

Episcopal visitations and the demography of Tudor Gloucestershire¹

John S. Moore

1. Introduction

The crucial importance of ecclesiastical records as sources for the historical demography of Tudor England has long been recognised. In a previous volume of *Southern History* I compared the visitation records of Canterbury diocese in the period 1557–69 with the chantry certificates of 1546–8 and the ecclesiastical census of 1563, as evidence for population-change in the period 1548–63, and endeavoured to show that these sources did provide reliable evidence of such population-change at that time.² In Gloucester diocese, besides the chantry certificates of 1548, there is a Gloucester diocesan visitation of 1551: these sources are sufficiently close in date to provide a mutual check on the quality of the data on communicants in each other. There is also a return to the 1563 ecclesiastical census. It is the more worthwhile undertaking this comparison for Gloucester diocese since for all other dioceses (apart from Canterbury for which visitations of 1557, 1565 and 1569 provide data on both households and communicants for most parishes), the only possible comparison is between the chantry certificates of 1546–48 and the 1563 returns, whilst Gloucester is the only diocese for which a visitation giving numbers of communicants survives close enough in time to the chantry certificates to enable a check to be made on the accuracy of their figures of ‘houseling people’.

2. The Gloucester visitations

Because of the importance of the Gloucester diocesan visitation-material for Gloucestershire demography in the period from 1548 to 1603, it is worthwhile reviewing it as a whole before proceeding to analysing the results to be obtained from it. There are five separate visitations for the period 1548–1603: the first was that made by the chantry commissioners in 1546 (though this contains few figures for ‘houseling people’), and

the second that of the chantry commissioners in 1548.³ The third visitation is that made by Bishop Hooper in the summer of 1551 which gives the number of communicants for nearly all the parishes in Gloucester diocese: this unfortunately only survives in the form of a late seventeenth-century transcript.⁴ The fourth is Bishop Cheyney's return to the 1563 Privy Council enquiry, giving the number of households for nearly all parishes: in addition to the fair copy submitted to the Privy Council, an eighteenth-century copy of the draft of this return also exists.⁵ The fifth visitation was made in 1603 by the officials of Bishop Bullingham and recorded the number of communicants and recusants in each parish: the fair copy exists but no draft is known to survive.⁶ By contrast with Canterbury diocese, however, neither the 1563 nor the 1603 visitations appear to have inspired any Gloucestershire incumbents to make detailed 'listings' for their parishes.⁷

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.⁸ 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.⁹ In general, however, the diocesan returns of 1563 thus appear 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 pointed-out 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.¹⁰ Nevertheless, I have argued later that enumerations of households are likely to be more accurate than enumerations of communicants, where they were carried-out: 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 Gloucester 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. As I have remarked in my previous article, we cannot assume that the statistics presented by our sources are necessarily correct, even though the source-material is undoubtedly genuine. Contemporary misinformation and contemporary

or later scribal errors may distort the picture, hence the resulting statistics must be carefully scrutinised and where necessary corrected if possible. Equally, the historian should not presume that these statistics are precise: 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.

Appendix 1 tabulates for the diocese of Gloucester the data from the chantry certificates of 1548, the visitation of 1551 and the ecclesiastical censuses of 1563 and 1603. The figures for Baunton in Cirencester deanery, which survive only for 1563, have been omitted entirely since the absence of figures at other dates precludes any chronological analysis. There are also chantry certificates with numbers of 'houseling people' in 1548 for the south Gloucestershire parishes in Bristol diocese, but since no returns survive from either the 1563 or 1603 ecclesiastical censuses for that diocese, these numbers cannot be used for comparative analysis. As already noted, the 1546 chantry certificates contain very few demographic details. Appendix 1 also presents estimates of population for these dates based on multipliers of 1.33 for 1548 and 1551, 4.75 for 1563 and 1.54 for 1603, and calculations of the percentage differences between these estimates for 1551-63, 1563-1603 and 1551-1603. Although the first period is our main concern, consideration of the other two periods is helpful in assessing the quality of the evidence and detecting figures which appear open to doubt. Because the order of both deaneries and parishes within deaneries differs at each visitation, deaneries have been arranged alphabetically after Gloucester and parishes have been arranged alphabetically inside each deanery, with chapelries (indented) following their mother-parishes.

In order to facilitate demographic comparisons at different dates, the data are presented together with estimates of total 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 1551 have been multiplied by 1.33 to produce estimates of total population in both years.¹¹ 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 1603 have been multiplied by 1.54 to produce estimates of total population.¹² Still, I note that a recent ecclesiastical history remarks that confirmation was rare in later medieval England, that the precise age of first communion is unclear and that 'fourteen remains a possibility'.¹³ For 1563 I have adopted Peter Laslett's well-known figure

of 4.75 for average household size, since the figure seems to be broadly applicable in England throughout the period from 1066 to 1871.¹⁴ This figure is nevertheless open to question for several reasons. In the first place it is inherently unlikely that any one 'multiplier' will be appropriate at all dates and in all circumstances, but it is impossible to utilise a range of multipliers at any one date because the evidence necessary to produce such a range simply does not exist before the late seventeenth century. Secondly, it could be argued that, since the average household-size in the only large-scale regional 'listing' in the 1550s, the 'grain returns' for Clackclose hundred in Norfolk in 1557, is 5.1,¹⁵ that a 'multiplier' of 5.0 would be more appropriate for converting the data of the ecclesiastical census of 1563 into population-estimates. My reason for rejecting this proposition is that the high mortality in the years 1557-9 would necessarily reduce the previous average household-size both by removing some members of the households then existing, and by permitting the creation of new households which in their early years would have had only a few children in the core family. The evidence for the creation of new households is the upsurge in marriages in the years 1558-62 in Wrigley and Schofield's parish register sample: in 1558-9 34,000 marriages per annum were 50 per cent higher than the level of 1554-7, in 1560-1 there were over 40,000 marriages per annum, and in 1562 35,000 marriages.¹⁶ In any case, a multiplier derived from East Anglia, the most densely populated region in Tudor England, is not likely to be applicable to the whole country. It has also been suggested that, particularly for rural parishes, a 'multiplier' of 4.3 may be more appropriate than 4.75.¹⁷ I have therefore preferred to retain Laslett's multiplier of 4.75 as intermediate between the higher figure of 5.0 and a lower figure of 4.3. It must be emphasised that all my population estimates are the arithmetical product of applying the appropriate 'multiplier' to the original 'raw data' or, occasionally, to revised figures; the results have been rounded to the nearest whole number, and will at best only represent approximate indications of local population-levels.

3. Scrutinising the original data

But some of the 'raw' data are fairly certainly erroneous, hardly surprisingly given that the 1551 figures derive from an eighteenth-century transcript and that at least one diocesan draft must lie behind the figures for 1563 and 1603 presented to the Privy Council.¹⁸ Consequently, the 'raw data' must first be scrutinised parish-by-parish to find and revise, or eliminate, those figures which appear to be erroneous for a number of reasons. The most likely reason is miscopying of original figures by

episcopal clerks; others are that the person supplying the information at visitation (usually the incumbent or his curate) was himself ignorant of the true situation or simply presented a figure returned at a previous visitation. In the better- documented diocese of Canterbury, for example, we can prove that about one-third of the figures supplied to the first stage of the 1563 visitation had been copied from the previous visitation in 1557.¹⁹ Moreover, what appear to be abnormal variations between different dates may result from the use of the standard multipliers – although in real life there were inevitably variations both in the general age-structure of the population and around the mean household size of 4.75²⁰ – 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 and early modern ‘proofs of age’, ‘upwards of’ that figure.²¹ Sometimes the erroneous figure is easily spotted, especially where, in Gloucester diocese, data for both 1548 and 1551 survive; where this comparison is not possible, scrutiny of the calculated percentage differences is necessary. Generally, given the short time-periods involved, calculated changes by a factor significantly greater than two (i.e. decreases of more than 50 per cent and increases of more than 100 per cent between 1551 (or 1548) and 1563) have been regarded as very unlikely in parishes of reasonable size without special problems, and such a calculated population-change would seem to present a clear case for rejection of one of the two figures being compared. Estimated population-increases over 200 per cent between 1563 and 1603 have also been scrutinised carefully.

Less obvious 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. 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 and a further set of calculations were performed. In a few parishes it is possible that the reported number of ‘communicants’ may in fact be total populations, as noted in Appendix 2. Confusion between inhabitants and communicants is quite understandable: it was not, incidentally, a confusion confined to the sixteenth century.²² Where no plausible corrections could be suggested, and where there were no known specific local circumstances which could explain what were *prima facie* anomalous figures, the data for all such parishes were discarded for purposes of comparative analysis. This analysis, arranged by deaneries in the same order as in Appendix 1, is to be found in Appendix 2. Since the 1551 visitation, as

already noted, survives only in the form of a late seventeenth-century transcript, it is less easy to assess the accuracy of this copy, and we have therefore to allow for the possibility not only of mistakes being made at the time of original compilation but also in the later transcription.

4. The reliability of the Gloucester 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 45 out of just over 900, i.e. about 5.0 per cent, of the original figures appear questionable. However, we cannot determine how far contemporary estimates were internally consistent, because for Gloucester diocese, unlike Canterbury diocese, statistics were not given for both communicants and households at the same date. It is perhaps worth noting that for Canterbury diocese, where a comparison can be made between estimates both from communicants and from households in all the years 1557, 1563, 1565 and 1569, the overall differences are low, ranging from 2.6 per cent to 6.9 per cent, but generally around six per cent.²³ This high level of consistency in the results obtained for each of these four years in Canterbury diocese 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. *A priori*, it is difficult to see why this conclusion should not apply to all English dioceses, including Gloucester, as well as to Canterbury.

Secondly, we can compare the figures in the 1551 visitation with those given in the 1548 chantry certificates for 55 parishes, nearly one-fifth of all the parishes in the 1551 return. The results of this comparison are displayed in Table 1.

There are of course, as one would expect, variations between the two sets of statistics for the same information, communicants, in two different years, albeit only three years apart: indeed, it would be suspicious if there were a large number of identical figures which would suggest copying of the earlier figures in the later year. But there are only five parishes out of 55 with identical 'raw data' in the two years: Marshfield, Minchinhampton, Northleach with Eastington, North Nibley and Westbury-on-Severn. Differences over plus or minus 50 per cent (which would be automatically suspect as too large to be true) are all due to defective data: when corrections have produced revised values, the differences are all considerably reduced. The most notable differences between adjoining parishes are within Gloucester City, but since none of the original figures appears to be the result of obvious scribal error, we are forced to accept

Table 1: Comparison of the 1548 chantry certificates and the 1551 visitation return

<i>Deanery, Parish, Chapelry</i>	<i>1548</i>	<i>1548</i>	<i>1551</i>	<i>1551</i>	<i>1548/1551</i>
<i>Unit of Enumeration</i>	<i>Comm</i>	<i>Pop</i>	<i>Comm</i>	<i>Pop</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
<i>Basis of estimate</i>		$\times 1.33$		$\times 1.33$	<i>difference</i>
Gloucester Deanery:					
All Saints	92	123	96	128	4.3
Holy Trinity	310	413	300	400	-3.2
St Aldate	140	187	164	219	17.1
St Catherine	300	400	296	395	-1.3
St John Baptist	309	412	150	200	-51.5
St Mary de Crypt	280	373	240	320	-14.3
St Mary de Grace	110	147	95	127	-13.6
St Mary de Lode	500	667	400	533	-20.0
St Michael	325	433	400	533	23.1
St Nicholas	520	693	360	480	-30.8
St Owen	273	364	250	333	-8.4
Sub-total (City):	3159	4212	2751	3668	-12.9
Arlingham	309	412	254	339	-17.8
Churchdown	283	377	290	387	2.5
Campden deanery:					
Childswickham	230	307	211	281	-8.3
Chipping Campden	600	800	485	647	-19.2
Toddington and Stanley	53	71	52	69	-1.9
Pontlarge					
Cirencester deanery:					
Cirencester	1400	1867	1460	1947	4.3
Northleach and Eastington	400	533	400	533	0
Dursley deanery:					
Berkeley	1117	1489	1012	1349	-0.4
Hill	N/A	N/A	100	133	
Stone	213	284	100	133	-53.1
Stone (RV)	213	284	200	267	-6.1
Dursley	500	667	460	613	-8.0
Rockhampton	100	133	50	67	-50.0
Rockhampton (RV)	100	133	100	133	0
Slimbridge	420	560	400	533	-4.8

<i>Deanery, Parish, Chapelry</i>	<i>1548</i>	<i>1548</i>	<i>1551</i>	<i>1551</i>	<i>1548/1551</i>
<i>Unit of Enumeration</i>	<i>Comm</i>	<i>Pop</i>	<i>Comm</i>	<i>Pop</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
<i>Basis of estimate</i>		<i>×1.33</i>		<i>×1.33</i>	<i>difference</i>
Thornbury and Rangeworthy	800	1067	700	933	-12.5
Wotton-under-Edge	800	1067	400	533	-50.0
Wotton-under-Edge (RV)	800	533	400	533	0
North Nibley	400	533	400	533	0
Fairford deanery:					
Coln St Aldwyns	106	141	40	53	-62.3
Coln St Aldwyns (RV)	106	141	90	120	-15.1
Lechlade	220	293	200	267	-9.1
Forest deanery:					
Dymock	480	640	440	587	-8.3
Lea	100	133	60	80	-40.0
Lea (RV)	100	133	110	147	10.0
Lydney	380	507	460	613	21.1
St Briavels	160	213	170	227	6.3
Mitcheldean	268	357	260	347	-3.0
Newent	500	667	712	949	42.4
Pauntley	90	120	60	80	-33.3
Newland and Bream	800	1067	700	933	-12.5
Westbury-on-Severn	700	933	700	933	0
Littledean	240	320	200	267	-16.7
Minsterworth	241	321	227	303	-5.8
Hawkesbury deanery:					
Marshfield	500	667	500	667	0
Chipping Sodbury	440	587	400	533	-9.1
Stonehouse deanery:					
Bisley	628	837	400	533	-36.3
Coberley	69	92	50	67	-27.5
Minchinhampton	500	667	500	667	0
Nymphsfield	83	111	85	113	2.4
Painswick	600	800	560	747	-6.7
Tetbury	800	1067	600	800	-25.0
Stow deanery:					
Bourton-on-the-Water and Lower Slaughter	123	164	94	125	-23.6

<i>Deanery, Parish, Chapelry</i>	<i>1548</i>	<i>1548</i>	<i>1551</i>	<i>1551</i>	<i>1548/1551</i>
<i>Unit of Enumeration</i>	<i>Comm</i>	<i>Pop</i>	<i>Comm</i>	<i>Pop</i>	<i>Percentage difference</i>
<i>Basis of estimate</i>		<i>×1.33</i>		<i>×1.33</i>	
Stow-on-the Wold	340	453	350	467	2.9
Wyck Rissington	10	13	62	83	520.0
Wyck Rissington (RV)	60	80	62	83	3.3
Winchcombe deanery:					
Cheltenham	600	800	526	701	-12.3
Charlton Kings	310	413	315	420	1.6
Tewkesbury	1600	2133	2600	3467	62.5
Tewkesbury (RV)	1600	2133	1600	2133	0
Winchcombe	800	1067	700	933	-12.5
Totals (55 parishes):	22472	29962	21496	28660	-4.3
Totals (revised values):	22122	30029	20746	27660	-6.2

Abbreviations:

Comm: 'Houseling people' (1548), Communicants (1603).

Hholds: Households.

Pop: Estimated population.

Sources: Appendix 1; revised values from Appendix 2.

the only alternative conclusion, unsurprising in itself, that conditions could vary widely between urban parishes resulting in widely varying mortality-patterns.²⁴ Elsewhere in the diocese, as in Gloucester itself, the major falls between 1548 and 1551 can be reasonably attributed to the last well-known outbreak of the 'sweat' in 1551, often accompanied by plague. This outbreak can also be seen from the rise in the number of wills proved annually in Gloucester diocese from an average of 126 in the years 1547-50 (1545 and 1546 were clearly years of exceptionally high mortality) to 167 in 1551 (+32.5 per cent) and to 157 in 1552 (+24.6 per cent) as well as in the near-trebling in the number of burials in 1551 compared to the preceding five years in one-third of those Gloucestershire parish registers that survive and are usable for this period.²⁵ Some large falls in population between 1548 and 1551 are to be expected: nevertheless, the overall difference between the 1548 and 1551 figures is only -4.3 per cent using 'raw data' and -6.2 per cent after substituting revised values for obviously erroneous figures. These small overall differences suggest that both sets of data, for 1548 and for 1551, can be regarded as reliable. All the empirical tests that we can apply to the Gloucester chantry certificates and visitation-records suggest that their evidence is at least as reliable, broadly speaking, as any other records

of economic and social events produced then. But we can take this analysis rather further in general terms. We may reasonably suspect that contemporary estimates of households were much more likely to be accurate than contemporary estimates of communicants. For 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.²⁶ Indeed, although the fifth article of the 1563 inquiry referred to 'households', some bishops and their officials made returns of 'families'.²⁷

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. Moreover, all parishioners over eighteen were required to communicate, pay tithes and offer 'oblations' at Easter; to judge from surviving accounts, many clergy by the fifteenth century were keeping accounts itemizing both tithes and Easter offerings paid by individual parishioners, 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', 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, so that they should have been in a good position to estimate at least numbers of their parishioners who were of communicable age. Indeed, the Hornsea accounts printed by Peter Heath contain several lists of tithe-payers and two estimates of the parochial population. Finally, churchwardens and other local officials from the fifteenth century at the latest were also keeping accounts which often 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.²⁸

The likelihood that household statistics were more accurate than figures for communicants is strengthened if we consider the nature of the original numerical data in Appendix 1. Table 2 displays the distribution of the last digit of the numbers in columns 4 (communicants

in 1551), column 6 (households in 1563) and column 8 (communicants in 1603), of Appendix 1. 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 (66.8 per cent in 1551, 47.0 per cent in 1603) than for households (19.0 per cent in 1563). This confirms my 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. Nevertheless, in 1551 one-third, and in 1603 a half, of all Gloucestershire incumbents were clearly endeavouring to provide precise answers to questions about the numbers of communicants, and in 1563 four-fifths of incumbents were providing numbers of households which were not rounded and thus appear to result from careful enumeration. The percentage distribution of all the final digits other than zero also appears to be fairly unbiased in all three data-sets, ranging round means of 9.0 per cent for households in 1563, 3.7 per cent for communicants in 1551, and 5.9 per cent for communicants in 1603. In general, therefore, I would argue that statistical data derived from visitations in Gloucester as well as Canterbury dioceses, used with 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.

**Table 2: Distribution of final digits in numerical data,
Gloucester Diocese, 1551-1603**

Figure ending in:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
A. Households:										
N	27	31	22	36	22	27	20	34	16	55
%	9.3	10.7	7.6	12.4	7.6	9.3	6.9	11.7	5.5	19.0
B. Communicants:										
1551:										
N	7	14	10	11	12	18	10	7	7	193
%	2.4	4.8	3.5	3.8	4.2	6.2	3.5	2.4	2.4	66.8
1603:										
N	12	19	18	18	18	27	16	13	10	134
%	4.2	6.7	6.3	6.3	6.3	9.5	5.6	4.6	3.5	47.0

Source: Appendix 1.

5. Demographic trends in Gloucestershire, 1548–1603

Fortified by the results of this analysis, we can now turn to consider the results to be obtained from the available statistics. Table 3 summarises by deanery the results of comparing the 'raw data' and derived population-estimates assembled in Appendix 1. Several sets of totals are given: set A refers to 284 parishes or separately enumerated chapelries for which data is given for all three dates 1551, 1563, and 1603; the data in this set have been taken from the sources without any modification. On this basis there was an estimated fall in population of 8.9 per cent between 1551 and 1563 followed by a rise of 52.1 per cent between 1563 and 1603. In addition to the 284 places for which figures are given in 1551 (or in two instances, Newnham and Oldbury on Severn, 1548, but not 1551), in 1563 and in 1603, there are four places with data in 1551 and 1563, but not 1603 (Aston Somerville, Alvington, Aylburton and Churchdown), and these have been included for the purpose of calculating mortality between 1551 and 1563. Seven places with no data for 1551 (Acton Turville, Aldsworth, Dodington, Flaxley, Kingswood, Longborough and Siddington St Mary) can be used only to help establish the rate of population-growth between 1563 and 1603, whilst Frampton on Severn (data in 1551 and 1603 but not in 1563), though included for completeness, does not allow the comparison of data at the two principal periods of concern, 1551–63 and 1563–1603.

It is also possible to show that the corrections to the 'raw data' discussed in Appendix 2 do not in fact greatly alter the conclusions to be drawn from Table 3. Table 4 summarises by deanery the results of comparing the 'raw data' and derived population-estimates assembled in Appendix 1, and, as in Table 1, provides three sets of totals in order to incorporate data from the few parishes for which statistics are given only either in 1548 and 1563 or in 1563 and 1603.

Although it is satisfying to be able to provide revised data that is as accurate as possible, the overall results are not greatly altered, so that it is not possible to argue that the suggested emendations have systematically distorted the figures to bias the conclusions. Analysis of the 'raw data' in Table 3 reveals a drop in population of 8.6–8.9 per cent between 1551 and 1563, followed by a rise of 52.0 per cent between 1563 and 1603; using the revised data in Table 4 raises the fall in population by 1563 to 11.0 per cent and slightly lowers the succeeding increase by 1603 to 48.5 per cent. The population-decline in Gloucester diocese was therefore double the 5.5 per cent calculated by Wrigley and Schofield for England as a whole in 1556–61, but the subsequent increase in Gloucester diocese of about 50 per cent by 1603 was not much larger than that of 42.5 per cent calculated for England between 1561 and 1606.²⁹

**Table 3: Population counts, Gloucester Diocese, 1551-1603
(raw data)**

<i>Deanery (Parishes)</i>	<i>1551</i>	<i>1551</i>	<i>1563</i>	<i>1563</i>
<i>Unit of Enumeration</i>	<i>Comm</i>	<i>Pop</i>	<i>Hhold</i>	<i>Hhold</i>
<i>Basis of estimate</i>		$\times 1.33$		$\times 4.75$
Gloucester (39)	6454	8603	1773	8426
Campden (35)	3905	5205	985	4688
Cirencster (24)	3223	4296	768	3650
Dursley (17)	4771	6706	1544	7337
Fairford (14)	1516	2021	330	1569
Forest (33)	6795	9288	1961	9320
Hawkesbury (33)	5526	7366	1264	6009
Stonehouse (28)	5540	7388	1388	6597
Stow (31)	2495	3326	579	2755
Winchcombe (33)	7871	10496	1811	8607
Totals:				
A: 284 parishes	48096	64695	12403	58958
B. 284 parishes, plus Astom Somerville, Alvington, Aylburton, Churchdown, 1551-63:	48596	65362	12570	59728
C. 284 parishes, plus Acton Turville, Aldsworth, Dodington, Flaxley, Kingswood, Longborough, Siddington St Mary, 1563-1603:	N/A	N/A	12542	59619

Abbreviations: Comm: Communicants.

Hholds: Households.

Pop: Estimated population.

Table 3: continued

1603 Hhold	1603 Pop × 1.54	1551/1563	1563/1603 Percentage difference	1551/1603
7659	111793	-2.1	40.0	37.1
5969	9195	-9.9	96.1	76.7
4093	6302	-15.0	72.7	46.7
7954	12250	9.4	67.0	82.7
1881	2896	-22.4	84.6	43.3
7794	11941	.3	28.1	28.6
5526	8508	-18.4	41.6	15.5
7152	11013	-10.7	66.9	49.1
2891	4451	-17.2	61.6	33.8
7346	11314	-18.0	31.5	7.8
58265	89663	-8.9	52.1	38.6
N/A	N/A	-8.6	N/A	N/A
58849	90572	N/A	51.9	N/A

Source: Appendix 1.

Table 4: Population counts, Gloucester Diocese, 1551-1603 (modified data)

<i>Deanery (Parishes)</i>	<i>1548</i>	<i>1548</i>	<i>1563</i>	<i>1563</i>
<i>Unit of Enumeration</i>	<i>Comm</i>	<i>Pop</i>	<i>Hhold</i>	<i>Hhold</i>
<i>Basis of estimate</i>		$\times 1.33$		$\times 4.75$
Gloucester (39)	6454	8603	1773	8426
Campden (35)	4255	5672	975	4640
Cirencster (24)	3323	4429	780	3707
Dursley (17)	5021	7040	1444	6862
Fairford (14)	1566	2088	350	1665
Forest (33)	6945	9488	1951	9272
Hawkesbury (30)	5926	7899	1294	6151
Stonehouse (28)	5689	7586	1388	6597
Stow (31)	2660	3546	539	2565
Winchcombe (33)	7071	9429	1816	8631
Totals:				
A: 284 parishes	48910	65780	12310	58516
B. 284 parishes, plus Astom Somerville, Alvington, Aylburton, Churchdown, 1551-63:	49410	66447	12477	59310
C. 284 parishes, plus Acton Turville, Aldsworth, Dodington, Flaxley, Kingswood, Longborough, Siddington St Mary, 1563-1603:	N/A	N/A	12477	59177

Abbreviations: Comm: 'Houseling people' (1548), Communicants (1603).

Hholds: Households.

Pop: Estimated population.

Table 4: continued

1603 Comm	1603 Pop ×1.54	1551/1563	1563/1603 Percentage difference	1551/1563
7559	11639	-2.1	38.1	35.3
5969	9195	-18.2	98.2	62.1
3863	5949	-16.3	60.5	34.3
6954	10053	-2.5	46.5	42.8
1881	2852	-20.3	71.3	36.6
7794	11941	-2.3	28.8	25.9
5526	8508	-22.1	38.3	7.7
7152	11013	-13.0	66.9	45.2
2891	4451	-27.7	73.5	25.5
7346	11314	-8.5	31.1	20.0
56935	86915	-11.0	48.5	29.7
N/A	N/A	-11.0	N/A	N/A
57519	87824	N/A	48.4	N/A

Source: Appendix 1; revised figures from Appendix 2.

We can now turn to enquire how these results, obtained by the comparison of data from the 1551 episcopal visitation with data from the 1563 national ecclesiastical return, contrast with a similar comparison between the 1548 chantry certificates and the 1563 census. Table 5 compares the unmodified chantry certificate data for 1548 with the modified household data for 1563, and shows a decline in estimated populations between those two years of 9.2 per cent, which would slightly increase to 9.6 per cent if the corrected 1548 figures were substituted. If the 'raw data' for 1563 were utilised as the basis of comparison, the calculated population-decline would drop to 7.4 per cent. See table 5.

We can now briefly summarize the changing population-trends in Gloucester diocese (and, by implication, throughout Gloucestershire) in the period 1548–1603. A fall of between 4.3 and 6.2 per cent between 1548 and 1551 (Table 1) can probably be ascribed to the 'sweat' which affected Gloucestershire severely in the years 1550–52; this was followed by a further drop of between 8.6 and 11.0 per cent between 1551 and 1563 (Tables 3–4), and overall population in Gloucestershire appears to have fallen by at least 9.2 per cent in 1548–63 (Table 5). 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 1603 Gloucestershire's population had risen by about 50 per cent (Table 3–4). The last phase is not in doubt, since after 1558 the parish registers are increasingly plentiful, and, as we have already seen, Wrigley and Schofield calculate a national population-increase between 1561 and 1601 of 42.5 per cent. The two earlier phases are supported by the evidence of probate records both in Gloucestershire and throughout the country,³⁰ by a nationwide comparison of chantry certificates with the surviving 1563 ecclesiastical returns,³¹ by other historians' work on a variety of sources,³² and by my own continuing analysis of a large sample of parish registers dating back to the 1540s.

Table 5: Comparison of the 1548 chantry certificates and the 1563 ecclesiastical census, Gloucester Diocese

<i>Deanery, Parish, Chapelry</i>	<i>1548</i>	<i>1548</i>	<i>1563</i>	<i>1563</i>	<i>1548/1563</i>
<i>Unit of Enumeration</i>	<i>Comm</i>	<i>Pop</i>	<i>Hhold</i>	<i>Pop</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
<i>Basis of estimate</i>		$\times 1.33$		$\times 4.75$	<i>Difference</i>
Gloucester Deanery:					
All Saints	92	123	15	71	-42.3
Holy Trinity	310	413	60	285	-31.0
St Aldate	140	187	50	238	27.3
St Catherine	300	400	102	485	21.3
St John Baptist	309	412	76	361	-12.4
St Mary de Crypt	280	373	71	337	-9.7
St Mary de Grace	110	147	29	138	-6.1
St Mary de Lode	500	667	156	741	11.1
St Michael	325	433	106	504	16.4
St Nicholas	520	693	146	694	0.1
St Owen	273	364	93	442	21.4
Sub-total (City):	3159	4212	904	4296	2.0
Arlingham	309	412	57	271	-34.2
Churchdown	283	377	75	356	-5.6
Campden deanery:					
Childswickham	230	307	48	228	-25.7
Chipping Campden	600	800	120	570	-28.8
Toddington and Stanley Pontlarge	53	71	12	57	-19.7
Cirencester deanery:					
Cirencester	1400	1867	320	1520	-18.6
Northleach and Eastington	400	533	131	622	16.7
Dursley deanery:					
Berkeley and Hill	1117	1489	340	1615	8.5
Stone	213	284	67	318	12.0
Dursley	500	667	92	437	-34.5
Rockhampton	100	133	28	133	0
Slimbridge	420	560	101	480	-14.3
Thornbury and Rangeworthy	800	1067	225	1069	0.2
Oldbury on Severn	260	347	70	333	-4.0

<i>Deanery, Parish, Chapelry</i>	1548	1548	1563	1563	1548/1563
<i>Unit of Enumeration</i>	<i>Comm</i>	<i>Pop</i>	<i>Hhold</i>	<i>Pop</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
<i>Basis of estimate</i>		$\times 1.33$		$\times 4.75$	<i>Difference</i>
Wotton-under-Edge	800	1067	115	546	-48.8
North Nibley	400	533	90	428	-19.7
Fairford deanery:					
Coln St Aldwyns	106	141	23	109	-22.7
Lechlade	220	293	65	309	5.5
Forest deanery:					
Dymock	480	640	106	504	-21.3
Lea	100	133	29	138	3.8
Lydney	380	507	105	499	-1.6
St Briavels	160	213	49	233	9.4
Mitcheldean	268	357	92	437	22.4
Newent	500	667	190	903	35.4
Pauntley	90	120	16	76	-36.7
Newland and Bream	800	1067	250	1188	11.3
Westbury-on-Severn	700	933	162	770	-17.5
Littledean	240	320	62	295	-7.8
Minsterworth	241	321	76	361	12.5
Newnham	170	227	55	261	15.0
Hawkesbury deanery:					
Hawkesbury and Little Badminton	420	560	111	527	-5.9
Marshfield	500	667	92	437	-34.5
Chipping Sodbury	440	587	91	432	-26.4
Stonehouse deanery:					
Bisley	628	837	112	532	-36.4
Coberley	69	92	11	52	-43.5
Minchinhampton	500	667	134	637	-4.5
Nympsfield	83	111	17	81	-27.0
Painswick	600	800	142	675	-15.6
Tetbury	800	1067	176	836	-21.6
Stow deanery:					
Bourton-on-the-Water and Lower Slaughter	123	164	21	100	-39.0
Stow-on-the-Wold	340	453	82	390	-13.9
Wyck Rissington	10	13	15	71	446.2

Deanery, Parish, Chapelry	1548	1548	1563	1563	1548/1563
Unit of Enumeration	Comm	Pop	Hhold	Pop	Percentage
Basis of estimate		×1.33		× 4.75	Difference
Winchcombe deanery:					
Cheltenham	600	800	164	779	-2.6
Charlton Kings	310	413	103	489	18.4
Tewkesbury	1600	2133	396	1881	-11.8
Winchcombe	800	1067	199	945	-11.4
Totals (57 parishes):	23322	31096	5941	28226	-9.2
Comparative totals:					
Uncorrected 1563 data:	23322	31096	6061	28797	-7.4
1548 and 1563 data corrected:	23422	31229	5941	28226	-9.6

Source: Appendix 1; revised data from Appendix 2.

7. Conclusions

What positive general conclusions can now be stated with confidence? Some important methodological conclusions of both general and local application can be drawn from these figures. The first is that, as a whole, the Gloucester diocesan visitations stand-up well to critical analysis as a demographic source; sixteenth-century clergy and officials 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 it was not a crucial matter, the occasional failure to provide the demographic data in 1551, 1563 or 1563, apparently went unpunished, whilst no attempt seems to have been made to follow- up the original enquiry in order to compel the presentation of the missing data. By contrast with Canterbury diocese, we cannot get behind the data registered by the clerks in Gloucester to see how incumbents or parishioners supplied the required information, and no Gloucestershire incumbents were inspired to prepare lists of communicants or even more detailed ‘listings’ of all inhabitants. Nevertheless, I have already suggested that reliable information could be obtained from ‘Easter Books’ and rate-books. But in most parishes, consequently, copying errors can often be suspected but not proven. Yet we have shown that an analysis across time of most parochial estimates, after allowing for scribal error, also suggests trends

that in themselves appear probable and can be supported by reference to other types of information.

Secondly, as already noted, the corrections to the 'raw data' do not significantly alter the results of overall comparisons between different dates in Gloucester diocese. This also has national relevance since it supports the general reasonableness of the procedure of cautious emendation of original data where implausible results would follow from their uncritical acceptance. Thirdly, the comparison between the chantry certificates and the 1551 visitation for Gloucester diocese strengthens the conclusion drawn by other historians that the chantry certificates are a reliable source for demographic data as for other matters.³³ Only two out of the 55 chantry certificate figures for the parishes in Gloucester diocese, when compared to the figures in the 1551 visitation, appear obviously erroneous because of copying errors, namely those for Hawkesbury and Wick Rissington. The rate of error (3.6 per cent) compares very favourably with that for the 1551 Gloucester visitation, with 23 obvious errors in 286 entries (8.0 per cent). For Gloucester diocese, the chantry certificate figures appear to be of better quality than those from the 1551 visitation: this again has national significance, for it suggests that we can rely on the data from chantry certificates in other dioceses where no visitations exist to provide the basis for such a comparison. Fourthly, contrasting the results in Tables 3 and 4 of calculated population-decline in 1551–63 (–8.6 per cent using the original data, –11.0 per cent using modified data) with those in Table 5 for 1548–63 (–7.4 per cent using 'raw data', at least –9.2 per cent using modified data) suggests that comparison of statistics from the chantry certificates with those from the 1563 ecclesiastical census understates the degree of change that actually occurred. This is a result that has already been demonstrated for Canterbury diocese, and may therefore be of wider application.³⁴

The fifth major conclusion is more specifically national. Unless the clerks at Gloucester were markedly more efficient than their colleagues in other sees (which does not seem very likely), there seems no good reason to suppose that the 1563 returns from those other sees, where they survive, are less worthy of credence than those from Gloucester. 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,

and 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.³⁵ Moreover, and of most significance for national and regional historians studying areas without the aid of the detailed demographic 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 'Jack Fisher's "flu"'. Yet some problems still remain. It is worth remarking that these results are, obviously, highly sensitive to alterations in the multipliers used. It is unlikely that the age of first communion in 1546 or 1548 had risen above ten, so that the multiplier of 1.33 suggested by Wrigley and Schofield seems entirely appropriate, as I have argued above. If, however, 'fourteen remains a possibility', the multiplier for 1548 and 1551 would rise to 1.54,³⁶ increasing the pre-epidemic population and hence the calculated drop in population by 1563. Equally, lowering the household multiplier in 1563 to Arkell's suggested figure of 4.3 instead of Laslett's 4.75 would obviously reduce calculated populations in 1563 and thereby raise the calculated population-decrease between 1548 and 1563 quite considerably. I believe that my choice of multipliers is therefore conservative and in fact minimises the drop in population during the later 1550s.

Appendix 1: Population Counts, Gloucester Diocese, 1548–1603 (Raw data)

<i>Deanery, Parish, Chapelry</i>	<i>1548</i>	<i>1548</i>	<i>1551</i>	<i>1551</i>
<i>Unit of Enumeration</i>	<i>Comm</i>	<i>Pop</i>	<i>Comm</i>	<i>Pop</i>
<i>Basis of estimate</i>		<i>×1.33</i>		<i>×1.33</i>
Gloucester Deanery:				
Gloucester: All Saints	92	123	96	128
Gloucester: Holy Trinity	310	413	300	400
Gloucester: St Aldate	140	187	164	219
Gloucester: St Catherine	300	400	296	395
Gloucester: St John Baptist	309	412	150	200
Gloucester: St Mary de Crypt	280	373	240	320
Gloucester: St Mary de Grace	110	147	95	127
Gloucester: St Mary de Lode	500	667	400	533
Gloucester: St Michael	325	433	400	533
Gloucester: St Nicholas	520	693	360	480
Gloucester: St Owen	273	364	250	333
Sub-total: Gloucester City:	3159	4212	2751	3668
Arlingham	309	412	254	339
Ashleworth	N/A	N/A	200	267
Barnwood	N/A	N/A	117	156
Brockworth	N/A	N/A	144	192
Brookthorpe	N/A	N/A	82	109
Elmore	N/A	N/A	230	307
Fretherne	N/A	N/A	63	84
Great Witcombe	N/A	N/A	71	95
Harescombe	N/A	N/A	43	57
Pitchcombe	N/A	N/A	26	35
Haresfield	N/A	N/A	244	325
Hartpury	N/A	N/A	280	373
Hempsted	N/A	N/A	100	133
Lassington	N/A	N/A	34	45
Longney	N/A	N/A	130	173
Maisemore	N/A	N/A	140	187
Matson	N/A	N/A	28	37
Moreton Valence	N/A	N/A	150	200
Whaddon	N/A	N/A	70	93
Norton	N/A	N/A	180	240
Quedgeley	N/A	N/A	69	92
Sandhurst	N/A	N/A	160	213

1563 Hhold	1563 Pop × 4.75	1603 Comm	1603 Pop × 1.54	1551/1563	1563/1603 Percentage difference	1551/1603
15	71	84	129	-44.5	81.7	0.8
60	285	249	383	-28.8	34.4	-4.3
50	238	124	191	8.7	-19.7	-12.8
102	485	350	539	22.8	11.1	36.5
76	361	312	480	80.5	33.0	140.0
71	337	257	396	5.3	17.5	23.8
29	138	236	363	8.7	163.0	185.8
156	741	520	801	39.0	8.1	50.3
106	504	450	693	-5.4	37.5	30.0
146	694	580	893	44.6	28.7	86.0
93	442	289	445	32.7	0.7	33.6
904	4296	3451	5313	17.1	23.7	44.8
57	271	366	564	-20.1	108.1	66.4
60	285	200	308	6.7	8.1	15.4
25	119	133	205	-23.7	72.3	31.4
30	143	140	216	-25.5	51.0	12.5
16	76	86	132	-30.3	73.7	21.1
36	171	236	363	-44.3	112.3	18.2
20	95	65	100	13.1	5.3	19.0
24	114	70	108	20.0	-5.3	13.7
24	114)	80	123	23.9	7.9	33.7
N/A	N/A)					
47	223	268	413	-31.4	85.2	27.1
51	242	250	385	-35.1	59.1	3.2
31	147	106	163	10.5	10.9	22.6
10	48	40	62	6.7	29.2	37.8
48	228	150	231	31.8	1.3	33.5
36	171	179	276	-8.6	61.4	47.6
7	33	37	57	-10.8	72.7	54.1
20	95	150	231	-52.5	143.2	15.5
31	147	84	129	58.1	-12.2	38.7
31	147	157	242	-38.8	64.6	0.8
28	133	123	189	44.6	42.1	105.4
42	200	233	359	-6.1	79.5	68.5

<i>Deanery, Parish: Chapelry</i>	<i>1548</i>	<i>1548</i>	<i>1551</i>	<i>1551</i>
<i>Unit of Enumeration</i>	<i>Comm</i>	<i>Pop</i>	<i>Comm</i>	<i>Pop</i>
<i>Basis of estimate</i>		<i>×1.33</i>		<i>×1.33</i>
Gloucester deanery (continued):				
Standish	N/A	N/A	246	328
Hardwicke	N/A	N/A	169	225
Randwick	N/A	N/A	100	133
Saul	N/A	N/A	67	89
Upton St Leonards	N/A	N/A	206	275
Whitminster	N/A	N/A	100	133
Campden deanery:				
Alderton	N/A	N/A	95	127
Aston Subedge	N/A	N/A	60	80
Batsford	N/A	N/A	52	69
Beckford and Ashton Underhill	N/A	N/A	190	253
Bourton-on-the-Hill and Moreton-in-Marsh	N/A	N/A	100	133
Buckland	N/A	N/A	160	213
Childswickham	230	307	211	281
Chipping Campden	600	800	485	647
Clifford Chambers	N/A	N/A	60	80
Cow Honeybourne	N/A	N/A	100	133
Didbrook	N/A	N/A	100	133
Dorsington	N/A	N/A	53	71
Dumbleton	N/A	N/A	100	133
Ebrington	N/A	N/A	180	240
Great Washbourne	N/A	N/A	42	56
Hinton on the Green	N/A	N/A	100	133
Kemerton	N/A	N/A	113	151
Lemington (chapelry of Tewkesbury)	N/A	N/A	56	75
Marston Sicca	N/A	N/A	80	107
Mickleton	N/A	N/A	200	267
Pebworth	N/A	N/A	151	201
Preston on Stour	N/A	N/A	30	40
Quinton	N/A	N/A	200	267
Saintbury	N/A	N/A	100	133
Sezincote	N/A	N/A	6	8
Shenington	N/A	N/A	112	149
Stanton and Snowhill	N/A	N/A	130	173
Stanway	N/A	N/A	160	213
Toddington and Stanley Pontlarge	53	71	52	69
Todenham	N/A	N/A	140	187

1563 Hhold	1563 Pop × 4.75	1603 Comm	1603 Pop × 1.54	1551/1563	1563/1603 Percentage difference	1551/1603
53	252	310	477	-23.2	89.3	45.4
29	138	100	154	-38.7	11.6	-31.6
18	86	223	343	-35.3	298.8	157.9
14	67	50	77	-24.7	14.9	-13.5
57	271	287	442	-1.5	63.1	60.7
24	114	85	131	-14.3	14.9	-1.5
22	105	100	154	-17.3	46.7	21.3
8	38	74	114	-52.5	200.0	42.5
6	29	60	92	-58.0	217.2	33.3
73	347	403	621	37.2	79.0	145.5
70	333	350	539	150.4	61.9	305.3
18	86	195	300	-59.6	248.8	40.8
48	228	280	431	-18.9	89.0	53.4
120	570	706	1087	-11.9	90.7	68.0
18	86	80	123	7.5	43.0	53.8
28	133	40	62	0	-53.4	-53.4
10	48	94	145	-63.9	202.1	9.0
14	67	40	62	-5.6	-7.5	-12.7
24	114	170	262	-14.3	129.8	97.0
30	143	201	310	-40.4	116.8	29.2
8	38	72	111	-32.1	192.1	98.2
18	86	200	308	-35.3	258.1	131.6
26	124	127	196	-17.9	58.1	29.8
7	33	60	92	-56.0	178.8	22.7
19	90	209	322	-15.9	257.8	200.9
41	195	246	379	-27.0	94.4	41.9
40	190	200	308	-5.5	62.1	53.2
18	86	214	330	115.0	283.7	725.0
38	181	400	616	-32.2	240.3	130.7
24	114	200	308	-14.3	170.2	131.6
2	10	10	15	25.0	50.0	87.5
14	67	80	123	-55.0	83.6	-17.4
40	190	176	271	9.8	42.6	56.6
36	171	140	216	-19.7	26.3	1.4
22	105	130	200	52.2	90.5	189.9
28	133	146	225	-28.9	69.2	20.3

<i>Deanery, Parish: Chapelry</i>	<i>1548</i>	<i>1548</i>	<i>1551</i>	<i>1551</i>
<i>Unit of Enumeration</i>	<i>Comm</i>	<i>Pop</i>	<i>Comm</i>	<i>Pop</i>
<i>Basis of estimate</i>		<i>×1.33</i>		<i>×1.33</i>
Campten deanery (continued):				
Welford on Avon	N/A	N/A	44	59
Weston on Avon	N/A	N/A	23	31
Weston Subedge	N/A	N/A	80	107
Willersey	N/A	N/A	100	133
Wormington	N/A	N/A	40	53
Cirencester deanery:				
Ampney St Mary	N/A	N/A	40	53
Bagendon	N/A	N/A	40	53
Barnsley	N/A	N/A	93	124
Bibury and Winson	N/A	N/A	80	107
Chedworth	N/A	N/A	160	213
Cirencester	1400	1867	1460	1947
Coates	N/A	N/A	30	40
Coln Rogers	N/A	N/A	36	48
Coln St Dennis	N/A	N/A	41	55
Daglingworth	N/A	N/A	46	61
Driffield	N/A	N/A	60	80
Duntisbourne Abbots	N/A	N/A	72	96
Duntisbourne Rous	N/A	N/A	42	56
Farmington	N/A	N/A	60	80
Hampnett	N/A	N/A	30	40
Harnhill	N/A	N/A	25	33
North Cerney	N/A	N/A	145	193
Northleach and Eastington	400	533	400	533
Preston	N/A	N/A	65	87
Rendcombe	N/A	N/A	61	81
Siddington St Peter	N/A	N/A	24	32
South Cerney	N/A	N/A	160	213
Stowell	N/A	N/A	9	12
Stratton	N/A	N/A	44	59
Dursley deanery:				
Berkeley	1117	1489	1012	1349
Hill	N/A	N/A	100	133
Stone	213	284	100	133
Beverstone and Kingscote	N/A	N/A	240	320
Cam and Stinchcombe	N/A	N/A	460	613
Coaley	N/A	N/A	200	267
Dursley	500	667	460	613

1563 Hhold	1563 Pop × 4.75	1603 Comm	1603 Pop × 1.54	1551/1563	1563/1603 Percentage difference	1551/1603
42	200	220	339	239.0	69.5	474.6
9	43	51	79	38.7	83.7	154.8
24	114	135	208	6.5	82.5	94.4
30	143	120	185	7.5	29.4	39.1
10	48	40	62	-9.4	29.2	17.0
6	29	43	66	-45.3	127.6	24.5
7	33	42	65	-37.7	97.0	22.6
28	133	120	185	7.3	39.1	49.2
49	233	202	311	117.8	33.5	190.7
40	190	200	308	-10.8	62.1	44.6
320	1520	1838	2831	-21.9	86.3	45.4
11	52	60	92	30.0	76.9	130.0
10	48	34	52	0	8.3	8.3
6	29	37	57	-47.3	96.6	3.6
12	57	50	77	-6.6	35.1	26.2
12	57	46	71	-28.8	24.6	-11.3
15	71	67	103	-26.0	45.1	7.3
7	33	70	108	-41.1	227.3	92.9
13	62	52	80	-22.5	29.0	0
9	43	24	37	7.5	-14.0	-7.5
5	23	52	80	-30.3	247.8	142.4
18	86	110	169	-55.4	96.5	-12.4
131	622	443	682	16.7	9.6	28.0
12	57	40	62	-34.5	8.8	-28.7
12	57	72	111	-29.6	94.7	37.0
6	29	60	92	-9.4	217.2	187.5
25	119	261	402	-44.1	237.8	88.7
1	5	10	15	-58.3	200.0	25.0
13	62	160	246	5.1	296.8	316.9
299	1420	1400	2156	5.3	51.8	59.8
41	195	140	216	46.6	10.8	62.4
67	318	190	293	139.1	-7.9	120.3
62	295	233	359	-7.8	21.7	12.2
115	546	620	955	-10.9	74.9	55.8
53	252	330	508	-5.6	101.6	90.3
192	912	523	805	48.8	-11.7	31.3

<i>Deanery, Parish: Chapelry</i>	<i>1548</i>	<i>1548</i>	<i>1551</i>	<i>1551</i>
<i>Unit of Enumeration</i>	<i>Comm</i>	<i>Pop</i>	<i>Comm</i>	<i>Pop</i>
<i>Basis of estimate</i>		<i>×1.33</i>		<i>×1.33</i>
Dursley deanery (continued):				
Lasborough	N/A	N/A	17	23
Newington Bagpath and Owlpen	N/A	N/A	70	93
Ozleworth	N/A	N/A	22	29
Rockhampton	100	133	50	67
Slimbridge	420	560	400	533
Thornbury and Rangeworthy	800	1067	700	933
Oldbury on Severn	260	347	N/A	347
Uley	N/A	N/A	140	187
Wotton-under-Edge	800	1067	400	533
North Nibley	400	533	400	533
Fairford deanery:				
Ampney Crucis	N/A	N/A	130	173
Ampney St Peter	N/A	N/A	40	53
Coln St Aldwyns	106	141	40	53
Down Ampney	N/A	N/A	80	107
Eastleach Martin	N/A	N/A	54	72
Eastleach Turville	N/A	N/A	50	67
Fairford	N/A	N/A	260	347
Hatherop	N/A	N/A	60	80
Kempsford	N/A	N/A	240	320
Lechlade	220	293	200	267
Maiseyhampton	N/A	N/A	120	160
Quenington	N/A	N/A	16	21
Sherborne	N/A	N/A	180	240
Southrop	N/A	N/A	46	61
Forest deanery:				
Abenhall	N/A	N/A	50	67
Awre and Blakeney	N/A	N/A	420	560
Blaisdon	N/A	N/A	100	133
Bromsberrow	N/A	N/A	80	107
Churcham and Bulley	N/A	N/A	340	453
Dymock	480	640	440	587
English Bicknor	N/A	N/A	177	236
Huntley	N/A	N/A	120	160
Kempley	N/A	N/A	80	107
Lea	100	133	60	80
Longhope	N/A	N/A	180	240

1563 Hhold	1563 Pop × 4.75	1603 Comm	1603 Pop × 1.54	1551/1563	1563/1603 Percentage difference	1551/1603
2	10	14	22	-56.5	120.0	-4.3
34	162	120	185	74.2	14.2	98.9
20	95	70	108	227.6	13.7	272.4
28	133	60	92	98.5	-30.8	37.3
101	480	300	462	-9.9	-3.8	-13.3
225	1069	1935	2980	14.6	178.8	219.4
70	333	210	323	-4.0	-3.0	-6.9
30	143	180	277	-23.5	93.7	48.1
115	546	1216	1873	2.4	243.0	251.4
90	428	413	636	-19.7	48.6	19.3
24	114	189	291	-34.1	155.3	68.2
7	33	27	42	-37.7	27.3	-20.8
23	109	131	202	105.7	85.3	281.1
27	128	147	226	19.6	76.6	111.2
14	67	85	131	-6.9	95.5	81.9
9	43	82	126	-35.8	193.0	88.1
27	128	221	340	-63.1	165.6	-2.0
14	67	55	85	-16.3	26.9	6.3
24	114	245	377	-64.4	230.7	17.8
65	309	240	370	15.7	19.7	38.6
32	152	160	246	-5.0	61.8	53.8
10	48	49	75	128.6	56.3	257.1
42	200	200	308	-16.7	54.0	28.3
12	57	50	77	-6.6	35.1	26.2
24	114	89	137	70.1	20.2	104.5
133	632	422	650	12.9	2.8	16.1
35	166	100	154	24.8	-7.2	15.8
30	143	120	185	33.6	29.4	72.9
65	309	298	459	-31.8	48.5	1.3
106	504	400	616	-14.1	22.2	4.9
25	119	206	317	-49.6	166.4	34.3
40	190	150	231	18.8	21.6	44.4
20	95	60	92	-11.2	-3.2	-14.0
29	138	47	72	72.5	-47.8	-10.0
63	299	210	323	24.6	8.0	34.6

<i>Deanery, Parish: Chapelry</i>	<i>1548</i>	<i>1548</i>	<i>1551</i>	<i>1551</i>
<i>Unit of Enumeration</i>	<i>Comm</i>	<i>Pop</i>	<i>Comm</i>	<i>Pop</i>
<i>Basis of estimate</i>		<i>×1.33</i>		<i>×1.33</i>
Forest deanery (continued):				
Lydney	380	507	460	613
Hewelsfield	N/A	N/A	80	107
St Briavels	160	213	170	227
Mitcheldean	268	357	260	347
Newent	500	667	712	949
Pauntley	90	120	60	80
Newland and Bream	800	1067	700	933
Oxenhall	N/A	N/A	90	120
Preston	N/A	N/A	60	80
Ruardean	N/A	N/A	160	213
Rudford	N/A	N/A	70	93
Staunton	N/A	N/A	100	133
Taynton	N/A	N/A	140	187
Tibberton	N/A	N/A	80	107
Tidenham	N/A	N/A	260	347
Lancaut	N/A	N/A	19	25
Upleadon	N/A	N/A	80	107
Westbury-on-Severn	700	933	700	933
Littledean	240	320	200	267
Minsterworth	241	321	227	303
Newnham	170	227	N/A	227
Woolaston	N/A	N/A	120	160
Hawkesbury deanery:				
Alderley	N/A	N/A	126	168
Bitton and Hanham	N/A	N/A	300	400
Boxwell and Leighterton	N/A	N/A	68	91
Charfield	N/A	N/A	100	133
Cold Ashton	N/A	N/A	80	107
Cromhall	N/A	N/A	180	240
Didmarton	N/A	N/A	30	40
Doynton	N/A	N/A	120	160
Dyrham and Hinton	N/A	N/A	180	240
Frampton Cotterell	N/A	N/A	120	160
Great Badminton	N/A	N/A	120	160
Hawkesbury and Little Badminton	420	560	750	1000
Horton	N/A	N/A	160	213
Iron Acton	N/A	N/A	210	280

1563 Hhold	1563 Pop × 4.75	1603 Comm	1603 Pop × 1.54	1551/1563	1563/1603 Percentage difference	1551/1603
105	499	516	795	-18.6	59.3	29.7
20	95	88	136	-11.2	43.2	27.1
49	233	148	228	2.6	-2.1	0.4
92	437	366	564	25.9	29.1	62.5
190	903	550	847	-4.8	-6.2	-10.7
16	76	81	125	-5.0	64.5	56.3
250	1188	858	1321	27.3	11.2	41.6
24	114	120	185	-5.0	62.3	54.2
13	62	48	74	-22.5	19.4	-7.5
54	257	251	387	20.7	50.6	81.7
21	100	82	126	7.5	26.0	35.5
25	119	102	157	-10.5	31.9	18.0
41	195	60	92	4.3	-52.8	-50.8
23	109	48	74	1.9	-32.1	-30.8
40	190)	360	554	-42.5	158.9	48.9
5	24)					
20	95	60	92	-11.2	-3.2	-14.0
162	770	940	1386	-17.5	80.0	48.6
62	295	140	216	10.5	-26.8	-19.1
76	361	320	493	19.1	36.6	62.7
55	261	304	468	15.0	79.3	106.2
48	228	250	385	42.5	68.9	140.6
24	114	80	123	-32.1	7.9	-26.8
130	618	466	718	54.5	16.2	79.5
50	238	100	154	161.5	-35.3	69.2
28	133	108	166	0	24.8	24.8
22	105	126	194	-1.9	84.8	81.3
44	209	242	373	-12.9	78.5	55.4
8	38	23	35	-5.0	-7.9	-12.5
26	124	128	197	-22.5	58.9	23.1
38	181	182	280	-24.6	54.7	16.7
31	147	100	154	-8.1	4.8	-3.8
30	143	110	169	-10.6	18.2	5.6
111	527	560	862	-47.3	63.6	-13.8
38	181	80	123	-15.0	-32.0	-42.3
49	233	185	285	-16.8	22.3	1.8

<i>Deanery, Parish: Chapelry</i>	<i>1548</i>	<i>1548</i>	<i>1551</i>	<i>1551</i>
<i>Unit of Enumeration</i>	<i>Comm</i>	<i>Pop</i>	<i>Comm</i>	<i>Pop</i>
<i>Basis of estimate</i>		<i>×1.33</i>		<i>×1.33</i>
Hawkesbury deanery (continued):				
Little Sodbury	N/A	N/A	70	93
Marshfield	500	667	500	667
Old Sodbury	N/A	N/A	120	160
Chipping Sodbury	440	587	400	533
Oldbury-on-the-Hill	N/A	N/A	70	93
Pucklechurch	N/A	N/A	120	160
Westerleigh	N/A	N/A	280	373
Wick and Abson	N/A	N/A	120	160
Siston	N/A	N/A	80	107
Tormarton and West Littleton	N/A	N/A	100	133
Tortworth	N/A	N/A	172	229
Tytherington	N/A	N/A	160	213
Wapley and Codrington	N/A	N/A	110	147
Westonbirt	N/A	N/A	40	53
Wickwar	N/A	N/A	400	533
Yate	N/A	N/A	240	320
Stonehouse deanery:				
Avening	N/A	N/A	260	347
Rodborough	N/A	N/A	240	320
Bisley	628	837	400	533
Stroud	N/A	N/A	580	773
Brimpsfield	N/A	N/A	77	103
Cherington	N/A	N/A	70	93
Coberley	69	92	50	67
Cowley	N/A	N/A	50	67
Cranham	N/A	N/A	69	92
Eastington	N/A	N/A	234	312
Edgeworth	N/A	N/A	45	60
Elkstone	N/A	N/A	56	75
Frocester	N/A	N/A	120	160
Horsley	N/A	N/A	217	289
King's Stanley	N/A	N/A	140	187
Leonard Stanley	N/A	N/A	263	351
Minchinhampton	500	667	500	667
Miserden	N/A	N/A	89	119
Nymphsfield	83	111	85	113
Painswick	600	800	560	747
Rodmarton	N/A	N/A	160	213

1563 Hhold	1563 Pop × 4.75	1603 Comm	1603 Pop × 1.54	1551/1563	1563/1603 Percentage difference	1551/1603
12	57	80	123	-38.7	115.8	32.3
62	295	563	867	-55.8	193.9	30.0
47	223	146	225	39.4	0.9	40.6
91	432	340	524	-18.9	21.3	-1.7
21	100	60	92	7.5	-8.0	-1.1
22	105	190	293	-34.4	179.0	83.1
28	133	240	370	-64.3	178.2	-0.8
24	114	160	246	-28.8	115.8	53.8
20	95	100	154	-11.2	62.1	43.9
31	147	108	166	10.5	12.9	24.8
42	200	187	288	-12.7	44.0	25.8
43	204	250	385	-4.2	88.7	80.8
28	133	155	239	-9.5	79.7	62.6
13	62	62	95	17.0	53.2	79.2
81	385	200	308	-27.8	-20.0	-42.2
70	333	195	300	4.1	-9.9	-6.3
61	290	240	370	-16.4	27.6	6.6
50	238	115	177	-25.6	-25.6	-44.7
112	532	900	1386	-0.2	160.5	160.0
130	618	903	1391	-20.1	125.1	79.9
16	76	112	172	-26.2	126.3	67.0
21	100	100	154	7.5	54.0	65.6
11	52	66	102	-22.4	96.2	52.2
14	67	95	146	0	117.9	117.9
24	114	93	143	23.9	25.4	55.4
56	266	140	216	-14.7	-18.8	-30.8
19	90	85	131	50.0	45.6	118.3
10	48	70	108	-36.0	125.0	44.0
41	195	210	323	21.9	65.6	101.9
56	266	400	616	-8.0	131.6	113.1
54	257	436	671	37.4	161.1	258.8
47	223	250	385	-36.5	72.6	9.7
134	637	600	924	-4.5	45.1	38.5
19	90	134	206	-24.4	128.9	73.1
17	81	91	140	-28.3	72.8	23.9
142	675	610	939	-9.6	39.1	25.7
19	90	81	125	-57.7	38.9	-41.3

<i>Deanery, Parish: Chapelry</i>	<i>1548</i>	<i>1548</i>	<i>1551</i>	<i>1551</i>
<i>Unit of Enumeration</i>	<i>Comm</i>	<i>Pop</i>	<i>Comm</i>	<i>Pop</i>
<i>Basis of estimate</i>		<i>×1.33</i>		<i>×1.33</i>
Stonehouse deanery (continued):				
Sapperton	N/A	N/A	100	133
Shipton Moyne	N/A	N/A	90	120
Stonehouse	N/A	N/A	280	373
Syde	N/A	N/A	35	47
Tetbury	800	1067	600	800
Winstone	N/A	N/A	50	67
Woodchester	N/A	N/A	120	160
Stow deanery:				
Bledington	N/A	N/A	100	133
Bourton-on-the-Water and Lower Slaughter	123	164	94	125
Broadwell and Adlestrop	N/A	N/A	160	213
Cold Aston	N/A	N/A	48	64
Condicote	N/A	N/A	42	56
Great Barrington	N/A	N/A	130	173
Great Rissington	N/A	N/A	107	143
Guiting Power	N/A	N/A	116	155
Farmcote	N/A	N/A	13	17
Hawling	N/A	N/A	71	95
Hazleton and Yanworth	N/A	N/A	120	160
Little Barrington	N/A	N/A	40	53
Little Compton	N/A	N/A	60	80
Little Rissington	N/A	N/A	80	107
Lower Swell	N/A	N/A	58	77
Naunton	N/A	N/A	80	107
Notgrove	N/A	N/A	40	53
Oddington	N/A	N/A	120	160
Pinnock	N/A	N/A	18	24
Salperton	N/A	N/A	100	133
Shipton Solers	N/A	N/A	30	40
Stow-on-the Wold	340	453	350	467
Sutton under Brailes	N/A	N/A	8	11
Temple Guiting	N/A	N/A	177	236
Turkdean	N/A	N/A	68	91
Upper Slaughter	N/A	N/A	40	53
Upper Swell	N/A	N/A	31	41
Westcote	N/A	N/A	56	75
Widford	N/A	N/A	16	21

1563 Hhold	1563 Pop × 4.75	1603 Comm	1603 Pop × 1.54	1551/1563	1563/1603 Percentage difference	1551/1603
35	166	190	293	24.8	76.5	120.3
26	124	120	185	3.3	49.2	54.2
52	247	284	437	-33.8	76.9	17.2
6	29	36	55	-38.3	89.7	17.0
176	836	600	924	4.5	10.5	15.5
7	33	61	94	-50.7	184.8	40.3
33	157	130	200	-1.9	27.4	25.0
20	95	143	220	-28.6	131.6	65.4
61	290	200	308	132.0	6.2	146.4
38	181	160	246	-15.0	35.9	15.5
9	43	50	77	-32.8	79.1	20.3
8	38	40	62	-32.1	63.2	10.7
30	143	149	229	-17.3	60.1	32.4
23	109	160	246	-23.8	125.7	72.0
20	95)	100	154	-33.7	35.1	-10.5
4	19)					
13	62	40	62	-34.7	0	-34.7
18	86	80	123	-46.3	43.0	-23.1
7	33	62	95	-37.7	187.9	79.2
22	105	116	179	31.3	70.5	123.8
20	95	90	139	-11.2	46.3	29.9
14	67	80	123	-13.0	83.6	59.7
18	86	86	132	-19.6	53.5	23.4
13	62	52	80	17.0	29.0	50.9
24	114	105	162	-28.8	42.1	1.3
3	14	7	11	-41.7	-21.4	-54.2
9	43	40	62	-67.7	44.2	-53.4
4	19	24	37	-52.5	94.7	-7.5
82	390	400	616	-16.5	57.9	31.9
20	95	103	159	763.6	67.4	1345.5
24	114	160	246	-51.7	115.8	4.2
14	67	84	129	-26.4	92.5	41.8
14	67	66	102	26.4	52.2	92.5
7	33	47	72	-19.5	118.2	75.6
10	48	88	136	-36.0	183.3	81.3
3	14	19	29	-33.3	107.1	38.1

<i>Deanery, Parish: Chapelry</i>	1548	1548	1551	1551
<i>Unit of Enumeration</i>	Comm	Pop	Comm	Pop
<i>Basis of estimate</i>		×1.33		×1.33
Stonehouse deanery (continued):				
Windrush	N/A	N/A	60	80
Wyck Rissington	10	13	62	83
Winchcombe deanery:				
Badgeworth	N/A	N/A	300	400
Shurdington	N/A	N/A	33	44
Bishops Cleeve	N/A	N/A	540	720
Stoke Orchard	N/A	N/A	40	53
Cheltenham	600	800	526	701
Charlton Kings	310	413	315	420
Colesbourne	N/A	N/A	60	80
Corse	N/A	N/A	130	173
Deerhurst	N/A	N/A	320	427
Dowdeswell	N/A	N/A	55	73
Elmstone Hardwicke	N/A	N/A	140	187
Hasfield	N/A	N/A	140	187
Hatherley	N/A	N/A	35	47
Leckhampton	N/A	N/A	102	136
Leigh	N/A	N/A	120	160
Prestbury	N/A	N/A	160	213
Sevenhampton	N/A	N/A	140	187
Shipton Oliffe	N/A	N/A	20	27
Staverton	N/A	N/A	50	67
Boddington	N/A	N/A	100	133
Sudeley	N/A	N/A	30	40
Swindon	N/A	N/A	60	80
Tewkesbury	1600	2133	2600	3467
Ashchurch	N/A	N/A	260	347
Forthampton	N/A	N/A	200	267
Oxenton	N/A	N/A	77	103
Tredington	N/A	N/A	49	65
Tirley	N/A	N/A	180	240
Twynning	N/A	N/A	260	347
Whittington	N/A	N/A	53	71
Winchcombe	800	1067	700	933
Withington	N/A	N/A	30	40
Woolstone	N/A	N/A	46	61

1563 Hhold	1563 Pop × 4.75	1603 Comm	1603 Pop × 1.54	1551/1563	1563/1603 Percentage difference	1551/1603
12	57	60	92	-28.8	61.4	15.0
15	71	80	123	-14.5	73.2	48.2
47	223	220	339	-44.3	52.0	-15.3
14	67	37	57	52.3	-14.9	29.5
98	466	520	801	-26.8	41.5	3.6
21	100					
164	779	805	1240	11.1	59.2	76.9
103	489	310	477	16.4	-2.5	13.6
18	86	67	103	7.5	19.8	28.8
39	185	100	154	6.9	-16.8	-11.0
87	413	202	311	-3.3	-24.7	-27.2
8	38	100	154	-47.9	305.3	111.0
40	190	188	290	1.6	52.6	55.1
38	181	130	200	-3.2	10.5	7.0
14	67	55	85	42.6	26.9	80.9
20	95	93	143	-30.1	50.5	5.1
40	190	197	303	18.8	59.5	89.4
54	257	300	462	20.7	79.8	116.9
20	95	125	193	-49.2	103.2	3.2
8	38	66	102	40.7	168.4	277.8
13	62	140	216	-7.0	16.1	8.0
26	124					
10	48	20	31	20.0	-35.4	-22.5
16	76	40	62	-5.0	-18.4	-22.5
396	1881	1600	2464	-45.7	31.0	-28.9
64	304	283	436	-12.4	43.4	25.6
42	200	94	145	-25.1	-27.5	-45.7
21	100	41	63	-2.9	-37.0	-38.8
15	71	48	74	9.2	4.2	13.8
60	285	220	339	18.8	18.9	41.3
58	276	280	431	-20.5	56.2	24.2
13	62	36	55	-12.7	-11.3	-22.5
199	945	862	1327	1.3	40.4	42.2
35	166	121	186	315.0	12.0	365.0
10	48	46	71	-21.3	47.9	16.4

<i>Deanery, Parish: Chapelry</i>	1548	1548	1551	1551
<i>Unit of Enumeration</i>	Comm	Pop	Comm	Pop
<i>Basis of estimate</i>		×1.33		×1.33
Totals:				
A. 284 parishes, unmodified data:	N/A	N/A	48096	64695
B. 284 parishes, plus Aston Somerville, Alvington, Aylburton, Churchdown, 1551-63, unmodified data:	N/A	N/A	48596	65362
C. 284 parishes, plus Acton Turville, Aldsworth, Dodington, Flaxley, Longborough, Kingswood, Siddington St Mary, 1563-1603, unmodified data:	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Those parishes with data missing in or more of the years 1551, 1563 or 1603 are listed below:				
Campden Deanery:				
Aston Somerville	N/A	N/A	40	53
Cirencester Deanery:				
Aldsworth	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Compton Abdale	N/A	N/A	90	120
Siddington St Mary	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Dursley Deanery:				
Frampton on Severn	N/A	N/A	200	267
Kingswood	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Forest Deanery:				
Alvington	N/A	N/A	110	147
Aylburton (chapelry of Lydney)	N/A	N/A	60	80
Flaxley	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Gloucester Deanery:				
Churchdown	283	377	290	387
Hawkesbury Deanery:				
Acton Turville (chapelry of Tormarton)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Dodington	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Stow Deanery:				
Longborough	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Sources:

1548: Maclean, 'Chantry Certificates, Gloucestershire'.

1551: Gairdner, 'Bishop Hooper's Visitation'.

1563: Bodleian Library, Rawlinson MS C 790.

1603: Sheils, 'Survey of the Diocese of Gloucester, 1603'.

1563 Hhold	1563 Pop × 4.75	1603 Comm	1603 Pop × 1.54	1551/1563 Percentage difference	1563/1603 Percentage difference	1551/1603
12403	58958	58265	89663	-8.9	52.1	38.6
12570	59728	N/A	N/A	-8.6	N/A	N/A
12542	59619	58849	90572	N/A	51.9	N/A
8	38	N/A	N/A	-28.3	N/A	N/A
21	100	94	153	N/A	53.0	N/A
N/A	N/A	24	37	N/A	N/A	-69.2
6	29	20	31	N/A	6.9	N/A
N/A	N/A	329	507	N/A	N/A	89.9
40	190	140	216	N/A	6.9	N/A
34	162	N/A	N/A	10.2	N/A	N/A
50	238	N/A	N/A	197.5	N/A	N/A
20	95	100	154	N/A	62.1	N/A
75	356	N/A	N/A	-8.0	N/A	N/A
15	71	46	71	N/A	0	N/A
7	33	40	62	N/A	87.9	N/A
30	143	144	222	N/A	55.2	N/A

Abbreviations:

Comm: 'Houseling people' (1548), Communicants (1603).

Hholds: Households.

Pop: Estimated population.

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.

Gloucester deanery:

The urban parishes in Gloucester city clearly need to be considered separately from the rest of the deanery, for two reasons: a full comparison is possible between the figures from the 1551 visitation and those from the 1548 chantry certificates, and the demographic experience of the county town is clearly very different from the that of the rest of the county. The overall totals for the city parishes suggest a fall in the estimated population of 12.9 per cent from approximately 4,200 to approximately 3,700 between 1548 and 1551, and this can plausibly be explained as the result of the last well-known outbreak of the 'sweat' in 1551. But some of the changes in population estimates are so large (falls of 20.1 per cent in St Mary de Lode parish, of 30.8 per cent in St Nicholas parish, and of 51.5 per cent in St John Baptist parish; a rise of 23.1 per cent in St Michael parish) that we may suspect either scribal errors or a volatile situation in which the demographic experience of various parishes did differ widely. No obvious scribal errors can explain the exceptional rates of change in the above-mentioned four parishes, hence it seems likely that the original data must be assumed to be correct and that there were indeed wide disparities in urban mortality-rates. Equally clearly, Gloucester's demographic situation in the second half of the sixteenth century was buoyant: only two parishes, All Saints and Holy Trinity, experienced falls in population between 1551 and 1563, whilst the overall city population rose by 17.1 per cent in the same period, and by a further 23.7 per cent between 1563 and 1603. Presumably this expansion can be attributed to Gloucester's long-established status as county town, its independence as a county in itself since 1483, the foundation of the new cathedral and diocese in 1541-2, and its prosperity as an industrial and commercial centre astride the junction of the Severn and Warwickshire Avon rivers.³⁷

Elsewhere in Gloucester deanery there was a general fall in population between 1551 and 1563, followed by a recovery in population and its continued growth into the seventeenth century. The only rates of change that appear suspicious in 1551-63 are at Moreton Valence and its chapelry of Whaddon (-52.5 and +58.1 per cent respectively) and at Standish (-66.8 per cent); in 1563-1603 growth-rates appear abnormally high at Randwick (298.8 per cent), a chapelry of Standish. In the case of Moreton Valence and Whaddon, the figure for Moreton Valence itself

in 1563 (20 households, estimated population 95) does seem low in the light of the estimates for 1551 (200) and 1603 (231), and perhaps should be corrected to 30 (estimated population 143).³⁸ Similarly, the 1563 figure for Whaddon (31 households, estimated population 147) seems high by comparison with the estimates for 1551 (93) and 1603 (129), and could be amended to 21, giving a population-estimate of 100. But an alternative suggestion, which avoids two changes in the original data, is that there may have been short-term migrations within the original parish: combining the figures for mother-parish and chapelry (293 in 1551, 242 in 1563, 360 in 1603) leads to far more likely rates of change, viz. -17.4 per cent in 1551-1603, +48.8 per cent in 1563-1603, +22.9 per cent in 1551-1603.³⁹ At Randwick the number of communicants in 1603 (223) may need to be corrected to 123, with a revised population-estimate of 189 and a revised population increase of 119.8 per cent in 1563-1603.⁴⁰ In Standish parish also there may well have been large local migrations within the ancient parish area: two of its chapelries, Hardwicke and Saul, are the only two localities in this deanery to have an overall population-fall between 1551 and 1603.⁴¹

Camden deanery:

Four parishes in this deanery have figures which at face value would suggest considerable population-growth between 1551 and 1563, a most improbable occurrence: these are Bourton-on-the-Hill with Moreton-in-Marsh (150.4 per cent), Preston on Stour (115.0 per cent), Toddington with Stanley Pontlarge (52.2 per cent) and Welford on Avon (239.0 per cent). For Chipping Camden figures exist for both 1548 (600 'houseling people') and 1551 (485 communicants), but it is impossible to decide which is correct - indeed, both may be correct if there was high mortality between 1548 and 1551 - so the lower figure has been used for calculating rates of change.⁴² The estimated rise of 25.0 per cent at Sezincote between 1551 and 1563 is acceptable because it was a very small parish verging on depopulation. The 1551 figure for Bourton-on-the-Hill (100 communicants, estimated population 133) is impossibly low, given the estimates of 333 for 1563 and 539 for 1603 which result in a population-rise between 1551 and 1563 of 150.4 per cent. The 1551 figure (which may perhaps refer only to Bourton, excluding the larger chapelry of Moreton-in-Marsh) should probably be raised to 300, resulting in a population-estimate of 400 and a fall between 1551 and 1563 of 16.8 per cent.⁴³ The impossible 1551 figure of communicants (30) for Preston on Stour doubtless results from miscopying an original *lxxx*, which would yield an acceptable estimate of 107 for 1551 and a fall in population of 19.6 per cent by 1563.⁴⁴ The 1551 number of communicants

at Toddington is confirmed by the 1548 figure, and therefore it is the 1563 figure for households (22) which must be wrong. Probably an original 12 has been misread as 22, a mistake which could as easily occur using roman numerals (*xij* becoming *xxij*) as arabic numerals; adopting this correction and the new estimated population of 57, the consequent fall in population in 1551–1563 is 17.4 per cent. The 1551 number of communicants at Welford on Avon (44) is improbably low in the light of estimates for 1563 (200) and 1603 (339): a minimum correction (which has been adopted) would be 144 communicants, estimated population 192, resulting in a slight rise of 4.2 per cent, but a figure of 244 communicants, producing an estimated population of 325 and a population-decrease of 38.5 per cent, would be entirely plausible.⁴⁵ Allowing for the above corrections, none of the calculated rates of increase for 1563–1603 or 1551–1603 presents any difficulties. Otherwise, I have hesitated to correct the figures for this deanery where high rates of population-decrease between 1551 and 1563, often followed by high rates of population-growth between 1563 and 1603, appear prevalent.

Cirencester deanery:

The three parishes which certainly present problems in this deanery in 1551–63 are Bibury with Winson, North Cerney and Stowell. In Bibury population apparently rose by 117.8 per cent: clearly the 1551 number of communicants at Bibury (80) is too low, given later population-estimates of 233 in 1563 and 440 in 1603, and should probably be corrected to 180, resulting in an estimated population of 240 and a small drop in population by 1563 of 2.9 per cent.⁴⁶ At North Cerney and Stowell there were population-falls of 55.4 per cent and 58.3 per cent respectively between 1551 and 1563: the number of households at North Cerney in 1563 (18) may be understated, and 28 (estimated population 133) could be substituted; but the population was only 169 in 1603 and about 190 in 1650.⁴⁷ Stowell was such a small parish that any absolute change would lead to high rates of change: this also applies to the trebling of Stowell's population in 1563–1603. Again allowing for the argued corrections, only a few of the calculated rates of increase for 1563–1603 or 1551–1603 present any difficulties. The quadrupling of estimated population at Duntisbourne Rous in 1563–1603 is very high: this, together with the preceding fall of 41.1 per cent in 1551–63, supports the need to correct the number of households (7) in 1563. The most likely correction would assume the miscopying a poorly written arabic '9', leading to an estimated population of 43, which would result in a fall of 32.2 per cent in 1551–63 and a rise of 151.2 per cent after 1563. At Harnhill also, population apparently increased nearly three and a half times in 1563–1603, and

probably the reported 52 communicants in 1603, which would result in an estimated population 80, were in error for 32, producing an estimated population of 49 and a more probable population-rise of 113.0 per cent. At Siddington St Peter population more than trebled between 1563 and 1603, but no plausible correction can be suggested: this may perhaps represent suburban development outside Cirencester. (Cirencester was probably growing in prosperity in Tudor times: many of its houses were being rebuilt in stone, and it became a Parliamentary borough in 1571. Since its expansion was restricted by the Abbey estate to the north and north-east and the Oakley estate to the west, extra-mural development could well have been forced into Siddington to the south.)⁴⁸ At Stratton, whose population apparently quadrupled in Elizabeth's reign, the 160 communicants reported in 1603, giving an estimated population of 246, must be wrong since Stratton's population had only reached 143 (30 families) in 1650: probably 160 should be corrected to 60, with a revised population-estimate of 93 and a much more likely rate of increase of 50.0 per cent in 1563–1603.⁴⁹ Finally, at South Cerney population increased by nearly three and a half times: here 261 communicants reported in 1603 probably result from a miscopying of 161, leading to a revised population-estimate of 248 and a revised population-rise of 108.4 per cent.

Dursley deanery:

Two groups of parishes and three other single parishes need consideration in this deanery. The communicants' figure for Hill in 1551 (100), when it was still a chapelry of Berkeley, needs to be added to that for Berkeley (1,012) to produce a closely comparable figure to the 1,117 'houseling people' recorded for Berkeley parish in 1548. Although both Berkeley and Hill were growing between 1548 and 1563, this may well reflect the re-occupation of Berkeley Castle and its estates by the Berkeleys in 1553 after the failure of the Tudor male line and the resulting termination of the 1486 entail on Henry VII's male heirs.⁵⁰ This exceptional event may also explain the rising population at Stone, another chapelry of Berkeley, though there the rise was exaggerated by the faulty 1551 figure of 100 communicants: the 1548 number of 'houseling people' was 213 and the original 1551 number obviously was 200. Taking Berkeley together with its two chapelries, population rose by 10.6 per cent between 1551 and 1563, which in the special circumstances is hardly surprising. Similarly at Thornbury the calculated restoration of population levels between 1548 (estimated 1,414 in 1548, probably 1,280 in 1551) and 1563 (estimated 1,402) probably can be ascribed to the re-occupation of Thornbury Castle and its estate by the Staffords after their restoration

by Queen Mary in 1554.⁵¹ At Dursley the number of households in 1563 (192) seems anomalous, since this produces an estimated population higher than in either 1548–51 (667, 613) or 1603 (805). The only probable corrections are 142 (estimated population 675) or 92 (estimated population 437), and since the manuscript figures in the final manuscript version are given in arabic numerals the latter emendation seems more likely than the former, and is equally feasible as a correction in roman numerals. The 1551 number of communicants at Rockhampton (50) is clearly the result of miscopying *c* as *l*, since there were 100 'houseing people' reported in 1548. The only other parish where error seems probable is Ozeleworth, where the figure for communicants in 1551 (22) is very low and has been corrected to 122. The virtual stagnation of population in the Elizabethan period probably results from the building of Newark Lodge in 1544–56 and the establishment of the surrounding park of 800 acres.⁵²

Only two parishes in this deanery have calculated rates of increase for 1563–1603 which call for comment, Thornbury (178.8 per cent) and Wotton-under-Edge (243.0 per cent). Despite Thornbury's importance as the centre of the Stafford estates and as one of the two major rural market towns in south Gloucestershire, an increase in population of 2.8 times in forty years is not easily explained, and it seems likely that the reported number of communicants in 1603 (1,935) should be corrected to 935, yielding an estimated population of 1,440 and a rate of increase of 34.7 per cent. This slower rate of population-growth is also supported by the number of baptisms in Thornbury which rose from an average of 42 per year in the 1560s to at best 55 per year in normal times in the 1590s, an increase of 31.0 per cent.⁵³ The apparent increase of 3.4 times in Wotton's estimated population, from 546 to 1873, is equally inexplicable: it was a local market town of some importance and in the seventeenth century would become a major clothing centre, but its revival can hardly be dated back to the Elizabethan period.⁵⁴ The figure of 1,216 for communicants in 1603 may therefore be an estimate of total population at that date: significantly, a local historian obviously ignorant of the 1603 ecclesiastical census estimated the population from a muster-roll of 1608 as 1,200.⁵⁵ Nevertheless the deanery was one of only two Gloucestershire deaneries not to experience a fall of population between 1551 and 1563.

Fairford deanery:

Two parishes in this deanery, Coln St Aldwyns and Quenington, have improbably large rises in population between 1551 and 1563. The apparent doubling of population at Coln St Aldwyns resulting from the

1551 figure of 40 communicants is very unlikely: fortunately this can be corrected from the chantry certificate number of 'houseling people' in 1548 (106, estimated population 141) to 90 (an original lxxx, miscopied as xxxx). The resulting estimated population of 120 in 1551 then compares well with 109 in 1563, a drop of 9.2 per cent.⁵⁶ At Quenington the population also apparently doubled in the same period: the number of communicants in 1551 (16) may be a misrendering of 26 or 36, but it was a small parish and may have been experiencing repopulation under the Kingston family as new manorial lords after the dissolution of the Hospitallers in 1540: by 1650 the population had nearly doubled to 143.⁵⁷ Both Fairford and nearby Kempsford display high rates of population-decline between 1551 and 1563 (63.1 and 64.4 per cent respectively) and very high rates of growth between 1563 and 1603 (165.6 and 230.7 per cent respectively), using 'raw data'. In both cases the number of households in 1563 appears too low, probably as a result of the same quite possible scribal error, namely the misreading of an initial '3' as '2' in the arabic numerals used in the 1563 return. Substituting 37 for 27 as the number of households at Fairford produces a revised population estimate of 176, with derived rates of change as -49.3 per cent (1551-63) and +93.2 per cent (1563-1603).⁵⁸ Substituting 34 for 24 as the number of households at Kempsford produces a revised population estimate of 162, with derived rates of change as -49.4 per cent (1551-63) and +132.7 per cent (1563-1603).⁵⁹ Before and after 1563 these rates of change, though still high, are less extreme than those calculated using the original statistics. By 1603 the population of Fairford had at best only regained the level of 1551, whilst Kempsford in 1603 had added less than one-fifth to the 1551 population. At Lechlade, the chantry certificate's 220 'houseling people' probably represents a more accurate figure than the rounded 200 communicants of 1551, but could possibly result from deaths caused by 'the sweat'. In 1563-1603 the increase in population of 2.9 times at Eastleach Turville calls for comment: here the number of communicants (82) in 1603 may perhaps refer to total population, but numbers at Eastleach Turville continued to rise to 185 in 1650.⁶⁰ Overall, Fairford deanery experienced the largest loss of population between 1551 and 1563 of any Gloucestershire deanery.

Forest deanery:

This deanery fairly obviously was less affected by population-decline than most between 1551 and 1563, and several parishes witnessed modest increases in population at this time, between 12.8 per cent and 27.2 per cent, perhaps linked to the prosperity of the local iron industry: another reason may be the prevalence within the Forest of Dean of dispersed

hamlets rather than nucleated villages, which would inhibit the spread of epidemic disease. Overall the local population was stable between 1551 and 1563; consequently only three parishes, with calculated population-increases above 40 per cent, appear suspicious. At Abenhall the 50 communicants of 1551 should probably be corrected to 100 (*c* instead of *l*), resulting in a modest fall of 14.3 per cent by 1563.⁶¹ The apparent high increase in population at Lea between 1551 and 1563 (72.2 per cent) is based partly on a figure of 60 communicants in 1551, which seems low given the 100 'houselyng people' of 1548 and should probably be corrected to 110 (*lx* resulting from a miscopying of *cx*). In addition, the estimated population in 1563 (138) seems out of line with estimates for 1548 (133), 1551 (147 after revision) and 1603 (72), and 29 households in 1563 is perhaps in error for 19, producing a revised population estimate of 90. But the continued population-decline at Lea throughout the Elizabethan period is obviously exceptional in both national and regional terms and is probably the consequence of specific local circumstances.⁶² Finally, at Woolaston the number of communicants in 1551 (120) as it stands produces an apparent population-increase of 42.5 per cent by 1563: it may therefore be a misrendering of 170 (*clxx* miscopied as *cxx*), leading to a revised estimate in 1551 which is virtually the same as the estimated population in 1563. An equally possible emendation to 220 (*ccxx*) would result in an estimated population of 293 and a decrease in population by 1563 of 22.2 per cent.⁶³ The figures for Tidenham with Lancaut also give rise to some doubt, for they imply a large drop in estimated population from 372 in 1551 to 214 in 1563, followed by a rise to 554 in 1603 and a renewed drop to 475 in 1650. The numbers of households in 1563 (40 for Tidenham, five for Lancaut) suggests that Lancaut had roughly one-ninth of the total parish population; this indicates that the figure for Tidenham's communicants alone in 1551 (260) is probably an error for 160, yielding a much more likely total population for Tidenham and Lancaut of 238 in 1551, falling by 10.1 per cent to 214 in 1563. It may well be also that the figure of 360 in 1603 is an estimate of total population, producing a more reasonable rise of 36 per cent between 1603 and 1650.⁶⁴ Given the buoyant demand for iron and the repercussions of this on local labour,⁶⁵ the substantial rise in population in most parishes after 1563 does not appear a problem except perhaps in English Bicknor (166.4 per cent), where there had been a large loss of population before 1563 (49.6 per cent) and the overall rate of change between 1551 and 1603 was not greatly out of line with other local parishes.

Hawkesbury deanery:

This deanery obviously suffered severely between 1551 and 1563, since most of its parishes record falling population during the period: it had a higher loss of population than any other deanery except Fairford. Consequently only six parishes require comment. The original data predicates an impossibly large rise in the population of Hawkesbury with Little Badminton from 420 'houseling people' in 1548 to 750 communicants in 1551. Since in 1563 Little Badminton contained only twelve households compared to 99 in Hawkesbury proper, we cannot explain the large difference by assuming the omission of Little Badminton in 1548; nor can we antedate the depopulation of Little Badminton with its absorption into the expanding Badminton Park. Although the extensive Badminton archives throw little light on the history of either Badminton House or the park in the sixteenth century, when their owners, the Boteler family, were in increasing financial difficulties, it is unlikely that the park was enlarged, or the house rebuilt, before the arrival of the Somerset family in 1612.⁶⁶ The only possible scribal error which would eliminate this large discrepancy is the miscopying of an original *dcccxx* (820) as *ccccxx*, producing an estimated population in 1548 of 1093 compared to 1000 in 1551: this change has therefore been adopted.

At Bitton with Hanham population apparently increased by 54.4 per cent, from 400 to 618, between 1551 and 1563, which seems unlikely given the very moderate rise of 16.2 per cent between 1563 and 1603. The major demographic expansion in this area would only come in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries with the development of the East Bristol and south Gloucestershire coalfields, especially after control of the Kingswood Chase area was wrested from the Crown by local landowners and coalminers after the Civil War.⁶⁷ Both in 1563 and 1603 Bitton was smaller than its chapelries of Hanham and Oldland (55:75 households; 220:246 communicants) and it is probable that the 300 communicants recorded in 1551 refer only to Bitton itself, consequently the number of communicants in 1551 can be revised to at least 600, and the estimated population of Bitton with Hanham and Oldland to at least 800. This revision would replace a very improbable rise in population of 54.4 per cent between 1551 and 1563 with a much more realistic fall of 22.8 per cent. The figures for the combined parishes of Boxwell and Leighterton are especially puzzling: an apparent rise of 161.9 per cent in 1551-63 followed by a fall of 35.2 per cent by 1603. Probably the 50 households reported in 1563 result from a miscopying of 30 in arabic numerals, revising the population-estimate to 143 and the population-rise by 1563 to 36.4 per cent. This smaller rise could well be explained by

the replacement of an absentee monastic landlord, the abbot of St Peter's Gloucester, by resident squires, the Huntleys, lessees of the manor since 1533, whilst the subsequent slow growth in population of 7.7 per cent by 1603 may be attributed to the known conversion by the Huntleys of most of Boxwell parish into parkland surrounding Boxwell Court.⁶⁸

As it stands, the Marshfield figure for households in 1563 (62) yields a large population-fall of 55.8 per cent (1551-63) and a rise of 193.9 per cent between 1563 and 1603, and is probably erroneous; the most plausible correction, arabic numerals being employed in the 1563 return, is 92 (resulting from the reversal of an initial '6'), leading to a revised estimate of 437, a fall in population of 34.5 per cent between 1551 and 1563 followed by a rise of 98.4 per cent from 1563 to 1603. At Old Sodbury the implied rise in population of 39.5 per cent, from 160 to 223, between 1551 and 1563 is particularly improbable when compared to the demographic stagnation for the rest of the sixteenth century and with the 19.0 per cent fall in the same period in the population of the borough of Chipping Sodbury, a chapelry entirely surrounded by the mother-parish of Old Sodbury. The number of communicants in 1551 (120: *cxx*) should therefore be revised to at least 170 (*clxx*: estimated population 227) if not 220 (*ccxx*: estimated population 293); if the latter change were adopted, the fall in Old Sodbury's population between 1551 and 1563 would be 23.9 per cent, only a little above the fall in the population of Chipping Sodbury. Finally, the Westerleigh figure for households in 1563 (28) is probably also understated, producing a population-fall of 64.4 per cent between 1551 and 1563, and perhaps should be corrected to 48, producing a population-estimate of 228 and a revised decrease between 151 and 1563 of 38.9 per cent. Once the Marshfield figure for 1563 has been revised as suggested above, none of the growth-rates between 1563 and 1603 appear unduly large, and the only doubtful trends are at Wickwar, where population fell throughout the second half of the sixteenth century. But Wickwar, despite its renewed market-grant of 1533, was too near the established boroughs of Chipping Sodbury and Wotton-under-Edge to thrive, and the Lords DelaWarr were concentrating their attention more and more on their estates in Kent and Sussex, especially after the extinction of the male line of the DelaWarr family in 1427 and a change from the senior to a junior line of the West family in the mid-sixteenth century.⁶⁹

Stonehouse deanery:

In Stonehouse deanery the parishes which arouse suspicion in the period 1551-63 are Edgeworth and King's Stanley, where there were substantial rises in population (50.0 per cent and 37.4 per cent respectively), whilst

at Rodmarton and Winstone the population-falls were very high (57.7 per cent and 50.7 per cent respectively); the stability of population at Cowley is perhaps also dubious. The 50 per cent increase in Edgeworth's population between 1551 and 1563 is improbable: the 45 reported communicants of 1551 perhaps represent a miscopied 95 (xxxxv instead of lxxxxv), and if so the population in 1551 can be estimated as 127 and the subsequent decline by 1563 as 29.1 per cent.⁷⁰ At King's Stanley also, where was an increase in estimated population of over one-third between 1551 and 1563, either the 1551 or the 1563 estimate, and the underlying original data, must be faulty. Probably the 140 communicants reported in 1551 should have read 240, leading to a population-estimate of 320 and a population-decrease of 19.7 per cent by 1563.⁷¹ The 1551 figure for communicants at Rodmarton (160 – clx) by contrast seems high in relation to estimates from later figures: 140 (cxl) is not a likely correction since 140 was normally rendered by cxxx, and perhaps 109 (cix) is the best correction. This would reduce the estimated population in 1551 to 145 and the fall by 1563 to 37.9 per cent.⁷² The 1563 figure for households at Winstone (7) is low and perhaps results from the miscopying of twelve (*vij* for *xij*) in a draft. But the parish is small and the decrease is only marginally over 50 per cent: the figures have therefore not been changed.⁷³ The apparently unchanged population of Cowley probably results from the miscopying of an original *c* as *l* in 1551, an error that also occurred, as we have already seen, at Abenhall in Forest deanery and at Rockhampton in Dursley deanery: a population of 133 estimated from 100 communicants dropping by one-third to 67 in 1563 and rising to 146 by 1603 is a much more likely scenario.⁷⁴ Finally the population-estimate for Bisley of 837 derived from the 1548 chantry certificate seems preferable to the 533 calculated from the 1551 visitation, unless the implied loss of 36.3 per cent of its population between 1548 and 1551 can be ascribed to the outbreak of the 'sweat' in 1551.⁷⁵ In the Elizabethan period there are some parishes where population more than doubled, notably Bisley with Stroud, Brimpsfield, Cowley, Elkstone, Horsley, King's Stanley, Miserden and Winstone, probably a result of reviving prosperity in the cloth-industry.⁷⁶

Stow deanery:

In Stow deanery, an area of general and high mortality in 1551–63, the obvious anomalies are those places with substantial increases: Bourton-on-the-Water and Lower Slaughter (+132.0 per cent), Little Compton (+31.3 per cent), Upper Slaughter (+26.4 per cent) and, above all, Sutton under Brailes (+763.6 per cent). The only parishes with substantial population-falls, over 50 per cent, are Salperton (67.7 per cent) and

Temple Guiting (51.7 per cent). The apparent doubling of population at Bourton on the Water and Lower Slaughter between 1551 and 1563, and its virtual stagnation thereafter, is difficult to explain. Since the number of communicants in 1551 (94), whilst lower than the number of 'houceling people' in 1548 (123), is of the same order, it is the figure for households in 1563 (61) that must be wrong. The only probable emendations of the arabic numerals in which the final figures for households were expressed are either the reversal of digits to 16 (giving a new estimated population of 76 and new rates of change: -39.2 per cent (1551-63), +242.2 per cent (1563-1603).) or the misreading of the first digit to produce 61 instead of 21 (giving a new estimated population of 100 and new rates of change: -20.0 per cent (1551-63), +208.0 per cent).). In both suggested emendations the rate of change in 1551-63 is quite possible, and in both the rate of change in 1563-1603 is high though not impossibly so. The second set of emendations has been chosen since it presupposes a smaller rate of change both before and after 1563.⁷⁷ The population experience of Little Compton, rising between 1551 and 1563 by 31.3 per cent, also seems anomalous, but the only probable correction is from 60 (lx) to 110 (cx) communicants in 1551: this produces a reasonable population-fall of 28.6 per cent which justifies this correction. The 1551 figure for communicants at Sutton under Brailles (8) is obviously an error, given the estimates of 95 for 1563 and 159 for 1603: the emendation, which involves the minimum scribal change, of viij to ciiij (103) results in an estimated population of 138 in 1551, reduced by 31.2 per cent in 1563.⁷⁸ Finally, at Upper Slaughter, the 1551 estimate of communicants (40 - xl) may well be an error for 60 (lx), yielding a population decrease from 1551 to 1563 of 25.6 per cent, in line with other rates of decrease in this area.⁷⁹ The only parishes with unduly high increases in the period 1563-1603 are Little Barrington (187.9 per cent) and Westcote (183.3 per cent). Both are small parishes which experienced high mortality before 1563 (37.7 per cent and 36.0 per cent respectively) and the only possible emendations would be to treat the data for communicants in 1603 as estimates of total population: since they were small parishes, statistical regularity should not be assumed and therefore the figures have been left unaltered.⁸⁰ Finally, it should be noted that the chantry certificate figure for 'houceling people' at Wyck Rissington (x) clearly must be corrected to lx, in the light of the 62 communicants reported in 1551 which there is no reason to doubt.⁸¹

Winchcombe deanery:

Several parishes in this deanery need to be considered. In the period 1551-63 there are seven places in which population apparently rose by

over 15.0 per cent: Shurdington (chapelry of Badgeworth) (52.3 per cent), Charlton Kings (chapelry of Cheltenham) (16.4 per cent), Hatherley (42.6 per cent), Prestbury (20.7 per cent), Shipton Oliffe (40.7 per cent), Sudeley (20.0 per cent) and Withington (315.0 per cent). In general this situation seems improbable when the deanery had the third highest level of overall mortality in Gloucestershire at this time. The figures for Hatherley, Shipton Oliffe, Shurdington and Sudeley do seem aberrant, but they are all very small places until the late Elizabethan period, in which one would not expect conformity to statistical regularity. The 1551 figures for Charlton Kings (315 communicants) are confirmed by the 310 'houceling people' reported in 1548, so the only possible error appears to lie in the 1563 number of households (103), but no obvious amendment can be suggested and the original data have therefore been retained unaltered. At Prestbury it is the 1551 figure that is probably wrong, since the growth-rate for 1563–1603 is already high, which argues for the figures in both 1563 and 1603 being accurate. If the reported 160 communicants (*clx*) was a miscopying of an original 260 (*cclx*), the new population estimate of 347 and the new calculated decrease of 25.9 per cent are both entirely acceptable.⁸² The Withington figure for 1551 (30 communicants, estimated population 40) is certainly wrong: the estimates for 1563 (166) and 1603 (186) result in an impossible growth-rate of 315 per cent between 1551 and 1563. If we substitute 130 for 30, the 1551 population would become 173, and the difference between 1551 and 1563 would be -4.0 per cent. Besides the above places where apparently rising population leads to doubts about the original data, there are two other instances where the data can be queried. At Tewkesbury the 1551 figure (2,600 communicants, estimated population 3,467) looks high in the light of both the estimates for 1563 (1,881) and 1603 (2,464) and by comparison with the 1546 chantry certificate figure of 2,000 'houceling people' (estimated population 2,660) and the 1548 chantry certificate figure of 1,600 'houceling people' (estimated population 2,133). The latter appears preferable, the 1551 figure being either an understandable mistranscription (*mmdc* for *mdc*) or an estimate of total population.⁸³ With the substitution of the 1548 data, the population-decrease by 1563 is reduced from 45.7 per cent to 11.8 per cent. Dowdeswell presents more serious problems: its population apparently falls before 1563 by 47.9 per cent and rises in the next forty years by 305.3 per cent. Probably the number of households in 1563 should be corrected from 8 to 13, and the estimated population from 38 to 62, assuming either that *xij* in a draft has been miscopied as *vij* or an arabic 13, closely written, has been misread as 8: this would lower the population-decline before 1563 from 47.9 per cent to 15.1 per cent and reduce the increase after 1563 from 305.3 per cent to 148.4 per cent.

Notes

1. My thanks are due to my colleagues for helpful criticisms of a paper read at the Staff Research Seminar in Economic and Social History at the University of Bristol out of which this article has evolved. I am particularly grateful to my friend and former colleague Dr Pam Sharpe for sharing my perverse interest in historical demography and providing informed criticism of my work: her departure to Australia is much regretted. I am indebted to Professor David Palliser of the University of Leeds and Dr Alan Dyer of the University of North Wales, Bangor, for their continued interest and supply of information. 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 Gloucestershire Record Office for their efficient help and courteous attention to my needs. Of course the usual disclaimers apply.
2. J. S. Moore, 'Canterbury Visitations and the demography of mid-Tudor Kent', *Southern History*, 15 (1993), pp. 36–85.
3. The chantry certificates for Gloucestershire in 1548 P[ublic] R[ecord] O[ffice] E 301/22, are printed in J. Maclean, 'Chantry Certificates, Gloucestershire (Roll 22)', *Trans. Bristol and Gloucs. Arch. Soc.*, 8 (1884), pp. 229–308; E. E. Williams, *The Chantries of William Canynge in St Mary Redcliffe, Bristol* (Bristol, 1950), pp. 32–41, tabulates the Bristol City certificates. The 1546 certificates for Gloucestershire (PRO, E 301/21) remain unprinted.
4. The only surviving source for the full text of this visitation is a late seventeenth-century transcript in Dr Williams's Library, London, Morrice MS L (3), printed in J. Gairdner, 'Bishop Hooper's Visitation of Gloucester Diocese, 1551', *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, 19 (1904), pp. 98–121; an early nineteenth-century copy of Morrice MS L (3) is in British Library Add. MS. 21251. The surviving act book for this visitation G[loucestershire] R[ecord] O[ffice], G[loucester] D[iocesan] R[ecords] vol. 5, does not include the full visitation return, but it has probably been dismembered since 1721.
5. Bodleian Library, Oxford, Rawlinson MS. C 790. There is no surviving register for Bishop Richard Cheyney, 1562–79, until 1570 (GRO, GDR Vol. 27A, ff. 1–107), and there is no draft of this return in GRO, GDR Vols 18–20. But the draft survived at Gloucester until at least 1721 when it was copied by Archdeacon Furney, whose transcript is now GRO, D 6755/2/2. The only significant differences between the draft and the final version are as follows: the order of deaneries, and of parishes within deaneries, differs; Little Barrington, Eastleach Turville and Rodmarton are not included in the final version; the figure for Winchcombe (excluding its chapelries) is given as 146 in the draft and as 148 in the final version.
6. BL, Harleian MS. 594, ff. 225r–55v, printed as W. J. Sheils, 'A Survey of the diocese of Gloucester, 1603', *Bristol and Gloucs. Arch. Soc., Records Sec.*, 11 (1976), pp. 68–102. The register of Bishop Godfrey Goldsborough, 1598–1604 (GRO, GDR Vol. 27A, pp. 233–86) contains nothing relating to this visitation.

7. No sixteenth-century 'listings' for Gloucestershire, and only a few lists of communicants, are noted in the 'Guide to the "Listings" Collection of the SSRC Cambridge Group', *Local Population Studies*, 24-37, 1980-86; in 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 incomplete, or in J. Gibson, M. Medlycott, *Local Census Listings, 1522-1930: holdings in the British Isles* (Birmingham, 1992), pp. 21-2.
8. P. Slack, *The Impact of Plague in Tudor and Stuart England* (Oxford, 1985), esp. chaps. 5-6.
9. See references cited in Moore, 'Canterbury Visitations', n. 23.
10. 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* (London, 1983), pp. 34-6; E. A. Wrigley, R. S. Schofield, *The Population History of England, 1541-1871: A Reconstruction* (London, 1981; Cambridge, rev. edn, 1989), 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. T. H. Hollingsworth, *Historical Demography* (London, 1969), pp. 80-4, on the censuses of 1563 and 1603.
11. Wrigley and Schofield, *op. cit.*, pp. 565-6.
12. *Ibid.*, pp. 569-70.
13. R. N. Swanson, *Church and Society in Late Medieval England* (Oxford, 1989), pp. 277, 279.
14. P. Laslett and R. Wall, *Household and Family in Past Time* (Cambridge, 1972, repr. 1974), pp. 47-8, 61, 76, 126, 130-1, 138, 140-4, 169-70, 174-97; R. A. Houlbrooke, *The English Family, 1450-1700* (London, 1984), 10, 18-26; J. S. Moore, 'The Anglo-Norman Family: size and structure', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 14 (1992), pp. 153-96.
15. In 23 parishes in Clacklose hundred in Norfolk in 1557, average household sizes per parish ranged from 4.4 to 6.8, the overall average size being 5.1: calculated from Norfolk RO, Pratt MS. 652. An edition of this document is being prepared by Dr R. A. Houlbrooke, Dr E. V. Morgan and myself for publication in the *Norfolk Record Society* series.
16. Wrigley and Schofield, *op. cit.*, pp. 496 (Table A2.3), 553 (Table 4.1, col. 6).
17. T. Arkell, 'Multiplying Factors for estimating population totals from the Hearth Tax', *Local Population Studies*, vol. 28 (1982), pp. 51-7.
18. See references cited in notes 4-6.
19. Moore, 'Canterbury Visitations', pp. 40-1.
20. The average size of households per parish in England 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. For Clacklose hundred in Norfolk in 1557, see n. 15 above.
21. J. C. Russell, *British Medieval Population* (Albuquerque USA, 1948), 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.
22. A. Whiteman (ed.), *The Compton Census of 1676: a critical edition* (London, 1986), pp. xxix–xxxi, xxxiv–vi, lix, lxix–xxi, lxxv (n. 239), lxxiv–v.
 23. Moore, 'Canterbury Visitations', Tables 1–3.
 24. *Victoria County History* [hereafter VCH] of *Gloucestershire* [hereafter *Glos*], IV (1988), pp. 73–4.
 25. Burials rising to more than twice the preceding five-year annual average are found in 1550 at Broadwell; in 1551 at Adlestrop and Buckland; in 1551 and 1552 at Bristol (St Nicholas), Great Barrington and Horfield; in 1552 at Bristol (Christchurch) and Sandhurst. GRO, P.5/IN/1/1–2; P.36/IN/1/1; P.61/IN/1/13; P.65/IN/1/1; P.281/IN/1/1; Bristol RO, P/Xch/R 1(a); P/StN/R 1(a)–(c).
 26. 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.
 27. The Lincoln diocese return for all the archdeaconries except Stow (BL, Harleian MS 618, ff. 21–39v) and the Worcester diocesan return (BL, Harleian MS 595, ff. 209r–12v) both consistently refer to families despite the erroneous claim that the Lincoln return lists households. G. A. J. Hodggett, *Tudor Lincolnshire* (Lincoln, 1975), pp. 189–99; *cp.* VCH Leics, III, pp. 137–8, 140.
 28. See Moore, 'Canterbury Visitations', notes 38–42, for references to this paragraph.
 29. Wrigley and Schofield, *op. cit.*, p. 208 (Table 7.8).
 30. J. S. Moore, '“Jack Fisher's 'Flu”: a visitation revisited', *Econ. His. Rev.*, 46 (1993), pp. 280–307.
 31. J. S. Moore, 'Demographic dimensions of the Mid-Tudor Crisis' (forthcoming).
 32. 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, 27 (1980), pp. 38–9; R. Humphreys, 'Mortality Crises in Sixteenth-Century Dorking', *Local Population Studies*, 39 (1987), pp. 46–53; G. Mayhew, *Tudor Rye* (Falmer, 1987), pp. 7, 21–3, 44–7, 196–7, 270.
 33. Russell, *op. cit.*, 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, *Historical Demography*, pp. 80, 231; Wrigley and Schofield, *op. cit.*, pp. 563–6, 574–5. Alan Kreider, who has probably examined more chantry certificates than any other scholar since the late Professor Hamilton-Thompson, extols their 'manifest quality' and considers them to be 'usually as accurate ... as possible'. A. Kreider, *English Chantries: the Road to Dissolution* (Cambridge, USA, 1979), pp. 45–6.
 34. Moore, 'Canterbury Visitations', pp. 42–7, 56.
 35. Whiteman (ed.), *Compton Census*, pp. xxv–xxxix, xxxiii–xliv.
 36. Wrigley and Schofield, *op. cit.*, pp. 565–6, 569–70.
 37. VCH *Glos*, IV, pp. 73–92, esp. pp. 73–4. Professor Clarke incorrectly totalled the 'houseling people' as 3,339, and did not consider the 1551 returns at all.

38. Dr Elrington did not comment on the sixteenth-century population fluctuations at Moreton Valence. *VCH Glos*, X (1972), p. 208, and does not mention the number of households in 1563.
39. Whaddon may not originally have been a chapelry of Moreton Valence, though it had been linked with Moreton since the twelfth century. *VCH Glos*, X, pp. 208–9, 211, 213.
40. But in 1650 there were 100 families, i.e. c. 450–500 people, in Randwick, so the 1603 figure may be correct. *VCH Glos*, X, p. 225.
41. Dr Elrington also thought the figure of 100 communicants for Hardwicke ‘too low’, and demonstrated that Saul’s population was falling in the later sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. *VCH Glos*, X, pp. 159, 180.
42. C. Whitefield, *A History of Chipping Campden* (Eton, 1958), pp. 80–1, regarded 600 ‘houseing people in 1548 as ‘rather lower than one would expect’ (why is not stated) but reported 485 communicants in 1551 without comment.
43. Dr Elrington did not comment on the sixteenth-century population statistics for either Bourton or Moreton, but it is clear that Moreton was consistently larger than Bourton and was growing faster after 1563. *VCH Glos*, VI (1965), pp. 198, 242.
44. Dr Elrington and Dr Herbert did not comment on the large discrepancy between 30 communicants in 1551 and 18 households in 1563, but regard the 1603 figure as ‘likely to be an exaggeration’ since there were 24 families in 1650. *VCH Glos*, VIII (1968), p. 82.
45. Dr L. F. Salzman did not touch on population in his account of Welford. *VCH of Warwickshire* [hereafter *Warws*], V (1949), pp. 189–93.
46. Dr Jurica failed to comment on the disparity between the 1551 and 1563 figures, though he did note the considerable rise in the period 1563–1603. *VCH Glos*, vol. VII, p. 26.
47. *VCH Glos*, VII, p. 152.
48. W. St C. Baddeley, *A History of Cirencester* (Cirencester, 1924), chap. XX; R. Reece, C. Catling, ‘Cirencester: the development and buildings of a Cotswold Town’, *British Archaeological Reports, British Series*, 12 (1975), pp. 15–6.
49. C. R. Elrington, ‘The Survey of Church Livings in Gloucestershire, 1650’, *Trans. Bristol & Glos. Arch. Soc.*, 83 (1964), p. 94.
50. H. P. R. Finberg, *Gloucestershire Studies* (Leicester, 1957), pp. 152–4.
51. *Calendar of Patent Rolls, 1553–1554* (London, 1937), pp. 483–4.
52. N. W. Kingsley, *The Country Houses of Gloucestershire*, I, 1500–1660 (Cheltenham, 1989), pp. 138–40.
53. Calculated from GRO, P 330/IN/1/1.
54. E. S. Lindley, *Wotton under Edge: Men and Affairs of a Cotswold Wool Town* (London, 1962), pp. 100–4, 124, 265–9, 287–94, 298–303, 310–11, despite its sub-title is an antiquarian work with very little analysis of the cloth industry, but its studies of the mills suggests that prosperity only became evident after 1600. The second half of the sixteenth century was a period of depression in the local cloth industry, revival beginning only in the late 1590s. R. Perry, ‘The Gloucestershire Woollen Industry, 1100–1690’, *Trans. Bristol & Glos. Arch. Soc.*, 66 (1947), pp. 73–137; J. Tann, *Gloucestershire*

- Woollen Mills (Newton Abbot, 1967), pp. 29–30; K. G. Ponting, *The Woollen Industry of South-West England* (Bath, 1971), chaps. 3–5; J. de L. Mann, *The Cloth Industry in the West of England from 1640 to 1880* (Oxford, 1971), pp. xii–viii.
55. Lindley, *op. cit.*, p. 53. By 1712 population had nearly trebled since 1608, suggesting considerable growth and prosperity after 1600.
 56. Dr Jurica noted the discrepancy between the 1548 and 1551 figures without comment. *VCH Glos*, VII, p. 46.
 57. *VCH Glos*, VII, p. 123, where Dr Jurica did not directly comment on ‘only c. 16 communicants in 1551’.
 58. Dr Jurica did not directly comment on ‘only 27 households’ in 1563, but noted the continued rise in population to 475 in 1650. *VCH Glos*, VII, p. 73.
 59. Dr Herbert commented on the 24 households in 1563 [this] figure looks too small to be accurate’, and noted the continued rise in population to 285 in 1650. *VCH Glos*, VII, p. 98.
 60. *VCH Glos*, VII, p. 62. Dr Herbert omitted the household data for 1563.
 61. Dr Jurica did not comment on the figure of 50 communicants. *VCH Glos*, V, p. 94.
 62. Nothing relevant to the apparent decline in the population of Elizabethan Lea is to be found in J. Duncomb, *Collections towards a History of Herefordshire*, II, pt. ii (bound with III, ed. W. H. Cooke, London, 1882), pp. 398–401, unless the unified ownership of the Hamelin family was a factor.
 63. Mr Smith commented, ‘The population was more stable than the figures suggest’, noting the 49 families (estimated population 233) in 1650. *VCH Glos*, X, p. 104: the number of reported communicants in 1603 (250) may well therefore be an estimate of total population.
 64. Dr Herbert did not comment on the sixteenth-century figures for Tidenham, and omitted the figures for Lancut in 1551 and 1563, but noted a rise in population to 475 in 1650. *VCH Glos*, X, p. 61.
 65. H. R. Schubert, *History of the British Iron and Steel Industry from 450 BC to AD 1775* (London, 1957), chaps. IX–XII, esp. pp. 176–9, 183–8, 192. C. E. Hart, *The Industrial History of Dean* (Newton Abbot, 1971), chap. 1, esp. pp. 7–8. The demand for iron at Bristol in the mid-sixteenth-century was so buoyant that local production had to be supplemented by Spanish imports which were resold throughout the Bristol region, the West Midlands and S. Wales. J. Vanes (ed.), ‘The Ledger Book of John Smyth’, *Bristol Rec. Soc.*, 28 (1974), *passim*, and even in the Forest of Dean. *ibid.*, pp. 32, 40, 84, 262–3, 289. Imports of Spanish iron continued on a reducing scale until 1594 but by 1598 had finally been superseded by ‘iron of Wales’. J. Vanes (ed.), ‘Documents illustrating the overseas trade of Bristol in the Sixteenth Century’, *Bristol Rec. Soc.*, 31 (1979), pp. 21, 38, 101, 124, 130, 135, 146–8.
 66. Kingsley, *op. cit.*, pp. 53–5.
 67. R. W. Malcolmsen, “‘A set of ungovernable people’: the Kingswood colliers in the eighteenth century”, in J. Brewer and J. Styles eds, *An Ungovernable People* (London, 1980), esp. pp. 89–91, deals with the exploitation of Kingswood Chase after 1660; J. S. Moore, ‘Rural Housing in the North Bristol

- Region, 1600–1750', in M. Baulant *et al.*, *Inventaires apres-decès et ventes de meubles. Apports à une histoire de la vie économique et quotidienne (XIVe-XIXe siècle)* (Louvain, Belgium, 1988), pp. 197–202, outlines the economic and demographic background of the area.
68. Kingsley, *op. cit.*, pp. 205–6; by 1601 500 acres of the Boxwell demesne already consisted of closes, with a further 195 acres in the two open fields. GRO D 48/M 2.
 69. Finberg, *op. cit.*, p. 68, n. 1; V. Gibbs and H. A. Doubleday, *The Complete Peerage*, IV (London, 2nd edn, 1916), pp. 139–62.
 70. Dr Sheils did not comment on the sixteenth-century figures, but the reported 22 families in 1650 (estimated population 105) suggests at best stagnating population which has continued to the present day. *VCH Glos*, XI, p. 42.
 71. Dr Herbert did not comment on the discrepancy between the figures for 1551 and 1563, but did note 'a rapid increase in population' after 1563, continuing into the seventeenth century and beyond, based on the growth of the cloth industry. *VCH Glos*, X, p. 245.
 72. Dr Jurica did not comment on the discrepancy between the figures for 1551 and 1563 and did not cite the number of communicants in 1603: there was a rapid rise to 227 people in c. 1628. *VCH Glos*, XI, p. 236.
 73. Dr Sheils did not cite the number of communicants in 1551 or 1603 and therefore failed to note the discrepancy with the number of households in 1563: the 21 reported families in 1650 (estimated population 100) tends to confirm the estimated population of 94 in 1603. *VCH Glos*, XI, 147.
 74. Dr Jurica did not comment on the apparently stable population implied by the figures for 1551 and 1563: population-growth continued until 1650. *VCH Glos*, VII, pp. 193–4.
 75. According to Dr Herbert 'Estimates of 628 communicants in 1548 and c. 400 in 1551 largely invalidate each other' (*sic*), though the population-estimates from the 1551 and 1563 data are virtually identical; he failed to cite the number of communicants in 1603, but rapid population-growth continued in the seventeenth century. *VCH Glos*, XI, p. 10.
 76. Perry, *op. cit.*, Ponting, *op. cit.*, chaps. 3–5; Tann, *op. cit.*, pp. 28–36; Mann, *op. cit.*, pp. xii–viii; *VCH Glos*, VII, p. 216; X, pp. 122, 251–2; XI, 3, 22–9, 120–30, 180–1.
 77. Dr Elrington did not comment on the discrepancy between the communicants' figures for 1548–51 and the number of households at Bourton in 1563, but did comment that 'the population remained static until the mid-17th century'. *VCH Glos*, VI, p. 37. He erroneously attributed the 94 communicants of 1551 solely to Lower Slaughter, where he wrongly thought that 'population had fallen again by 1650': on his own figures it had doubled between 1563 and 1650, *ibid.*, p. 129.
 78. Dr L. F. Salzman did not touch on population in his accounts of Little Compton and Sutton under Brails. *VCH Warus*, V, pp. 50–2, 157–9.
 79. Dr Elrington's only comment on population was that 'in the late sixteenth century it rose by half or more'. *VCH Glos*, VI, p. 135.
 80. At Westcote in 1650 25 families yield a population estimate of 119, *ibid.*, p. 173: either population had fallen since 1603 or the 1603 figure for communicants refers to total population.

81. Dr Elrington accepted the figure of 62 communicants in 1551 and did not mention the 1548 chantry certificate figure, *ibid.*, p. 114.
82. Dr Elrington did not comment on the discrepancy between the communicants' figures for 1551 and the number of households in 1563: the reported 60 families in 1650 (estimated population 285) suggest considerable population-decline since 1603, *VCH Glos*, VIII, p. 70, when the figure of 300 for communicants may therefore refer to total population.
83. Dr Elrington noted 'the various estimates ... of communicants' and commented 'The lowest figure has the look of most accuracy', *ibid.*, p. 120).