heads of households): these accounts as well as the later separate 'rate-books' would form another source of contemporary knowledge on the number of households per parish.⁴² In general, therefore, I would argue that statistical data derived from visitations, used with proper caution and after making such corrections as appear necessary, can yield useful information on demographic trends to supplement that from wills and from parish registers, since incumbents and churchwardens ought to have been able to give accurate answers both about the numbers of their parishioners who were of communicable age and about the number of households.

6. Demographic trends in Kent, 1548–69

When, however, we turn to consider the course of population-change in Kent before 1557, the situation is less conducive to analysis than might appear at first sight: there are only ten parishes in Canterbury diocese where a direct comparison between numbers of communicants in 1548 and 1557 is possible, and in four of these cases the large fall in population, ranging from 16.1 per cent at Petham to 76.7 per cent at Detling, might suggest that one of the two sets of data is faulty. Fortunately, in three out of these four cases the population estimate from communicants' numbers in 1557 is validated by their closeness to the estimates from the number of households. In addition, the form of the chantry certificate data on 'housing people' for these four parishes – Biddenden *mccxl*; Detling *iiij^c*; Loose *cxx*; Petham *cc* – does not suggest any obvious emendations which would significantly reduce the estimated population of these four parishes in 1548 and thereby lessen the implied high mortality by 1557.⁴³ Perhaps the high mortality at Detling and Loose, both chapelries of Maidstone, may be partly explained by migration into Maidstone itself, but the overall drop of Maidstone and its two chapelries is 9.4 per cent. Of the remaining seven parishes, only two have figures within 10 per cent at the two dates, as Table 6 shows. A further comparison involves a further eleven parishes for which figures are available from the 1548 chantry certificates but not from the 1557 visitation; for nine of these parishes, however, the 1557 figures are arguably represented by the higher of two 1563 figures. A comparison of these figures reveals a slight rise in population of 6.9 per cent between 1548 and [1557], which is entirely explained by the large rise in the population of two of the Canterbury parishes; otherwise, there was virtually no change in this second sample.

Table 6: Comparison of Population Counts, Canterbury Diocese, 1548-57:

	1548	1548	1557	1557	1557	1557	1548/1557
	Comm	Pop (Comm X1.33)	Comm	Pop (Comm X1.33)	Hholds	Pop (Hholds X4.75)	Percentage difference
Basis of estimate							

A. RAW DATA:**DEANERY OF BRIDGE:**

Godmersham	182	243	220	293	60	285	20.6
Petham	200	267	168	224	55	261	-16.1

DEANERY OF CHARING:

Biddenden	1240	1653	600	800	160	760	-51.6
-----------	------	------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-------

DEANERY OF OSPRINGE:

Faversham	900	1200	1100	1467	N/A	N/A	22.3
Teynham	160	213	180	240	50	238	12.7

DEANERY OF SITTINGBOURNE:

Bapchild	64	85	60	80	N/A	N/A	-5.9
----------	----	----	----	----	-----	-----	------

DEANERY OF SUTTON:

Bearsted	190	253	200	267	N/A	N/A	5.5
Maidstone	1440	1920	1600	2133	N/A	N/A	11.1
Detling	400	533	100	133	24	114	-75.1
Loose	120	160	76	101	N/A	N/A	-36.9
TOTALS:	4896	6527	4304	5738	N/A	N/A	-12.1

	1548 Comm	1548 Pop (Comm X1.33)	[1557] Hholds	[1557] Pop (Hholds X4.75)	1548/[1557] Percentage difference
Basis of estimate					

B. INTERPOLATED DATA:

DEANERY OF CANTERBURY:

Canterbury, All Saints	104	139	29	138	-0.7
Canterbury, Holy Cross	240	320	87	413	29.1
Canterbury, St Dunstan	174	232	70	333	43.5

DEANERY OF BRIDGE:

Ickham	170	227	42	200	-11.9
--------	-----	-----	----	-----	-------

DEANERY OF SANDWICH:

Sandwich, St Clement	300	400	81	385	-3.8
Sandwich, St Mary	280	373	62	295	-20.9
Sandwich, St Peter	440	587	138	656	11.8

DEANERY OF WESTBERE:

Hoath	90	120	28	133	10.8
Minster in Thanet	192	256	60	285	11.3

TOTALS (9 parishes):

Less: Canterbury, All Saints,		2654		2838	6.9
Holy Cross, St Dunstan:		1963		1954	-0.5

Abbreviations

Comm: 'Houseling people' (1548), Communicants (1557).

Hholds: Households.

N/A: No data in document.

Pop: Estimated population.

Sources

1548: Hussey, *Kent Chantries*.

1557: Whatmore, *Archdeacon Harpsfield's Visitation*.

[1557]: C.C.C.C., MS.122, ff.291-318; B.L. Harleian MS.594, ff.63r-84r.

Note

For Ash next Sandwich (430) and Wingham (260) in Bridge deanery only the numbers of 'houseling people' in 1548 are available; no data is available for 1557.

At first sight this is a discouraging result, but the sample-size is very small. The calculated decline in the population of all ten parishes between 1548 and 1557 using raw data is 12.1 per cent; including all nine parishes with interpolated data, this falls to 6.6 per cent but rises to 9.4 per cent if the three Canterbury city parishes are excluded. A decrease in population between 1548 and 1557 of the order of 6.6 to 12.1 per cent is not in itself surprising. An analysis of annual probate-totals in Canterbury diocese suggests that Kentish mortality was above average between 1549 and 1553 and was 37.4 per cent above the preceding quinquennial average in 1550 and 21.1 per cent above that average in both 1551 and 1552, probably as a result of the last, well known, outbreak of the 'sweating sickness'. Furthermore, Archdeacon Harpsfield's 1557 visitation was spread over two months, from 30 July to 30 September, during which mortality was already starting to rise spectacularly.⁴⁴

A similar comparison can be made in Canterbury diocese between the estimated population in 1557, derived from figures of communicants and/or households presented to Archdeacon Harpsfield's visitation, and the population estimated from the 1563 ecclesiastical census. The data for those parishes with statistics available in both years is summarised by deanery in Table 7: in the table section A contains the 'raw data' for 101 parishes excluding only obviously erroneous data which are represented by blanks in the appendix; Section B covers 177 parishes where the original statistics have been corrected or, for 1557, supplied from data reported in 1563. Calculations have been made separately for each section.

Table 7: Population Counts, Canterbury Diocese, 1557-1563:

Deanery	(Number of parishes/ chapelries)	1557 Pop (Preferred value)	1563 Pop (Preferred value)	1557-1563 Percentage difference
A. RAW DATA, EXCLUDING ERRONEOUS DATA:				
BRIDGE (5)		1060	982	-7.4
CHARING (18)		8308	7137	-14.1
DOVER (4)		342	324	-5.3
ELHAM (7)		1502	1408	-6.3
LYMPNE (27)		5537	4786	-13.6
OSPRINGE (11)		3131	2927	-6.5
SITTINGBOURNE (9)		1667	1569	-5.9
SUTTON (20)		7552	6203	-17.9
TOTALS (101 parishes):		29099	25336	-12.9

	1557	1563	1557-1563
Deanery (Number of parishes/ chapelries)	Pop (Preferred value)	Pop (Preferred value)	Percentage difference

B. DATA INCLUDING CORRECTIONS AND INTERPOLATIONS:

CANTERBURY (20)	5090	3827	-24.8
BRIDGE (16)	3548	3171	-10.6
CHARING (19)	8773	7351	-16.2
DOVER (14)	2769	2141	-22.7
ELHAM (6)	1458	1237	-15.2
LYMPNE (30)	5879	5037	-14.3
OSPRINGE (11)	3147	2927	-7.0
SANDWICH (17)	3409	2386	-30.0
SITTINGBOURNE (12)	1893	1749	-7.6
SUTTON (21)	7485	6071	-18.9
WESTBERE (11)	4063	2775	-31.7
TOTALS (177 parishes):	47514	38672	-18.6

Abbreviations

Pop: Estimated population.

Source

Appendix 1; revised data from Appendix 2.

This comparison provides an independent check on an analysis which in all other counties except Gloucestershire is necessarily based principally on chantry certificates: Gloucester diocese is the only other English diocese in which a visitation gives demographic data before 1563. The comparison shows that in E. Kent there was a marked drop in population between mid-1557 and mid-1563, whichever basis of calculation is used. For the 101 parishes in Section A using only 'raw data', the drop is 12.9 per cent; for the 177 parishes in Section B using both corrected and interpolated data where appropriate, the drop is 18.6 per cent. This is of the same order as the drop which can be calculated from the Kent chantry certificates and the 1563 ecclesiastical census for Canterbury diocese as Table 8 shows.

Including the probably faulty 'raw data' for St Peter's, Sandwich, there is a drop of 16.9 per cent between 1548 and 1563, which alters to 14 per cent when the data is corrected. If we include Biddenden and Petham, for which the 1563 data is in fact copied from 1557 and therefore does not fully reflect mortality between 1557 and 1563, the overall decrease in population is 20 per cent. There is, therefore, little disparity between the population-decrease in 1548-63 calculated from

Table 8: Population Counts, 1548-63:

	1548	1548	1563	1548-1563
	Comm	Pop (Comm X1.33)	Pop (Preferred value)	Percentage difference
Basis of estimate				
DEANERY OF CANTERBURY:				
Canterbury, All Saints	104	139	95	-31.7
Canterbury, Holy Cross	240	320	380	18.8
Canterbury, St Dunstan	174	232	299	28.9
DEANERY OF BRIDGE:				
Ash next Sandwich	430	573	285	-50.3
Godmersham	182	243	283	16.5
Ickham	170	227	166	-26.9
Wingham	260	347	309	-11.0
DEANERY OF OSPRINGE:				
Faversham	900	1200	1425	18.8
Teynham	160	213	238	11.7
DEANERY OF SANDWICH:				
Sandwich, St Clement	300	400	385	-3.8
Sandwich, St Mary	280	373	295	-20.9
Sandwich, St Peter	440	587	285	-51.4
Sandwich, St Peter (CD)	440	587	523	-10.9
DEANERY OF SITTINGBOURNE:				
Bapchild	64	85	81	-4.7
DEANERY OF SUTTON:				
Bearsted	190	253	190	-24.9
Maidstone	1440	1920	1549	-19.3
Detling	400	533	119	-77.7
Loose	120	160	67	-58.1
DEANERY OF WESTBERE:				
Minster (in Thanet)	192	256	252	-1.6
Hoath (in Reculver)	90	120	95	-20.8

TOTALS AND PERCENTAGE DIFFERENCES, 1548–63:

	1548 Pop	1563 Pop	%
A. 19 parishes:			
1. Sandwich St Peter CD:	8181	7036	–14.0
2. Sandwich St Peter 'raw data':	8181	6798	–16.9
B. 21 parishes:			
3. Sandwich St Peter CD, and including Biddenden and Petham:	10101	8077	–20.2

Abbreviations

Comm: Houseling people (1548). Pop: Estimated population.

Source

Appendix 1; revised data from Appendix 2.

a comparison of the chantry certificates with the 1563 census and that in 1557–63 calculated from a comparison of the 1557 visitation with the 1563 census. Furthermore, we have already seen that there is evidence for population-losses in a small number of Kentish parishes (see Table 6 above) of the order of 8–12 per cent between 1548 and mid-1557.

We can now briefly summarize the changing population-trends in Canterbury diocese (and, by implication, throughout Kent) in the period 1548–69. A fall of approximately 10 per cent between 1548 and mid-1557 (Table 6) can probably be ascribed to the 'sweat' which affected Kent severely in the years 1550–52; this was followed by a further drop of between 13 and 19 per cent between mid-1557 and mid-1563 (Table 7), and overall population in E. Kent appears to have fallen by between 14 and 20 per cent in the period 1548–63 (Table 8). In some parishes the mortality was considerably above these levels. The factors responsible were the poor harvests of 1555–56 followed by typhus, 'famine fever', and an epidemic of influenza, the 'new ague', in 1557–59. Especially in the towns, recovery was swift and by 1569 population had risen by about 17 per cent (Table 4). The last phase is not in doubt, since after 1558 the parish registers are increasingly plentiful, and Wrigley and Schofield calculate a national population-increase between 1561 and 1571 of 9.6 per cent.⁴⁵ The two earlier phases are supported by the evidence of probate records both in Kent and throughout the country,⁴⁶ by a nationwide comparison of chantry certificates with the surviving 1563 ecclesiastical returns,⁴⁷ by other historians' investigations of parish registers,⁴⁸ and by my own continuing analysis of a large sample of parish registers dating back to the 1540s.

7. Conclusions

What positive general conclusions can now be stated with confidence? The first conclusion is local. As a whole, the Canterbury visitations stand up well to critical analysis as a demographic source; contemporaries were not as ignorant of conditions in their time as some modern historians would have us believe. Partly, this may be because enumerating parochial populations, unlike reporting on ecclesiastical doctrine or ritual practice, was not a crucial matter on which penalties would arise if the 'wrong' answer was provided to higher authority. Equally, however, precisely because information about the population of a parish was not a crucial matter, failure to provide it (which was quite common in 1557) or the repetition of data from an earlier year (equally common in 1563) apparently went unpunished. In no visitation, apart possibly from 1565, was any attempt made to follow-up the original enquiry in order to compel the presentation of the missing data. Nevertheless, especially in 1557 and 1569, when two sets of population-estimates for each parish can often be based on the reported numbers of both communicants and households, the correspondence between these two sets of estimates is frequently close and cumulatively impressive. This correspondence in turn suggests that reliance may generally be placed in series of single estimates both in these years (1557 and 1569) and in 1563, unless analysis of all the figures for a particular place suggests that a particular figure was either erroneously reported or miscopied. In only one instance (Hythe in 1565) can we get behind the data registered by clerks in Canterbury to see parishioners in the process of supplying the required information in an addendum to a bishop's transcript,⁴⁹ and in that year, as already noted, many incumbents prepared lists of communicants or even more detailed 'listings' of all inhabitants.⁵⁰ Moreover, I have already suggested that reliable information could be obtained from 'Easter Books' and rate-books. In most parishes, however, errors can often be suspected but not proven. Nevertheless, I have shown that an analysis of most parochial estimates across time, after allowing for scribal error, also suggests trends that in themselves appear probable and can be supported by reference to other types of information.

The second major conclusion moves from the local to the national. Unless the clerks at Canterbury were markedly more efficient than their colleagues in other sees (which *prima facie* is unlikely), there seems no good reason to suppose that the 1563 returns from those other dioceses, where they survive, are less worthy of credence than those from Canterbury. The 1563 ecclesiastical census can therefore be defended against any general accusation of unreliability, although particular

criticisms of individual entries are still justifiable where sound cause exists. In short, the 1563 ecclesiastical census is no better, and no worse, than most other quantitative source-materials for the economic and social history of early modern England; as a demographic source it stands free of any imputation of bias since the clerks who compiled it and the local informants who provided the basic information had nothing to gain from falsification, indeed no obvious motivation for falsification. Unlike the local compilers of the Compton Census a century later, they were neither confused by nor influenced by guidance from above in trying to present the truth as they knew it.⁵¹

Finally, a general conclusion of most significance for national and regional historians trying to study the demographic trends in areas without the aid of the detailed population-data contained in the Canterbury and Gloucester visitation-records. Despite the non-random distribution of both chantries and surviving chantry certificates across England, a comparison of population-estimates from the surviving chantry certificates and the 1563 ecclesiastical censuses is a valid method of ascertaining the mortality caused by the mid-sixteenth century epidemic known to historians as 'Jack Fisher's' 'flu', though the crisis fairly certainly included typhus as well as influenza and was preceded by two of the worst harvests in the entire century. The results of applying this method compare well with those which have been obtained from probate records, and it appears increasingly likely that more extended analysis of parish registers will also will produce similar findings. The demographic crisis was in turn only one aspect of what political and religious historians have termed the 'mid-Tudor crisis', though these historians have for the most part failed to take on board the economic and demographic implications of what one Kentish incumbent aptly termed 'troubulous days, . . . the days of affliction.'⁵²

Notes

* My thanks are due to my colleagues for helpful criticisms of a paper read at the Staff Research Seminar in Economic and Social History out of which this article has evolved. I am indebted to Professor Christopher Clay and Dr Christine MacLeod for reading a draft of this article, and to Professor David Palliser of the University of Hull for his continued interest and supply of information; Professor Peter Clark of the University of Leicester also kindly answered enquiries. I am particularly grateful to Miss Anne Oakley and Mr Paul Blewitt of Canterbury Cathedral Archives for their efforts in ensuring that I obtained a full photographic reproduction of the 1565 and 1569 visitations.

I must also thank the staffs of the British Library, Department of Manuscripts, the University of Bristol Library (especially the Inter-Library Loans section), the archives room of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and the Kent Archives Office for their

efficient help and courteous attention to my needs. Finally, the comments of the editor of *Southern History* and an anonymous referee were much appreciated in revising the final draft for publication. Of course the usual disclaimers apply. Detailed tabulations by parish of the data summarized in Tables 1–4, 7–8, can be obtained at cost from the author.

¹ J.C.K. Cornwall, *Wealth and Society in Early Modern England* (1988); T.H. Hollingsworth, *Historical Demography* (1969), p.231; E.E. Rich, 'The Population of Elizabethan England', *Econ.Hist.Rev.* 2nd ser, 3 (1950), pp.247–65. My own view is that the degree of evasion for military service is likely to be even higher than for paying taxes and in addition the proportion of fit adult males in the whole male population aged between 16 and 60 is so problematical that the muster rolls after 1522 are not a safe source for Tudor historical demography.

² F.J. Fisher, 'Influenza and inflation in Tudor England', *Econ.Hist.Rev.* 2nd ser, 18 (1965), pp.120–9.

³ J.C. Russell, *British Medieval Population* (Albuquerque (USA), 1948), pp.19–23, 32–3, 272–81, 364–5; J. Thirsk, 'Sources of Information on Population, 1500–1760', *Amateur Historian*, 4 (1959), pp.131–3; Hollingsworth, *op. cit.*, pp.80, 231; E.A. Wrigley and R.S. Schofield, *The Population History of England, 1541–1871: a reconstruction* (1981; rev. edn, Cambridge, 1989), pp.563–6, 574–5.

⁴ Wrigley and Schofield, *op. cit.*

⁵ Thirsk, *op. cit.*, pp.132–3; Hollingsworth, *Historical Demography*, pp.80–4; D.M. Palliser and L.J. Jones, 'A neglected source for English population history: the bishops' returns of 1563 and 1603', *Local Historian*, 15 (1982), pp.155–6; D.M. Palliser and L.J. Jones, 'The Diocesan Population Returns for 1563 and 1603', *Local Population Studies*, 30 (1983), pp.55–9. Dr Thirsk's statement that 'All the 1563 returns that have ever been found are here [in the Harleian MSS]' (Thirsk, *Amateur Historian*, 4, p.132) is incorrect.

⁶ J.S. Moore, "'Jack Fisher's 'Flu': a visitation revisited", *Econ.Hist.Rev.* 2nd ser., 46 (1993), pp.280–307.

⁷ Wrigley and Schofield, *op. cit.*, pp.208–9 (Table 7.8).

⁸ The Privy Council letter requiring the information on the church is printed by J. Strype, *Life and Acts of Matthew Parker* (Oxford, 3 vols, 1821), vol.I, pp.255–6, from C(orpus) C(hristi) C(ollege), C(ambridge), MS.122, ff.287–8 (Canterbury), and in J. Strype, *The History of the Life and Acts of the Most Reverend Father in God Edmund Grindal* . . . (Oxford, 1821), pp.101–2, from G(uildhall) L(ibrary), London, MS.9531/13, pt.1, pp.27v–8r (London). Other copies of this letter are preserved in B(ritish) L(ibrary), Harleian MS.594, f.85r (Carlisle), Bodleian Library, Rawlinson MS. C 790, ff.1r, v (Gloucester) and N(orfolk) R(ecord) O(ffice), SUN/3, pp.92v–3v (Norwich). The Privy Council Register is defective between January 1562/3 and April 1564 (J.R. Dasent, ed., *Acts of the Privy Council, 1558–1570* (1893), pp.vii, 137, 140) and there is no reference to the 1563 diocesan returns in E. Green, ed., *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, Addenda, 1547–65* (1870), pp.225–34. Nothing relating to the 1563 census survives among the Cecil MSS at Hatfield House (*ex inf.* R.H. Harcourt-Williams).

⁹ C.C.C.C., MS.122, ff.291–318 (draft); B.L. Harleian MS.594, ff.63r–84r (final version).

¹⁰ B.L. Harleian MS.594, ff.197r (Ely; but a return was later submitted: ff.198r–200v), 202r (Exeter); B.L. Harleian MS.595, ff.10v (Llandaff), 77r (London), 80r (St Davids), 208v (Worcester; but a return was later submitted: ff.209r–12v); B.L. Lansdowne MS.6, ff.141v (Rochester), 143r (Peterborough), 147r (Norwich); G.L., MS.9531/13, pt.1, p.33r (London); N.R.O., SUN/3, p.97v (Norwich).

¹¹ The existence of the visitation-material for the 1560s was made widely known in P. Clark and J. Clark, 'The social economy of the Canterbury suburbs: the evidence of the census of 1563', in A. Detsicas and N. Yates, eds., *Studies in Modern Kentish History*

(Maidstone, 1983), p.66, and in M. Zell, 'Families and Households in Staplehurst, 1563-4', *Local Population Studies*, 33 (1984), p.57, nn.3-4. The 1557 visitation has been in print for many years (see n.17) but has not been utilised by historical demographers.

¹² The Chantry Certificates in the P(ublic) R(ecord) O(ffice) exist in two main series, of which the second is much less well known than the first: PRO E 301/1-130 (Court of Augmentations, Chantry Certificates, General series) and PRO DL 38/1-6 (Duchy of Lancaster, Chantry Certificates) [Lancashire (1546, 1548); Duchy lands in the English counties of Cambridgeshire, Essex, Huntingdonshire, Lincolnshire and Norfolk (1548)]. A few isolated certificates are reported among the Chancery Miscellanea (PRO C47/7/3) and in series of Rentals and Surveys (e.g. PRO DL43/6/22). A. Kreider, *English Chantries: the Road to Dissolution* (Cambridge (USA), 1979), pp.266-8, has the most up-to-date list of printed chantry certificates. The Kentish chantry certificates are printed in A. Hussey, *Kent Chantries* (Kent Archaeological Society, Records Branch, 12, 1936).

¹³ Russell, *op. cit.*, pp.19-23, 32-3, 272-81, 364-5; Thirsk, *op. cit.*, 4, pp.131-3; Hollingsworth, *op. cit.*, pp.80, 231; Wrigley and Schofield, *op. cit.*, pp.563-6, 574-5.

¹⁴ J.A.H. Murray, *A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles* (Oxford, 11 vols, 1888-1933), V, pt.I, p.423, reprinted in J.A. Simpson and E.S.C. Weiner, eds., *The Oxford English Dictionary* (Oxford, 2nd ed, 15 vols, 1989), VII, pp.444-5, with extremely little revision or addition.

¹⁵ The Lincolnshire chantry certificates are printed in C.W. Foster and A. Hamilton-Thompson, eds., 'The Chantry Certificates for Lincoln and Lincolnshire', *Reports and Proceedings of the Associated Architectural Societies*, 36 (1922), pp.183-294; 37 (1925), pp.18-106, 247-75; the Hitchin certificate is printed in J.E. Brown, ed., *Chantry Certificates for Hertfordshire* (Hertford, n.d. [1909]), p.27; the Somerset certificates are printed in E. Green, ed., *The Survey and Rental of the Chantries, Colleges, Free Chapels, Guilds, Fraternities, Lamps, Lights and Obits in the County of Somerset* (Somerset Record Society, 2, 1888). 'Housing people' also appears as a synonym for 'communicantes' in the Canterbury diocesan visitation of 1565 (C(anterbury) C(athedral), D(ean) and C(hapter) A(rchives), MS.DCb/Z.3.8, fol.132r).

¹⁶ Dr Williams's Library, London, Morrice MS. L (3), a late seventeenth-century transcript printed in J. Gairdner, ed., 'Bishop Hooper's Visitation of Gloucester Diocese, 1551', *English Historical Review*, 19 (1904), pp.98-121; an early nineteenth-century copy of Morrice MS L (3) is in B.L. Add. MS. 21251.

¹⁷ C.C., D.C.A., DCb/Z.3.32, printed in L.E. Whatmore, *Archdeacon Harpsfield's Visitation, 1557* (Catholic Record Society, 45-6 (1950-1)).

¹⁸ See references cited in n.9.

¹⁹ C.C., D.C.A., DCb/Z.3.8, ff.130r-43r. In addition, a bishop's transcript provides the demographic information for Hythe (C.C., D.C.A., DCa/BT/214/5).

²⁰ Kent Archives Office, PRC 43/13/1, 3-5, 7, 9-10, 12, 15-8, 21-2, 28-9, 31, 35-7. P. Laslett and R. Wall (eds.), *Household and Family in Past Time*, (1972) p.130, recorded no listings earlier than 1574. No 'listings' between 1557 (Clackclose hundred, Norfolk) and the 1570s (Sandwich (Kent: Flemish immigrants only), Poole and Lyme Regis (Dorset)) are recorded in the more up-to-date schedules of listings known to the Cambridge group in 'Guide to the Listings Collection of the SSRC Cambridge Group', *Local Population Studies*, 24-37 (1980-86); see also S.J. Wright, 'A Guide to Easter Books and related parish listings', *Local Population Studies*, 42 (1989), pp.18-31; 43 (1989), pp.13-27, though this is an incomplete survey. The Kentish 'listings' for the 1560s are, however, recorded in J. Gibson and M. Medlycott, *Local Census Listings, 1522-1930: holdings in the British Isles* (Birmingham, 1992), pp.24-25. The only earlier 'listings' for Tudor England are the Coventry city enumeration of 1523

(C. Phythian-Adams, *Desolation of a City: Coventry and the Urban Crisis of the late Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1979), esp. Appendix 1), the Lichfield Abbey confraternity register of c.1532–3 (A. Kettle, *A list of families in the archdeaconry of Stafford, 1532–3* (Staffordshire Record Society, 4th ser., 8, 1976), the tithe-list for Burton-upon-Trent in 1555 (Staffordshire R.O., D(W) 1734/2/3/21B), and the ‘grain returns’ for Clackclose hundred, Norfolk, in 1557 (N.R.O, Pratt MS. 652, to be edited by R. Houlbrooke, V. Morgan and myself for the *Norfolk Record Society*).

²¹ C.C., D.C.A., DCb/Z.3.10, ff.2r–36v.

²² P. Slack, *The Impact of Plague in Tudor and Stuart England* (Oxford, 1985), esp. chaps.5–6

²³ The virulence of the 1563 plague is documented in I. Sutherland, ‘When was the great plague?’ (in D.V. Glass, R. Reville (eds), *Population and Social Change* (1972), pp.287–320). Numerous London and Westminster parish registers printed in the *Harleian Society, Parish Register Section*, and elsewhere prove that the plague was active in the metropolis by July–August 1563. On 22 July 1563 Edmund Grindal ordered public prayers ‘in this contagious time’ (Strype, *Life and Acts . . . of Edmund Grindal*, p.105, from G.L., MS.9531/13, pt.1, p.35r).

²⁴ N. Goose, ‘The Ecclesiastical Returns of 1563: a cautionary note’, *Local Population Studies*, 34 (1985), pp.46–7; D.M. Palliser, *The Age of Elizabeth* (1983), pp.34–6; Wrigley and Schofield, *op. cit.*, p.569. Goose’s critique concentrates on the quality of the surviving data for 1563, but ignores both the strong possibility of internal migration within towns and the considerable difficulties faced by David Palliser in making allowance for the dioceses for which no returns exist; *cp.* Hollingsworth, *op. cit.*, pp.80–4, on the censuses of 1563 and 1603.

²⁵ Wrigley and Schofield, *op. cit.*, pp.565–6.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp.569–70.

²⁷ Laslett and Wall, *op. cit.* pp.47–8, 61, 76, 126, 130–1, 138, 140–4, 169–70, 174–97; R.A. Houlbrooke, *The English Family, 1450–1700* (1984), pp.10, 18–26; J.S. Moore, ‘The Anglo-Norman Family: size and structure’, *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 14 (1992), pp.153–96.

²⁸ The parishes with identical numbers of households reported in 1557 and in one or both of the 1563 returns are: **Bridge Deanery**: Chartham, Chilham, Molash, Petham, Stelling. **Charing Deanery**: Benenden, Biddenden, Cranbrook, Malden, Headcorn, Tenterden. **Dover Deanery**: Newington. **Elham Deanery**: Acrise, Brabourne, Denton, Elham, Postling, Stanford. **Lympne Deanery**: Dymchurch, Fairfield, Hope, Midley, Old Romney, Snave. **Ospringe Deanery**: Badlesmere, Graveney, Hernhill, Leaveland, Luddenham, Ospringe, Teynham, Throwley. **Sittingbourne Deanery**: Bicknor, Bobbing, Borden, Bredgar, Hartlip, Iwade, Milton, Newington, Tonge, Tunstall, Upchurch, Warden. **Sutton Deanery**: Boxley, Bredhurst, Hucking, Lenham, Linton, Sutton Valence.

²⁹ The parishes with household numbers differing by only one final digit in 1557 and 1563 are: **Dover Deanery**: Buckland. **Lympne Deanery**: Orlestone, St Mary-in-the-Marsh. **Ospringe Deanery**: Otterden. **Sittingbourne Deanery**: Halstow, Wichling. **Sutton Deanery**: Wormshill.

³⁰ Gibson and Medlycott, *op. cit.*, pp.24–25.

³¹ A. Whiteman, ed., *The Compton Census of 1676: a critical edition* (1986), pp.xxix–xxxii, xxxiv–vi, lix, lxix–xxi, lxxv (n.239), lxxiv–v.

³² The average size of households per parish ranged between 4.05 and 5.62 (overall average 5.07) in the period 1574–1645, and between 3.69 and 5.70 (overall average 4.70, excluding London) in the period 1662–1749 (Laslett and Wall, *op. cit.*, pp.130–1, 138). In 23 parishes in Clackclose hundred in Norfolk in 1557, parochial average household sizes ranged from 4.4 to 6.8 (overall average size 5.1) (calculated from N.R.O, Pratt MS. 652).

³³ Wrigley and Schofield, *op. cit.*, p.208 (Table 7.8).

³⁴ Russell, *op. cit.*, pp.94–114, 208–14, 365–6; D.A. Bullough and R.L. Storey, eds., *The Study of Medieval Records* (Oxford, 1971), pp.206–7, 227, and references cited in p.206, n.3.

³⁵ Laslett and Wall, *op. cit.*, chaps.1, 4–5; P. Laslett, *Family Life and Illicit Love in earlier Generations* (Cambridge, 1977), chap.1; Houlbrooke, *op. cit.* pp.9–10, 15–6, 19–20, 189–92, 253.

³⁶ The Lincoln diocese return for all the archdeaconries except Stow (B.L. Harleian MS 618, ff.2r–39v) and the Worcester diocesan return (B.L. Harleian MS.595, ff.209r–12v) both consistently refer to families despite the erroneous claim that the Lincoln return lists households (G.A.J. Hodgett, *Tudor Lincolnshire* (Lincoln, 1975), pp.189–99; *cp. VCH (Leics)*, III, pp.137–8, 140).

³⁷ *Cp. Hollingsworth, op. cit.*, pp.14, 46–8, 79–89, 231, 298–9, 316–7; Wrigley and Schofield, *op. cit.*, pp.34, 563–6, 569–70; *cp. Whiteman, ed., Compton Census*, pp.xlii–iv.

³⁸ P. Heath, *The English Parish Clergy on the eve of the Reformation* (1969), pp.3, 7, 156–7.

³⁹ P. Heath, *Medieval Clerical Accounts*, St Anthony's Hall Publications, 26 (1964), pp.25–59; Heath, *English Parish Clergy*, pp.3, 7, 156–7; R. Whiting, *The Blind Devotion of the People* (Cambridge, 1989), p.135; *cp. Whiteman, ed., Compton Census*, pp.xliii–iv.

⁴⁰ Wright, *op. cit.*, 42 (1989), pp.18–31; 43 (1989), pp.13–27.

⁴¹ Heath, *Medieval Clerical Accounts*, pp.30–1, 32–3, 35–8, 43–6, 48, 50–1, 55, 57–8.

⁴² E. Cannan, *History of Local Rates* (2nd ed., 1912), pp.10–12, 14–22; J.C. Cox, *Churchwardens' Accounts from the fourteenth century to the close of the seventeenth century* (1913), pp.2, 11–2, 75–9; J.H. Thomas, *Town Government in the Sixteenth Century* (1933), pp.28–9; W.E. Tate, *The Parish Chest* (Cambridge, 3rd ed, 1960), pp.14, 26–7, 92–4; L.M. Munby, *Short Guides to Records* (n.d. [c.1972]), pt.1, p.1; pt.15, pp.36–8; R.N. Swanson, *Church and Society in Late Medieval England* (Oxford, 1989), pp.218–9.

⁴³ Hussey, *Kent Chantries*, pp.20, 186, 219.

⁴⁴ Kentish parish registers show burials rising to crisis-levels from August 1557 onwards (e.g. R. Hovenden, *The Register of . . . the parish of . . . St Mary, Chislet . . . from the year 1538 to the year 1707* (1887); J.M. Cowper, *The Register Booke off the Parishes of St George the Martyr, Canterbury . . . 1538–1800* (Canterbury, 1891); J.S.F. Chamberlain, *The Old Register of Staplehurst, 1538–58* (Canterbury, 1907).).

⁴⁵ Wrigley and Schofield, *op. cit.*, p.208 (Table 7.8).

⁴⁶ Fisher, 'Influenza and inflation . . .', pp.120–29; Moore *op. cit.*, pp.280–307.

⁴⁷ J.S. Moore, 'Demographic dimensions of the Mid-Tudor Crisis' (forthcoming).

⁴⁸ A.D. Dyer, *The City of Worcester in the Sixteenth Century* (Leicester, 1973), chap.2, tables 2–7; T.S. Willan, 'Elizabethan Manchester', *Chetham Society*, 3rd ser, vol.27 (1980), pp.38–9; R. Humphreys, 'Mortality Crises in Sixteenth-Century Dorking', *Local Population Studies*, vol.39 (1987), pp.46–53; G. Mayhew, *Tudor Rye* (Falmer, 1987), pp.7, 21–3, 44–7, 196–7, 270.

⁴⁹ C.C., D.C.A., DCa/BT/214/5.

⁵⁰ See reference cited in n.31 above.

⁵¹ Whiteman, *op. cit.*, pp.xxv–xxxix, xxxiii–xliv.

⁵² J.S.F. Chamberlain, *The Registers of Staplehurst, 1558–1596* (Canterbury, 1910), p.3.

⁵³ P. Clark, 'The migrant in Kentish Towns, 1580–1640' (in P. Clark and P. Slack, eds., *Crisis and Order in English Towns, 1500–1700* (1972), pp.117–63). The general point about the essential contribution of migration to urban population is well made in D.A. Souden and P. Clark, *Migration and Society in early Modern England* (1987), esp. chaps.1, 3–4, 7, 9–10.

APPENDIX 1: POPULATION COUNTS, CANTERBURY DIOCESE, 1548 - 1569 (RAW DATA):

	1548	1548	1557	1557	1557	1557	1563
	Comm	Pop	Comm	Pop	Hholds	Pop	Hholds
Basis of estimate	X 1.33		X 1.33		X4.75		(a)

DEANERY OF CANTERBURY:

Blean	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	23
Canterbury:							
All Saints	104	139	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	29
Holy Cross	240	320	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	87
St Alphege	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	74
St Andrew	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	73
St Dunstan	174	232	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	63
St George	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	61
St Margaret	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	44
St Martin	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	16
St Mary Bredin	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	18
St Mary Bredman	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	40
St Mary Magdalen	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	40
St Mary Northgate	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	108
St Mildred	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	102
St Paul	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100
St Peter	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	43
Fordwich	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	32
Hackington	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	34
Harbledown	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	29
Hardres, Lower	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	14
Milton (near Canterbury)	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1
Nackington	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5
Sturry	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	58
Thanington	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	20

DEANERY OF BRIDGE:

Adisham	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Staple	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Ash next Sandwich	430	573	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Bekesbourne	N/CC	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	17
Bishopsbourne	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Barham	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Boughton Aluph	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	39
Brook	N/Ch	N/A	68	91	21	100	N/A
Chartham	N/Ch	N/A	280	373	60	285	73
Chilham (Note 1)	N/A	N/A	140	187	75	356	90
Molash	N/Ch	N/A	80	107	30	143	N/A
Chillenden	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	17
Crundale	N/Ch	N/A	70	93	23	109	N/A
Elmstone	N/CC	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Godmersham	182	243	220	293	60	285	64
Challock	N/A	N/A	170	227	50	238	62

	1548	1548	1557	1557	1557	1557	1563
	Comm	Pop	Comm	Pop	Hholds	Pop	Hholds
Basis of estimate	X	1.33	X	1.33	X	4.75	(a)

Deanery of Bridge (Cont):

Goodnestone (Sandwich)	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	41
Hardres, Upper	N/Ch	N/A	78	104	16	76	N/A
Ickham	170	227	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	42
Kingston	N/CC	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Littlebourne	N/CC	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Patricxbourne	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Bridge	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Petham	200	267	168	224	55	261	N/A
Preston (near Wingham)	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	12
Stodmarsh	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	15
Stourmouth	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Waltham	N/CC	N/A	140	187	45	214	N/A
Stelling	N/Ch	N/A	70	93	20	95	N/A
Wickambreux	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	36
Wingham	260	347	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Wye	N/Ch	N/A	500	667	140	665	N/A

DEANERY OF CHARING:

Ashford	N/CC	N/A	540	720	N/A	N/A	128
Benenden	N/Ch	N/A	600	800	200	950	150
Bethersden	N/A	N/A	400	533	110	523	N/A
Biddenden	1240	1653	600	800	160	760	160
Boughton Malherbe	N/Ch	N/A	160	213	N/A	N/A	N/A
Egerton	N/Ch	N/A	280	373	60	285	N/A
Charing	N/CC	N/A	300	400	100	475	N/A
Chart, Great	N/CC	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	85
Chart, Little	N/Ch	N/A	80	107	24	114	16
Cranbrook (Note 2)	N/A	N/A	1500	2000	300	1425	500
Eastwell	N/Ch	N/A	110	147	18	86	N/A
Frittenden	N/Ch	N/A	240	320	N/A	N/A	N/A
Halden	N/Ch	N/A	260	347	60	285	N/A
Hawkhurst	N/Ch	N/A	800	1067	N/A	N/A	N/A
Headcorn	N/CC	N/A	400	533	110	523	93
Hothfield	N/Ch	N/A	211	281	66	314	50
Kennington	N/Ch	N/A	180	240	N/A	N/A	42
Newenden	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Pevington	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	10	N/A
Pluckley	N/Ch	N/A	220	293	N/A	N/A	66
Rolvenden	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Sandhurst	N/Ch	N/A	280	373	N/A	N/A	N/A
Smarden	N/CC	N/A	400	533	N/A	N/A	110
Tenterden	N/CC	N/A	700	933	200	950	195
Westwell	N/Ch	N/A	300	400	N/A	N/A	N/A

	1548	1548	1557	1557	1557	1557	1563
	Comm	Pop	Comm	Pop	Hholds	Pop	Hholds
Basis of estimate	X 1.33		X 1.33		X4.75 (a)		

DEANERY OF DOVER:

Alkeham (Note 3)	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	39
Capel-le-Ferne	N/Ch	N/A	50	67	14	67	20
Bewisfield	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	12
Bircholt	N/Ch	N/A	5	7	3	14	58
Buckland (near Dover)	N/CC	N/A	N/A	N/A	16	76	15
Charlton (Note 3)	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	7
Cheriton	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	29
Dover, St James	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	95
Dover, St Mary	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	13
Dover, St Peter	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	60	285	N/A
Ewell, Temple	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	30
Folkestone	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	160
Guston	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	13
Hawkinge	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	12
Hougham	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	15
Lydden	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	13	62	12
Newington (near Hythe)	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	40	190	42
River	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	17
St Margaret-at-Cliffe	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Swinfield	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	27
Westcliff	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

DEANERY OF ELHAM:

Acrise	N/Ch	N/A	51	68	12	57	N/A
Brabourne	N/Ch	N/A	160	213	45	214	45
Denton	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	7	33	N/A
Elham	N/Ch	N/A	500	667	140	665	140
Elmsted	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	47
Hastingleigh	N/Ch	N/A	50	67	N/A	N/A	14
Horton, Monks	N/Ch	N/A	80	107	30	143	28
Lyminge	N/Ch	N/A	260	347	N/A	N/A	68
Stanford	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	22	105	18
Paddlesworth	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6
Postling	N/Ch	N/A	72	96	18	86	18
Saltwood	N/CC	N/A	80	107	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hythe	N/CC	N/A	500	667	N/A	N/A	150
Stowting	N/Ch	N/A	54	72	20	95	18
Wooton	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Canterbury Visitations and the Demography of Mid-Tudor Kent 67

1563	1563	1563	1565	1565	1565	1565	1569	1569	1569	1569
Pop	Hholds	Pop	Hholds	Pop	Comm	Pop	Hholds	Pop	Comm	Pop
X4.75	(b)	X4.75		X4.75		X 1.54		X4.75		X 1.54
185	40	190	40	190	N/A	249	28	133	130	200
95	20	95	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	18	86	61	94
57	8	38	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	15	71	36	55
276	2	10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	19	14	22
71	12	57	16	76	51	79	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
33	8	38	9	43	N/A	33	6	29	14	22
138	20	95	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	26	124	90	139
451	70	333	99	470	268	413	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
62	50	238	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	20	95	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
143	30	143	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	30	143	60	92
760	70	333	142	675	N/A	N/A	130	618	370	570
62	15	71	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
57	16	76	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	11	52	50	77
71	30	143	26	124	N/A	N/A	26	124	95	146
57	20	95	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8	38	20	31
200	40	190	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	35	166	157	242
81	20	95	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	18	86	27	42
N/A	20	95	19	90	70	108	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
128	20	95	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	26	124	120	185
N/A	16	76	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8	38	36	55
N/A	12	57	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	14	67	52	81
214	45	214	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	49	233	195	300
N/A	7	33	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6	29	28	43
665	140	665	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	141	670	449	691
223	24	114	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	48	228	146	225
67	14	67	14	67	56	86	16	76	58	89
133	20	95	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	38	181	114	176
323	30	143	65	309	247	380	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
86	22	105	20	95	68	105	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
29	12	57	7	33	21	32	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
86	18	86	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	16	76	59	91
N/A	20	95	30	143	115	177	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
713	110	523	149	708	460	708	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
86	10	48	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	20	95	66	102
N/A	7	33	15	71	48	74	16	76	50	77

	1548	1548	1557	1557	1557	1557	1563
	Comm	Pop	Comm	Pop	Hholds	Pop	Hholds
Basis of estimate	X 1.33		X 1.33		X4.75	(a)	
DEANERY OF LYMPNE:							
Aldington	N/Ch	N/A	180	240	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hurst	N/Ch	N/A	7	9	4	19	N/A
Smeeth	N/Ch	N/A	140	187	N/A	N/A	29
Appledore	N/A	N/A	240	320	N/A	N/A	N/A
Ebony	N/Ch	N/A	110	147	N/A	N/A	N/A
Bilsington	N/Ch	N/A	60	80	N/A	N/A	N/A
Bonnington	N/Ch	N/A	30	40	N/A	N/A	N/A
Brenzett	N/Ch	N/A	80	107	N/A	N/A	N/A
Brookland	N/Ch	N/A	160	213	50	238	N/A
Burmarsh (Note 3)	N/Ch	N/A	80	107	12	57	N/A
Dymchurch (Note 3)	N/Ch	N/A	60	80	15	71	15
Fairfield	N/Ch	N/A	30	40	9	43	N/A
Hinxhill	N/Ch	N/A	60	80	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hope	N/CC	N/A	11	15	4	19	6
Ivychurch	N/CC	N/A	140	187	85	404	N/A
Kennardington	N/Ch	N/A	115	153	N/A	N/A	N/A
Kingsnorth	N/Ch	N/A	120	160	N/A	N/A	N/A
Lydd	N/Ch	N/A	600	800	N/A	N/A	N/A
Lympne	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mersham	N/Ch	N/A	300	400	N/A	N/A	90
Midley	N/Ch	N/A	15	20	2	10	N/A
Newchurch	N/Ch	N/A	100	133	24	114	N/A
Orlestone	N/Ch	N/A	30	40	9	43	N/A
Romney, New	N/Ch	N/A	200	267	80	380	70
Romney, Old	N/Ch	N/A	120	160	30	143	N/A
Ruckinge	N/Ch	N/A	100	133	N/A	N/A	N/A
St Mary-in-the-Marsh	N/Ch	N/A	30	40	11	52	13
Sellinge (near Hythe)	N/Ch	N/A	160	213	N/A	N/A	N/A
Sevington	N/Ch	N/A	51	68	N/A	N/A	16
Shadoxhurst	N/Ch	N/A	80	107	24	114	N/A
Snargate	N/Ch	N/A	60	80	19	90	N/A
Snave	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	16	76	19
Stone (near Oxney)	N/Ch	N/A	200	267	N/A	N/A	N/A
Warehorne	N/Ch	N/A	140	187	N/A	N/A	N/A
Westhythe	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Willesborough	N/Ch	N/A	220	293	N/A	N/A	55
Wittersham	N/Ch	N/A	240	320	N/A	N/A	N/A
Woodchurch	N/Ch	N/A	300	400	N/A	N/A	N/A

Canterbury Visitations and the Demography of Mid-Tudor Kent 69

1563	1563	1563	1565	1565	1565	1565	1569	1569	1569	1569
Pop	Hholds	Pop	Hholds	Pop	Comm	Pop	Hholds	Pop	Comm	Pop
X4.75	(b)	X4.75	X4.75	X4.75	X 1.54	X4.75	X4.75	X 1.54	X 1.54	X 1.54
N/A)	40	190	(N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A)			(N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	19	6	9
138	24	114	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	52	247	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	60	285	176	271
N/A	24	114	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	24	114	45	69
N/A	20	95	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	24	114	63	97
N/A	11	52	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	28	133	70	108
N/A	24	114	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	12	57	72	111
N/A	40	190	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	54	257	123	189
N/A	20	95	15	71	N/A	64	18	86	40	62
71	15	71	16	76	N/A	96	17	81	59	91
N/A	9	43	11	52	33	51	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	15	71	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	16	76	71	109
29	4	19	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	19	20	31
N/A	N/A	N/A	38	181	140	216	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	30	143	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	27	128	82	126
N/A	20	95	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	33	157	108	166
N/A	150	713	168	798	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	30	143	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	27	128	102	157
428	70	333	76	361	248	382	68	323	247	380
N/A	2	10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	19	14	22
N/A	20	95	83	394	124	191	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	10	48	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	48	38	59
333	40	190	83	394	222	342	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	30	143	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	33	157	102	157
N/A	16	76	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	80	380	98	151
62	10	48	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	12	57	45	69
N/A	40	190	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	40	190	145	223
76	10	48	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	16	76	45	69
N/A	20	95	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	25	119	79	122
N/A	16	76	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	16	76	46	71
90	16	76	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	18	86	60	92
N/A	45	214	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	51	242	160	246
N/A	40	190	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	36	171	129	199
N/A	7	33	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	19	14	22
261	34	162	52	247	160	246	52	247	200	308
N/A	60	285	71	337	234	360	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	80	380	100	475	233	359	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

	1548	1548	1557	1557	1557	1557	1563
	Comm	Pop	Comm	Pop	Hholds	Pop	Hholds
Basis of estimate	X 1.33		X 1.33		X4.75		(a)

DEANERY OF OSPRINGE:

Badlesmere	N/Ch	N/A	25	33	6	29	N/A
Boughton-under-Blean	N/Ch	N/A	320	427	90	428	N/A
Buckland (near Faversham)	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Davington	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Doddington	N/Ch	N/A	60	80	32	152	N/A
Eastling	N/Ch	N/A	80	107	26	124	N/A
Faversham	900	1200	1100	1467	N/A	N/A	N/A
Goodnestone (Faversham)	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Graveney	N/Ch	N/A	80	107	30	143	N/A
Harty	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hernhill	N/Ch	N/A	200	267	60	285	N/A
Leaveland	N/Ch	N/A	25	33	6	29	N/A
Luddenham	N/Ch	N/A	44	59	14	67	16
Lynsted	N/Ch	N/A	180	240	48	228	N/A
Newenham	N/Ch	N/A	60	80	23	109	N/A
Norton	N/Ch	N/A	50	67	N/A	N/A	N/A
Oare	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	20	95	N/A
Ospringe	N/CC	N/A	160	213	48	228	48
Otterden	N/Ch	N/A	34	45	15	71	N/A
Preston (near Faversham)	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6
Selling (near Faversham)	N/CC	N/A	140	187	90	428	34
Sheldwich	N/Ch	N/A	140	187	16	76	41
Stallisfield	N/Ch	N/A	120	160	32	152	N/A
Teynham	160	213	180	240	50	238	50
Throwley	N/Ch	N/A	200	267	50	238	50

DEANERY OF SANDWICH:

Barfreston	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Betteshanger	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2
Coldred	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	13
Deal	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	63
Eastry	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	82
Worth	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	26
Eythorne (Note 3)	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	17
Ham	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3
Knowlton	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1
Langdon, East	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	22
Langdon, West	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	10
Mongeham, Great	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	20
Mongeham, Little	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Northbourne	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	51
Sholden	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	20
Ringwold	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	30

Canterbury Visitations and the Demography of Mid-Tudor Kent 71

1563	1563	1563	1565	1565	1565	1565	1569	1569	1569	1569
Pop	Hholds	Pop	Hholds	Pop	Comm	Pop	Hholds	Pop	Comm	Pop
X4.75	(b)	X4.75	X4.75	X4.75	X 1.54	X4.75	X4.75	X 1.54	X 1.54	X 1.54
N/A	6	29	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6	29	34	52
N/A	80	380	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	2	10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	5	6	9
N/A	10	48	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5	24	27	42
N/A	30	143	36	171	113	174	35	166	113	174
N/A	16	76	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	24	114	87	134
N/A	300	1425	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	278	1321	867	1335
N/A	10	48	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8	38	33	51
N/A	30	143	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	26	124	82	126
N/A	10	48	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	12	57	46	71
N/A	60	285	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	6	29	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6	29	21	32
76	14	67	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	17	81	54	83
N/A	40	190	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	53	252	185	285
N/A	20	95	25	119	59	191	24	114	60	92
N/A	16	76	7	33	34	52	7	33	34	52
N/A	15	71	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	17	81	47	72
228	48	228	53	252	180	277	53	252	145	223
N/A	16	76	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	16	76	46	71
29	6	29	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	12	57	62	95
162	34	162	39	185	131	202	39	186	133	205
195	41	195	39	185	123	189	38	181	120	185
N/A	24	114	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	39	185	61	94
238	50	238	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	43	204	145	223
238	50	238	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	52	247	180	277
N/A	12	57	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	9	43	28	43
10	2	10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	10	12	19
62	16	76	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	13	62	61	94
299	40	190	72	342	240	370	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
390	40	190	60	285	238	367	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
124	20	95	22	105	105	162	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
81	20	95	18	86	N/A	109	18	86	76	117
14	5	24	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	14	20	31
5	2	10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	10	22	34
105	12	57	20	95	80	123	21	100	72	111
48	9	43	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	13	62	40	62
95	30	143	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	20	95	80	123
N/A	7	33	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	16	76	44	68
242	40	190	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	51	242	192	296
95	12	57	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	20	95	62	95
143	22	105	28	133	92	142	30	143	60	92

	1548	1548	1557	1557	1557	1557	1563
	Comm	Pop	Comm	Pop	Hholds	Pop	Hholds
Basis of estimate	X 1.33		X 1.33		X4.75		(a)

Deanery of Sandwich (Cont):

Ripple	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	12
Sandwich, St Clement	300	400	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	81
Sandwich, St Mary	280	373	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	62
Sandwich, St Peter	440	587	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	138
Shepherdswell	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	24	114	N/A
Sutton (near Dover)	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	13
Tilmanstone	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	18
Waldershare (Note 3)	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5
Walmer	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	29
Woodnesborough	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	35

DEANERY OF SITTINGBOURNE:

Bapchild	64	85	60	80	N/A	N/A	N/A
Bicknor	N/Ch	N/A	8	11	4	19	4
Bobbing	N/Ch	N/A	80	107	30	143	N/A
Elmley	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Borden	N/Ch	N/A	200	267	50	238	N/A
Bredgar	N/CC	N/A	140	187	40	190	42
Eastchurch	N/Ch	N/A	240	320	N/A	N/A	N/A
Halstow	N/Ch	N/A	60	80	23	109	N/A
Hartlip	N/Ch	N/A	106	141	30	143	N/A
Iwade	N/Ch	N/A	60	80	16	76	N/A
Queenborough	N/Ch	N/A	48	64	23	109	N/A
Kingsdown	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Leysdown (Note 4)	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	10
Milsted	N/Ch	N/A	60	80	18	86	N/A
Milton (Sittingbourne)	N/Ch	N/A	360	480	80	380	N/A
Minster (in Sheppey)	N/Ch	N/A	220	293	N/A	N/A	N/A
Murston	N/CC	N/A	50	67	N/A	N/A	N/A
Newington (Sittingbourne)	N/Ch	N/A	240	320	60	285	N/A
Rainham	N/Ch	N/A	200	267	N/A	N/A	N/A
Rodmersham	N/Ch	N/A	89	119	N/A	N/A	N/A
Sittingbourne (Note 5)	N/A	N/A	345	460	N/A	N/A	N/A
Stockbury	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tonge	N/CC	N/A	60	80	18	86	N/A
Tunstall	N/Ch	N/A	60	80	16	76	N/A
Upchurch (Note 6)	N/Ch	N/A	120	160	42	200	60
Warden	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	19	N/A
Wichling	N/Ch	N/A	28	37	11	52	N/A

Canterbury Visitations and the Demography of Mid-Tudor Kent 73

1563	1563	1563	1565	1565	1565	1565	1569	1569	1569	1569
Pop	Hholds	Pop	Hholds	Pop	Comm	Pop	Hholds	Pop	Comm	Pop
X4.75	(b)	X4.75	X4.75		X 1.54		X4.75		X 1.54	
57	20	95	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	11	52	42	65
385	60	285	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	86	409	320	493
295	80	380	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	72	342	204	314
656	60	285	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	130	618	420	647
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	21	100	83	128
62	14	67	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	12	57	36	55
86	16	76	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	19	90	96	148
24	12	57	4	19	N/A	30	5	24	39	60
138	13	62	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	26	124	81	125
166	24	114	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	44	209	100	154
N/A	17	81	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	20	95	82	126
19	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	14	6	9
N/A	30	143	31	147	81	125	31	147	118	182
N/A	2	10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0
N/A	50	238	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	53	252	107	165
200	40	190	45	214	152	234	42	200	155	239
N/A	21	100	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	31	147	156	240
N/A	24	114	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	16	76	47	72
N/A	30	143	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	36	171	107	165
N/A	16	76	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	18	86	59	91
N/A	20	95	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	22	105	76	117
N/A	13	62	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	9	43	33	51
48	7	33	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	9	43	24	37
N/A	20	95	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	16	76	55	85
N/A	80	380	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	108	513	374	576
N/A	60	285	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	77	366	308	474
N/A	12	57	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	48	42	65
N/A	60	285	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	77	366	236	363
N/A	57	271	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	69	328	280	431
N/A	32	152	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	32	152	98	151
N/A	70	333	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	80	380	300	462
N/A	30	143	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	49	233	176	271
N/A	18	86	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	13	62	50	77
N/A	16	76	14	67	62	95	16	76	82	126
285	42	200	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	28	133	76	117
N/A	4	19	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0
N/A	12	57	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	12	57	28	43

	1548	1548	1557	1557	1557	1557	1563
	Comm	Pop	Comm	Pop	Hholds	Pop	Hholds
Basis of estimate	X 1.33		X 1.33		X4.75		(a)

DEANERY OF SUTTON:

Bearsted (Note 7)	190	253	200	267	N/A	N/A	58
Boughton Monchelsea	N/Ch	N/A	180	240	N/A	N/A	34
Boxley	N/Ch	N/A	240	320	60	285	70
Chart by Sutton	N/Ch	N/A	191	255	N/A	N/A	45
Frinsted	N/Ch	N/A	50	67	14	67	N/A
Goudhurst	N/Ch	N/A	900	1200	N/A	N/A	168
Harrietsham	N/Ch	N/A	240	320	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hollingbourne	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	64
Bredhurst	N/Ch	N/A	50	67	10	48	N/A
Hucking	N/Ch	N/A	30	40	12	57	12
Langley	N/Ch	N/A	40	53	13	62	10
Leeds	N/Ch	N/A	280	373	N/A	N/A	N/A
Bromfield	N/Ch	N/A	40	53	N/A	N/A	N/A
Lenham	N/Ch	N/A	500	667	120	570	N/A
Linton	N/Ch	N/A	120	160	30	143	N/A
Maidstone (Note 8)	1440	1920	1600	2133	N/A	N/A	352
Detling	400	533	100	133	24	114	26
Loose	120	160	76	101	N/A	N/A	N/A
Marden	N/Ch	N/A	500	667	300	1425	N/A
Otham	N/Ch	N/A	80	107	N/A	N/A	N/A
Staplehurst	N/A	N/A	400	533	N/A	N/A	120
Sutton Valence	N/Ch	N/A	180	240	40	190	60
East Sutton	N/Ch	N/A	120	160	N/A	N/A	10
Thornham	N/Ch	N/A	80	107	23	109	24
Ulcombe	N/Ch	N/A	180	240	N/A	N/A	54
Wormshill	N/Ch	N/A	60	80	16	76	20

DEANERY OF WESTBERE:

Birchington	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	40
Chislet	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	56
Herne	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	143
Minster (in Thanet)	192	256	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	53
Monkton	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	15
Reculver (Note 9)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	45
Hoath	90	120	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	28
St John in Thanet	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	96
St Lawrence in Thanet	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	98
St Nicholas-at-Wade	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	33
St Peter in Thanet	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	107
Seasalter	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	20
Swalecliff	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	9
Westbere	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	21
Whitstable	N/Ch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	98

Canterbury Visitations and the Demography of Mid-Tudor Kent 75

1563	1563	1563	1565	1565	1565	1565	1569	1569	1569	1569
Pop	Hholds	Pop	Hholds	Pop	Comm	Pop	Hholds	Pop	Comm	Pop
X4.75	(b)	X4.75		X4.75		X 1.54		X4.75		X 1.54
276	40	190	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	56	266	143	220
162	40	190	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	56	266	212	326
333	60	285	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	74	352	288	444
214	20	95	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	52	247	211	325
N/A	20	95	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	14	67	62	95
798	200	950	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	205	974	759	1169
N/A	60	285	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	66	314	191	294
304	34	162	60	285	243	374	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	10	48	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
57	12	57	12	57	37	57	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
48	15	71	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	12	57	40	62
N/A	70	333	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	60	285	220	339
N/A	12	57	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	18	86	50	77
N/A	120	570	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100	475	400	616
N/A	30	143	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	28	133	114	176
1672	300	1425	420	1995	1300	2002	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
124	24	114	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	14	67	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	100	475	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	126	599	420	647
N/A	24	114	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	27	128	92	142
570	100	475	N/A	N/A	399	614	120	570	440	678
285	40	190	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	58	276	206	317
48	30	143	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	38	181	130	200
114	22	105	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	16	76	60	92
257	60	285	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	54	257	192	296
95	17	81	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	17	81	63	71
190	40	190	42	200	200	308	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
266	60	285	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	62	295	100	154
679	210	998	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
252	60	285	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	58	276	207	319
71	N/A	N/A	15	71	78	120	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
214	30	143	39	185	123	189	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
133	20	95	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
456	55	261	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	120	570	400	616
466	60	285	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	98	466	400	616
157	30	143	36	171	154	237	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
508	52	247	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	94	447	264	407
95	15	71	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	26	124	78	120
43	9	43	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	48	29	45
100	20	95	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	21	100	80	123
466	70	333	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	95	451	288	444

Abbreviations:

Comm: Houseling people (1548), Communicants (1557-69).
Hholds: Households.
N/A: No data in document.
N/Ch: No chantry in parish in 1548.
N/CC: No chantry certificate in 1548.
Pop: Estimated population.

Notes:

1. Chilham: 1563 (a) also records 340 communicants.
2. Cranbrook: 1563 (a) also records 2000 communicants.
3. 1565: where a population-figure follows N/A in the 'communicants' column, it represents the total given in a full 'listing'.
4. Leysdown: 1563 (a) also records 44 communicants.
5. Sittingbourne: the ms. figure for communicants in 1557 is cccxlv, probably in error for cccxlv.
6. Upchurch: 1563 (a) also records 209 communicants.
7. Bearstead: 1563 (a) also records 140-160 communicants.
8. Maidstone: the ms. figure for communicants in 1565 is '130', obviously in error for 1300.
9. Reculver: the ms. figures for households and communicants in 1565 should obviously be transposed.

Sources:

- 1548: Hussey, Kent Chantries.
1557: Whatmore, Archdeacon Harpsfield's Visitation.
1563: (a) C.C.C.C., MS.122, ff.291-318.
 (b) B.L. Harleian MS.594, ff.63r-84r.
1565: C.C., D.C.A., DCb/Z.3.8, ff.130-43r; DCa/BT/214/5; K.A.O.,
 PRC 43/13/1, 3-5, 7, 9-10, 12, 15-8, 21-2, 28-9, 31, 35-7.
1569: C.C., D.C.A., DCb/Z.3.10, ff.2r-36v.

APPENDIX 2: EMENDATIONS TO THE ORIGINAL DATA:

This appendix embodies the results of a detailed scrutiny of the original data, and suggested emendations, arranged by deaneries.

Canterbury deanery:

The absence of returns for this deanery in the 1557 visitation presents special problems. But in every parish except four (Blean, Lower Hardres, Milton, Nackington) the estimated population in 1563 calculated from the number of households in the draft return ('1563 (a)') is higher than that calculated from the final return ('1563 (b)'). Since in nearly a third of the parishes in the other deaneries in Canterbury diocese the 1563 figures are directly copied from the 1557 household-data, it does not appear unreasonable to assume that the '1563 (a)' figures for Canterbury deanery also in the main reflect the situation of 1557. Consequently, the overall decrease in household numbers between 1563 (a) and 1563 (b) of 23.7 per cent would seem to result from the actual population-fall between 1557 and 1563: certainly, the situation is not a statistical artifact created by differing multipliers being applied to different kinds of information, since the same data-source (households) and the same multiplier (4.75) were utilised in both the (a) and (b) returns for 1563.

Comparison of the available data, both totals and for individual parishes, for '1563 (b)' and 1569 does not suggest that any of the parish estimates are likely to be faulty, if we accept a fairly rapid recovery in the level of population between 1563 and 1569. The overall rise in population of 35 per cent reflects both the natural increase observable in other deaneries and the migration from country to town which affects most early modern towns, including Canterbury.⁵³ The increase between 1563 and 1569 in the population of Dover (to judge from one only out of its three parishes) was of the same order; Sandwich's population apparently rose by 63 per cent. In 1569 the only Canterbury city parish where there is a great disparity between the two sets of population-estimates is St Dunstan's: 442 from 93 households, 220 from 143 communicants. The estimates for 1563 (299–333) suggest that 220 is unduly low, hence 143 probably should be corrected to 243, leading to a revised estimate of 374.

Bridge deanery:

There are only five parishes in this deanery where the original figures for 1557 or 1563 appear suspect. At Challock (a chapelry of Godmersham) the population-estimates in 1557 derived from communicants and households are close to each other (227, 238), but the estimate from the households in '1563 (a)' (295) is well above the 1557 level and the estimate from the households in '1563 (b)' (95) is well below that level. Since there is no obvious emendation to the '1563 (b)' figure, it has been rejected, whilst 62 could result for a miscopying of *xlij* as *lxij*; substituting 42 as the number of households in 1563 produces a plausible population-estimate of 200 for that year. At Chilham 140 communicants and 90 households were recorded in 1557, leading to discrepant

population-estimates of 187 and 356. Since all other estimates put Chilham's population above 350, 140 is probably a miscopying of 240, producing an estimated population of 320. Secondly, 90 households are recorded in '1563 (a)' as against 75 in both 1557 and '1563 (b)'; since it is most unlikely that population would have risen significantly between 1557 and 1563, the '1563 (a)' figure is probably in error for 70 (three score and ten instead of four score and ten), producing a population-estimate of 333. At Barham (a chapelry of Bishopsbourne) the population-estimate of 162 from 34 households in 1563 does not compare well with the 1569 estimates (277–285), and probably 34 resulted from a miscopying of 54 (3 and 5 written in the new-fangled arabic numerals were easily confused) which would produce an estimate of 257. At Upper Hardres the 30 households recorded in '1563 (b)' result in a population-estimate higher than any other in the period 1557–69, and this should probably be amended to 20. At Preston (near Wingham), the 12 households recorded in '1563 (a)' (estimated population 71) compare poorly with estimates for other years which are all above 140; substituting 22 produces a more reasonable estimate of 152. Finally, the '1563 (a)' figures for Boughton Aluph, Chartham, Chillenden, Goodnestone, Ickham and Wickhambreux probably refer to 1557. Only four parishes (Adisham (with Staple), Brook, Goodnestone and Ickham) permit comparison between 1563 and 1565, and no problems arise from this comparison. Comparing the 22 parishes for which there is information in both 1563 and 1569 does, however, throw suspicion on the figures for four other parishes where the degree of change seems improbable. At Littlebourne the 1563 household figure (30) appears very low, but there is no obvious correction; at Patixbourne, the 1563 household figure (also 30) appears very high, and again there is no obvious correction. At Waltham also the 1563 household figures appears low, and again no obvious correction can be suggested, but the figure may simply reflect above average mortality in 1557–63 followed by rapid recovery in 1563–69. Finally, at Wye the 72 households of 1563 produce a population-estimate (342) well below the averages for 1557 (666) and for 1569 (738); here a miscopying of *cxij* as *lxij* may be suspected, for 112 households and a consequent estimate of 532 appear entirely reasonable.

Charing deanery:

Cranbrook, Eastwell and Egerton are the only places in Charing deanery for which one of the 1557 figures appears doubtful: in the latter two cases, correction can be made without difficulty. As they stand, the 18 households and 110 communicants at Eastwell yield wildly discrepant population-estimates of 86 and 147 respectively, whilst the only other figures for 1569 indicate an estimated population between 71 and 111. Since it seems more likely that the population in 1557 would have been nearer 86 than 147, *lx* has probably been miscopied as *cx*, for 60 communicants would lead to a population-estimate of 80, close to the 86 derived from the 18 households. At Egerton, a chapelry of Boughton Malherbe, there is again a large difference between the estimates calculated from 280 communicants (373) and from 60 households (285). Since

the only other estimate for the chapelry alone is 190 in 1563, the 1557 communicants' figure is obviously far too high, and the MS *xiiij^{xx}* may be an error for *xij^{xx}* (240), lowering the estimated population to 320. The data for Cranbrook, however, presents considerable problems. The figure of 300 households in '1563 (b)' is clearly copied from 1557 and can be disregarded; the estimated population from that figure (1425) is well below that calculated from 1500 communicants in 1557 (2000), whilst '1563 (a)' also yields its own varying estimates of 2375 (from 500 households) and 2667 (from 2000 communicants). It is exceedingly unlikely that Cranbrook's population was considerably higher in 1563 than in 1557, and it is impossible to reconcile the derived estimates either at the same time or at different dates. The only safe course appears to be to disregard all the Cranbrook figures entirely, especially since the estimates from the two sets of data in 1569 are also mutually incompatible.

There are only four parishes (excluding Cranbrook, considered above) in this deanery where the 1563 figures appear doubtful: at Little Chart the '1563 (b)' figure of 30 households produces an estimate well above those for 1557, '1563 (a)' or 1569, and it probably results from a miscopying of an original 20. In four parishes, however, one of the 1563 figures is much higher than the other and probably refers to 1557. At Great Chart the '1563 (a)' figure of 85 households probably refers to 1557, and similarly at Smarden the '1563 (a)' figure of 110 households. By contrast, at both Kennington and Pluckley the '1563 (b)' figures are much higher than the '1563 (a)' figures and again probably refer to 1557; in both the latter parishes the resulting population-estimates compare well with those derived from communicants' numbers. No problems arise with one of the two possible comparisons between 1563 and 1565 (Tenterden), but it should be noted that the 1565 figures for Egerton probably include its mother-parish of Boughton Malherbe. Only two problems arise in this deanery as a result of comparing the figures for 1563 with those for 1569. At Pluckley in 1569 there is a large difference between the estimated population of 342 derived from 72 households and the 166 derived from 108 communicants: comparison with earlier figures suggests that the number of households, probably itself copied from '1563 (b)', is likely to be correct, so that 108 communicants is probably a miscopying of 208 which would produce a comparable population-estimate of 320. At Smarden also there is a large discrepancy between the estimates of 314 derived from 66 households and the 470 derived from 305 communicants. To judge from estimates for 1557 (533) and 1563 (523) 470 seems a more likely figure for 1569, and 66 households could be in error for 96, producing a closely comparable population-estimate of 456.

Dover deanery:

There is one parish in this deanery, Bircholt, where the 1557 data probably needs correction: five communicants, total estimated population seven, is difficult to reconcile with three households and an estimated population of 14. Perhaps *x* has been misread as *v*, since 13 estimated from ten communicants would fit very well with the 14 calculated from three households. But the

parish is so small that statistical regularity cannot be taken for granted. The figures for Capel-le-Ferne (a chapelry of Alkeham) also present problems: the 20 households recorded in 1563 result in a higher estimated population than in any other year, and should probably be amended to 15. The six parishes where the figures for 1563 and 1565 can be compared produce no problems, except for Folkestone, where the 70 households of '1563 (b)' and the derived total of 333 are not comparable with the figures for '1563 (a)', 1565 or 1569. Probably an original *cxx* has been miscopied as *lxx*, for a population-estimate of 570 in 1563 would fit well with all the remaining figures, especially if the '1563 (a)' data represents the 1557 situation. Less serious errors have probably occurred at Hougham and Lydden. At Hougham the 15 households of '1563 (a)' probably result from a miscopying of 25, by comparison with the 26 households recorded in both 1565 and 1569, and the '1563 (b)' figure of 30 may again represent the 1557 situation. At Lydden the 20 households of '1563 (b)' must be a miscopying of 10, since all the other household figures range between 8 and 13. At Dover St Mary the 13 households of '1563 (a)' perhaps result from a miscopying of *lxij* as *xij*, and this corrected figure of 63 may well reflect the 1557 situation, but in the absence of any other figures for that parish apart from 50 in '1563 (b)' these can only be conjectures. At Dover St Mary the 20 households recorded in '1563 (b)' seems very low, and should probably be corrected to 40.

In addition there are five other parishes where some of the 1563 data probably refers to 1557: in the cases of Cheriton, Dover St James and Swinfield it is probably the '1563 (a)' data, whilst at Hawkinge and River it is probably the '1563 (b)' data. Finally in 1563 there are two parishes where it is certain that the figures given in our sources are wrong, but it is impossible to say what the correct figures should be. At Bircholt the 58 households recorded in '1563 (a)' are totally incompatible with all the remaining data, and must be disregarded: likewise at Dover St Peter the 20 households of '1563 (b)' do not seem comparable with the 60 households of 1557. In 1569 the estimated population for River derived from 27 communicants (42) is less than half that from 18 households (86), which is close to the two estimates of 81 and 95 in 1563; 57 would be a plausible correction and leads to a population-estimate of 88. Finally, there are several parishes in this deanery where one of the two sets of 1563 data may well refer to 1557: this applies to the '1563 (a)' figures for Bewisfield, Cheriton, Dover St James and St Mary, Folkestone and Swinfield, and to the '1563 (b)' figures for Guston, Hawkinge, Hougham and River.

Elham deanery:

Comparisons between 1563 and either 1565 or 1569 reveal no problems except in the case of Monks' Horton, where the 20 households of '1563 (b)' seem anomalous in view of other household figures of 30 or more. This most likely results from a simple miscopying of the 30 households recorded for 1557. The '1563 (a)' figure for Hythe probably relates to 1557. Other more certain corrections are as follows: at Elmsted 24 households in '1563 (b)' do not compare well with other household figures in the forties and 44 seems a likely

emendation. The 30 households for Lyminge in '1563 (b)' are improbably low, and the only emendation possible on statistical grounds is 60, though it is difficult to see how *lx* could be miscopied as *xxx*. At Paddlesworth, the 12 households in '1563 (b)' must be in error for 7, the figure recorded for 1565, *vij* obviously having been miscopied as *xij*, whilst at Wooton the reverse error has occurred, since 12 would fit well with 15 households in 1565 and 16 in 1569. At Stowting the ten households recorded in '1563 (b)' doubtless represent a miscopying of the 20 households recorded in 1557.

Lympne deanery:

In Lympne deanery seven communicants recorded at Hurst (a chapelry of Aldington) in 1557 lead to an estimated population of nine, compared to 19 from four households, and the correct figure may be 12 (estimated population 16) as a result of *xij* being miscopied as *vij*. At Burmarsh a population of 57 estimated from 12 households does not fit well either with 107 calculated from 80 communicants in the same year or with 95 calculated from 20 households in '1563 (b)': probably *xij* results from a miscopied *xxij*, yielding an estimate of 105. At Ivychurch the 85 households recorded in 1557 must result from a miscopying of *xxxv* as *lxxxv*: the resulting estimated population of 166 is then close to the 187 calculated from the communicants. At New Romney too the number of communicants in 1557 needs to be corrected from 200 to 300: the resulting estimated population of 400 is then close to the 380 calculated from the households: it also seems likely that the number of households in '1563 (b)' (40) should be 60, closer to the 70 given in '1563 (a)'. Finally, the '1563 (a)' figures for Mersham and Sevington probably refer to 1557.

At Bonnington the number of communicants in 1557 should probably be altered to 80, assuming that *lxxx* has been misread as *xxx*, and at Snaves the number of households in '1563 (a)' (19) should likewise be altered to 14, assuming that *xiiij* has been misread as *xviiij*: both parishes then present a more coherent development. At Willesborough the '1563 (b)' figure of 34 households produces a population-estimate (162) considerably below those for 1557 (293), '1563 (a)' (261), 1565 (247) and 1569 (247–308): 34 probably results from a miscopying of 54 written in arabic numerals in a draft, from which the population can be estimated as 257. There are also two rare examples of errors in the 1565 data: the 83 households recorded for Newchurch must be the result of miscopying 33, since the resulting population-estimate of 157 is of the same order of magnitude as others for that parish. At Woodchurch an estimated population of 475 derived from 100 households compares unfavourably with 359 derived from 233 communicants, the latter being fairly close to estimates of 400 in 1557 and 380 in 1563, but no plausible correction for the number of households in 1565 can be suggested.

There are also some probable errors in the 1569 figures. The six communicants at Hurst (in Aldington) indicate a population of about nine, less than half the 19 calculated from four households; if '6' was a miscopying of 16, the resulting estimate of 25 would fit much better with the other 1569 estimate of 19, but the chapelry is in any case so small that random factors may

be at work. The number of communicants at Ebony (a chapelry of Appledore) is stated to be 45, presumably because an original *lxv* has been miscopied as *xlv*; the resulting estimate of 100 is close to the 114 calculated from the numbers of households. At Brenzett the number of households is given as 12; a probable emendation to 22 produces an estimated population of 105 which is close to the 111 calculated from the number of communicants. At Ruckinge the number of households is stated as 80, an impossibly high figure probably caused by the miscopying of *xxx* as *lxxx*; adopting this correction produces an estimated population of 143 which is close to the 151 calculated from the number of communicants. The number of households at Ruckinge in '1563 (b)' (16) also needs to be corrected to 26; the resulting estimated population of 124 is then in line with 133 for 1557 and 143 (after correction) and 151 for 1569.

Ospringe deanery:

In this deanery the number of communicants in 1557 at Doddington is reported as 60, giving a population-estimate of 80 which is widely at variance with the 152 estimated from the number of households; it seems clear that *lx* has been read for *cx*, since 110 communicants yields an entirely acceptable estimate of 147. Similarly the stated total of 90 households at Selling near Faversham in 1557 is completely out of line with every other figure for that parish; if, however, we assume that *xxxx* was misread as *lxxx*, the resulting estimate of population, 190, is very close to that derived from the number of communicants, 187. At Sheldwich 16 recorded households in 1557 lead to an estimated population of 76, less than half the 187 calculated from 140 communicants; *xvj* is probably in error for *xlvi* (46), raising the estimated population to 219, which compares well with the 41 households reported in 1563.

No problems arise from a comparison of the data for 1563 with that for 1565, and only one problem comes to light for 1569. At Stallisfield the population-estimates of 185 (from 39 households) and 94 (from 61 communicants) differ considerably: since the estimated population in 1563 was 114, 94 seems a more acceptable estimate for 1569 than 185, and correcting 39 as the number of households to 19 leads to a close estimate of 90. Only two other corrections appear necessary. At Eastling, the stated number of households (16) in '1563 (b)' leads to an improbable population-rise of 63 per cent between 1563 and 1569; it seems more likely that 16 is an erroneous copying of the 26 households reported in 1557. Finally, at Preston near Faversham the six households of 1563 leads to a most improbable population-rise of 162 per cent (1563–69), and an original *xj* has probably been miscopied as *vj*.

Sandwich deanery:

In Sandwich deanery several corrections appear necessary from a comparison of the data for 1563 with that for 1565 or 1569. At both Deal and Eastry the 40 households reported in '1563 (b)' seem low by comparison with the number of reported households in 1565, even assuming that in both parishes the '1563 (a)' figures refer to 1557; in both cases an easy miscopying of *lx* as *xl* was

responsible. At East Langdon the '1563 (b)' figure of 12 is probably in error for 22 as in '1563 (a)'. The apparent and implausible doubling of Little Mongeham's population between 1563 and 1569 probably results from miscopying *xij* as *vij* in 1563, whilst the reverse error has occurred at Waldershare, where 12 households are reported in '1563 (b)' but in no other year in the fifteen-sixties is that number greater than five. At Sandwich St Peter there is a large discrepancy between '1563 (b)' (60 households; estimated population 285) and every other estimate for that parish: 587 (1548), 656 ('1563 (a)'), 618–647 (1569); probably *cx* has been miscopied as *lx*, for 110 households (estimated population 523) fits far better into the series. At Knowlton the 1569 estimates appear incompatible (ten from two households, 34 from 22 communicants), but this is probably because of the parish's very small size: two gentry households could easily contain 34 people between them, and at this social level the 'normal' average household-size of 4.75 is distinctly misleading. At Tilmanstone in 1569 the figure for communicants (96) may well be a total of all inhabitants; if taken as a number of communicants it results in an estimated population well above all others for that parish. The 13 households recorded for Walmer in '1563 (b)' is probably a mistake for 23, by comparison with the 29 households in '1563 (a)' and 26 in 1569. Finally, there are a number of parishes where one of the sets of 1563 data probably refers to 1557: this applies to the '1563 (a)' data for Deal and Eastry (already noted above) as well as to Northbourne (including Sholden), Ringwold, Sandwich St Clement and St Peter, Tilmanstone, Woodnesborough and Worth, and to the '1563 (b)' data for Coldred, Eythorne, Ham, Knowlton, Great Mongeham, Ripple and Sandwich St Mary.

Sittingbourne deanery:

The figures for communicants in 1557 in this deanery need to be adjusted for three parishes in the light of other figures for 1557 or later years. At Queenborough (a chapelry of Iwade) 48 communicants (estimated population 64) is well below the 109 calculated from household-data; an amendment to 68 (estimated population 91) seems justifiable. At Milton next to Sittingbourne 360 communicants leads to a population-estimate of 480, compared to 380 derived from household-data; emending the number of communicants to 260 produces a better estimate of 347. At Eastchurch the 320 people derived from 240 communicants is by far the highest population-estimate in the period 1557–69: changing 240 to 140 produces a revised estimated population of 187, much more in line with later statistics. The '1563 (a)' figures for Leysdown probably refer to 1557. No problems arise from a comparison of the data for 1563 and 1565, but the comparison with the 1569 data does highlight three parishes where the 1563 figures need to be amended. The 21 households recorded for Eastchurch suggest a highly unlikely rise in population of 93 per cent by 1569: 21 should probably be amended to 31. The 30 households recorded for Stockbury likewise suggest an increase in population of 76 per cent by 1569, and 40 should probably be substituted. The 60 households at Upchurch produce an estimated population far higher than at any time between

1557 and 1569: probably the real figure was 40, and as elsewhere *xl* has been miscopied as *lx*. The 12 households recorded at Wichling in '1563 (b)' almost certainly result from a miscopying of the 11 recorded in 1557, when the 28 communicants should probably be corrected to 38: the estimated population on that basis is 51, compared to 52 calculated from the 11 recorded households.

Sutton deanery:

Only two figures for households in 1557 in this deanery need to be changed. At Marden 300 households produce an estimated population of 1425 which is more than double other estimates of 667 (from 500 communicants in 1557), 475 (from 100 households, '1563 (b)') and 599–647 in 1569: presumably *iiij^c* is a misreading of *ciiij*. At Sutton Valence 40 households in 1557 produce an estimated population of 190, which is considerably lower than any estimate except that from '1563 (b)', whilst the 1557 estimate from communicants is 240. It seems probable that the number of 1557 households should be 60, as in '1563 (a)'. The '1563 (a)' data for Bearsted, Staplehurst and Wormshill, and the '1563 (b)' data for Boughton Monchelsea, Goudhurst and Ulcombe should probably be referred to 1557.

Comparison of the data for 1563 with that in 1565 produces no problems, but a comparison with the 1569 data does throw light on the need for some changes. At Chart by Sutton the 20 households of '1563 (b)' lead to population-estimates well below any others in the period of study: 40 seems the only possible amendment. Similarly at Hollingbourne, where 34 households in '1563 (b)' must be emended to the 64 of '1563 (a)', and at East Sutton, where 10 households recorded in '1563 (a)' must be altered to the 30 recorded in '1563 (b)'. At Frinsted the 20 recorded households in 1563 lead to a higher population-estimate than any except one for 1569; since the 14 households recorded in 1557 is confirmed by the 50 communicants then recorded, both resulting in a population-estimate of 67, 20 must be amended to 15, assuming a misreading of *xv* as *xx*.

Westbere deanery:

In this deanery a comparison between the data for 1563 and 1565 does not show up any noteworthy discrepancies, and comparison of the data for 1563 and 1569 suggests that there are only three parishes where changes are perhaps required in 1563, namely the Thanet parishes of St John, St Lawrence and St Peter, which all show a sharp drop of between 39 and 51 per cent in the number of households given in '1563 (a)' and '1563 (b)'. If we assume that the higher figures in fact relate to 1557, the drop indicates very high mortality between 1557 and 1563. The only obvious possible scribal error is a misreading of *c* as *l*, changing the '1563 (b)' figures to 105, 110 and 102 respectively, but this assumes that the scribe persistently made the same mistake, a possible but rather unlikely assumption. Moreover, in other parishes in this deanery, such as Seasalter and Whitstable, if we assume that the higher of the 1563 figures in fact refers to 1557 (which seems reasonable), the implied level of mortality is

also high, ranging from 25 to 33 per cent. The figures in this deanery for 1563 have therefore been left unchanged. In 1569, however, there are two parishes where there are major discrepancies between estimates from households and from communicants. At Chislet the respective estimates are 295 and 154, and comparison with the 1563 estimates of 266 and 285 suggests that 154 is wrong; perhaps the number of communicants was 200 instead of 100, leading to an acceptable population-estimate of 308. At St Lawrence in Thanet the number of households in 1569 is the same (98) as in 1563, suggesting that the number of communicants in 1569 (400) may in fact have been 300: the resulting population-estimate of 462 is virtually identical to that derived from 98 households, namely 466. Finally, the '1563 (a)' figures for Chislet, Reculver (including Hoath), St John, St Lawrence, St Nicholas at Wade, St Peter in Thanet, Seasalter and Whitstable probably refer to 1557, as do the '1563 (b)' figures for Herne and Minster in Thanet.