

# AN ELIZABETHAN CENSUS

JULIAN CORNWALL

CONSPICUOUS amongst the innovations made in the art of government by the Tudor sovereigns and their servants is the diligence with which they essayed to appease their appetite for reliable facts relating to the condition of the body politic. The idea of a statistical survey was by no means new, as witness "Domesday Book", that great compilation beside which the inquiries of sixteenth-century statesmen appear tentative and disjointed. Yet for more than four centuries English rulers made virtually no attempt to emulate the all-embracing inquisitiveness of the Conqueror; indeed, until the taking of the first census in 1801, there was no single undertaking of comparable magnitude. During the Middle Ages scant regard was paid to accuracy: the medieval attitude to numbers was mystical rather than statistical. Tudor statesmen had neither the time nor the inclination to be mystics. Society was changing rapidly, and the problems of government becoming daily more complex. The history of Parliamentary taxation from 1512 to 1527 illustrates strikingly the manner in which government was handicapped through lack of facts. A subsidy of £160,000 voted in 1514 realised only £48,085, and two further imposts produced a total that was still substantially short of the target.<sup>1</sup> In preparation for the demands to be made of the Parliament of 1523, Cardinal Wolsey, without disclosing his purpose, caused a survey of men and harness to be made in the summer of 1522, in which the value of every man's lands and goods was recorded, probably with considerable accuracy. Unfortunately, only fragments of this valuable survey survive,<sup>2</sup> but from these it is clear that even in the subsidy of 1524-5, which was levied with unwonted rigour, not only were the assessments in many cases unrealistic, but also that there was widespread evasion or scaling-down.<sup>3</sup>

The uses to which the replies to seemingly innocent inquiries could be put, as in the case of the Survey of 1522, meant that other attempts to ascertain the real state of the kingdom provoked suspicion and hostility, but the opportunity could be taken when the situation was favourable of introducing measures of this type. Thus after the crushing of the Pilgrimage of Grace the temporary absence of any kind of organised opposition made it possible to begin the registration of births, deaths and marriages in 1538.

At the outset of the reign of Elizabeth I, 1558, the state of the country was about as bad as it could possibly be. Thanks to successive political, religious and economic upheavals, disorder was rife, and, in addition to the fruitless war with France and the threat of encirclement resulting from the French ascendancy in Scotland, the prospect of civil strife was not remote. Reformation and Counter Reformation had divided the country into antagonistic religious groups. The suppression of the monasteries and secularisation of their property,

together with the enclosures of common land and eviction of peasants, and the beginnings of an industrial revolution had drastically changed the distribution of wealth, and had been the prime cause of at least two rebellions within a quarter of a century. And to crown all, years of improvident and inefficient government had borne fruit in the shape of a bankrupt treasury and a coinage so debased that economic life was nearly at a standstill. Fortunately, the young queen chose as her ministers men of ability and, for the most part, of moderate views. Of these, the most influential was the patient, methodical Sir William Cecil, who, as Secretary of State, made it his object to "study and digest" every aspect of the nation's life and business.<sup>4</sup> The facts and figures which he obtained through diligent local inquiries served to control the alarmist reports and prognostications of popular preachers and pamphleteers.

The Church, which, in the system of episcopal and archidiaconal visitations, possessed both the machinery and a strong tradition of inquiry, had its own occasions for stock-taking. After thirty years of reformation and spoliation, the true condition of the ecclesiastical body was an unknown quantity. Doctrine and ritual were, of course, diverse; but on the practical plane one of the most serious matters was the establishment of clergy. During the two previous reigns many priests had fled overseas or had been deprived of their livings on account of their opinions; and in 1559 perhaps as many as 1,000 had been removed for refusing the oath of supremacy.<sup>5</sup> At all events, many parishes had been left without a clergyman, resident or non-resident.<sup>6</sup> In 1560 Archbishop Parker made a thorough inquiry amongst his bishops respecting the state of their dioceses. This revealed serious deficiencies: Cox of Ely, for example, reported that of 152 cures only a third were duly served.<sup>7</sup> Clearly, an establishment in so defective a state was extremely vulnerable to attack.

In 1563 came the first wave of the Puritan counter-attack on the settlement of 1559. In Parliament, after the failure of an attempt to enact penal laws against Papists,<sup>8</sup> they seized upon and drastically intensified a government measure "against those that extol the power of the Bishop of Rome, and refuse the oath of allegiance".<sup>9</sup> In Convocation, the first of the Church of England, where they concentrated their main effort, the extremists "only just failed to carry a series of Articles wholly at variance with what had been laid down in the Ornaments Rubric of 1559".<sup>10</sup> On the positive side, this assembly framed the Thirty-nine Articles, while the House of Commons was giving short shrift to a Bill—probably the work of Cecil—intended to improve the incomes of clergy in the smaller parishes; no doubt because taxation and the tithes of lay impropiators would be involved. The intention was that the priests of parishes of at least 200 people were to receive at least 20 marks a year, those of at least 400 people, £20, those of at least 600, 40 marks, and so forth.<sup>11</sup>

Parliament was prorogued in April to meet again in October<sup>12</sup>; in fact, it was not re-convened until 1566.<sup>13</sup> None the less, it is possible that Cecil expected an early resumption, and made preparations to reintroduce the Bill by arming himself with reliable statistics, for it was the Privy Council which that summer addressed letters to all bishops ordering them to survey their dioceses as speedily and apparently as secretly as possible.<sup>14</sup>

The letter to the Bishop of London<sup>15</sup> sought the following information:

1. The names of the counties into which the diocese extended.
2. Into what archdeaconries and deaneries it was divided.
3. Particulars of any peculiar or exempt jurisdictions within it.
4. The number of parish churches in each division which had parsons, vicars or curates; which large parishes containing chapels of ease had or should have had curates for them; how many such chapels there were in each parish, and the names of the townships or hamlets in which they were situated.
5. The number of households in each parish or chapelry.

The same facts were to be obtained from the holders of peculiar jurisdiction and returned with the rest of the diocese. The bishop was bade make reply by the bearer of the missive, or within two or three days. Should he not have all the information to hand, he was to send immediately what he could, and the remainder as soon as possible.

According to Dixon,<sup>16</sup> "suspicion was aroused by these demands: the alienation of chapelries and places exempt was thought to be intended; for it was with regard to these foundations that the inquisition was most inquisitive". This is not surprising, seeing that notwithstanding the Settlement the government had "pressed on with squeezing the bishops out of their temporal lands into spiritualities, i.e., making them exchange fat manors for tithes".<sup>17</sup> The present survey could well be a further move in this game, while at the same time the laity, especially the impropiators of rectorial tithes, must have been keenly aware of the threat to their pockets. After all, for thirty years wealth had been flowing from church to laity, and habits once formed are hard to change. But whatever the reasons—probably because the returns were almost certainly made piecemeal—none of the surviving documents entirely fulfils requirements. While those for Canterbury and Bangor record the status of each cure and the number of families within it, Bath and Wells and Chichester furnish only the former, while St. Asaph gives the names of incumbents and states which are resident.<sup>18</sup>

The return for the diocese of Lincoln is contained in a single folio volume (British Museum, Harleian MS. 618). It is undated, but is assigned to the year 1563 in the catalogue,<sup>19</sup> and like others was probably made in July or August of that year. It contains the divisions of the diocese, namely, archdeaconries, rural deaneries, parishes, chapelries and hamlets, with the number of families in each of the last three. The status of the livings is noted in some archdeaconries—not Buckingham—but the only other reference to clergy is in the names of archdeacons. There is also an appendix containing parishes under exempt jurisdiction, but none in Bucks. is given. The archdeaconry of Buckingham occupies twelve pages, folios 27–32v.

While nearly all the ancient parishes of the county are represented, several are wanting for one reason or another, or none that is apparent.<sup>20</sup> Ibstone, Stokenchurch and Lillingstone Lovell were in the diocese and county of Oxford. Monks Risborough and Halton formed Risborough Deanery, a peculiar of Canterbury from which the requisite particulars had evidently not been obtained. On the other hand, parishes within the jurisdiction of the Bishop of London—Winslow, Granborough, Little Horwood and Aston Abbots—are all included. The fact that Eton was a collegiate church, Whaddon belonged to

New College, Oxford, and Towersey was a chapel appendant to Thame may have entailed procedural delay in getting returns for these places. But although Wing and Wingrave had formerly belonged to the Abbey of St. Albans, they had never been under exempt jurisdiction and the absence of returns is inexplicable, as is also the case with Great Brickhill, Beachampton and Gayhurst. Similarly, although one of the chapelries of Olney—Warrington—is recorded, the other—Weston Underwood—is not. Tattenhoe appears as a hamlet of the “parish” of Hollingdon, although taxed as a separate parish in 1291<sup>21</sup>; while Hollingdon itself has never been anything but a hamlet of Soulbury. The small parish of Grove may well have been without priest or people.<sup>22</sup> Of the important medieval chapels mentioned in the article on ecclesiastical history in the *Victoria County History*, eleven do not feature in the returns,<sup>23</sup> and may be assumed to have been dispensed with.

Whatever the defects of these returns, they are valuable for the light they shed on the obscure problem of population, “the least studied, the most uncertain and difficult subject”<sup>24</sup> in the history of the period. In recent years considerable attention has been given to the problems of medieval demography. The most comprehensive approach is that of Professor J. C. Russell,<sup>25</sup> who has attempted to trace the history of the population from the eleventh to the sixteenth century, on the basis principally of the Domesday Survey of 1086 and the Poll Tax Returns of 1377. In the case of the former, he rejects the traditional conception of a family unit of five persons in favour of one of 3·5, by which figure he multiplies every recorded layman to arrive at the gross population.<sup>26</sup> Recently, however, Dr. J. Krause has severely criticised Russell’s thesis, and, if not finally proving the validity of the family of five persons, has at least demolished the arguments against it. His preference for a factor somewhere between 4·5 and 5 finds confirmation in another recent study<sup>28</sup> in which the average size of peasant families in thirteenth-century Lincolnshire is shown to be 4·68 persons. Support is also forthcoming from the tables of population drawn up by Gregory King in 1688,<sup>29</sup> and computing the number of families and heads per family in each class of society. The average of those classes which might be considered as mainly rural<sup>30</sup> is 4; 4·5 if the numerous class of “cottagers and paupers” be omitted on the ground that in earlier times it was probably far from being the large, well-defined unit it had become by the late seventeenth century. The tables also indicate that 38 per cent of the population was under 15 years of age.<sup>31</sup>

The Poll Tax Returns of 1377 accounted in theory for every person aged 14 and over. To obtain a figure for the gross population, Russell increases this total by one-half,<sup>32</sup> but since the basis of this calculation is similar to that of the rejected family unit of 3·5, the result should be treated as a minimum only. Finally, his estimates of the ratio of population increase from 1377 to 1545, founded upon the worthless evidence of a handful of Chantry Certificates,<sup>33</sup> may safely be disregarded.

By Russell’s reckoning, the 5,554 persons recorded in Buckinghamshire in 1086 represent a total population of 19,439,<sup>34</sup> and the 24,672 taxpayers of 1377 a total of 37,008.<sup>35</sup> But the use of a multiplier of 4·75 raises the former to a total of 26,382, while the latter should possibly be as high as 40,000. These figures,

though by no means definitive, form the starting point for considering the evidence as to the population of the county in the sixteenth century.

The primary source, inexplicably ignored by Russell, is the "census" which forms the main topic of this paper. This gives an estimate of the number of families in each parish. For the eleven parishes which are missing an estimate has been made based upon the figures given for parishes which contained comparable numbers of taxpayers in the Subsidy of 1524-5.<sup>36</sup>

<i>Deanery</i>							<i>Number of Families</i>
Buckingham	..	..	..	..	..	..	1,074
Beachampton (est.)	..	..	..	..	..	..	21
Luffield (est.)	..	..	..	..	..	..	3
							<hr/> 1,098
Mursley	..	..	..	..	..	..	1,146
Wing (est.)	..	..	..	..	..	..	50
Wingrave (est.)	..	..	..	..	..	..	50
							<hr/> 1,246
Newport	..	..	..	..	..	..	1,433
Great Brickhill (est.)	..	..	..	..	..	..	50
Gayhurst (est.)	..	..	..	..	..	..	16
Weston Underwood (est.)	..	..	..	..	..	..	42
							<hr/> 1,541
Waddesdon	..	..	..	..	..	..	764
							<hr/> 764
Wendover	..	..	..	..	..	..	1,251
Towersey (est.)	..	..	..	..	..	..	25
							<hr/> 1,276
Burnham	..	..	..	..	..	..	1,290
Eton (est.)	..	..	..	..	..	..	65
							<hr/> 1,355
Wycombe	..	..	..	..	..	..	913
							<hr/> 913
Monks Risborough and Halton (est.)	..	..	..	..	..	..	57
							<hr/> 57
TOTAL	..	..	..	..	..	..	<hr/> 8,250

8250, families  $\times$  4.75 = 39,188 persons.

To control this we have the survey of men and harness of 1522<sup>37</sup> and the Subsidy Rolls of 1524-5. The latter return contains a total of 7,987 persons, an estimate having been made by the editors to cover the defective schedule for the three hundreds of Aylesbury; five parishes, Turweston, Edgcott, Foscott, Cholesbury and Hawridge, are wanting. A name-by-name comparison of the equivalent documents for the county of Rutland, 1522-5,<sup>38</sup> shows that, of the total number of persons recorded, not more than 70 per cent occur in the 1524 subsidy return, nor 63 per cent in that of 1525. Although I have only had the opportunity of taking a sample of a few parishes,<sup>39</sup> the results are so uniform with the pattern in Rutland that it is reasonable to make at least a provisional

correction of the Buckinghamshire subsidy rolls. This should in theory give the total number of males aged 16 and over residing within the country. A very small number of women, nearly all widows, occur, but are insufficient to make any material difference. It is assumed that within the brief period covered—June, 1522, April, 1524, and January, 1525—deaths and removals would not only not be numerous, but would also be compensated by new entrants to the age group.

<i>Hundred</i>	<i>Taxpayers</i>	<i>Corrected Total of Adult Males</i>
Aylesbury, 1525 (est.)	1,565 × $\frac{100}{63}$	2,484
Ashendon, 1524	1,165 × $\frac{100}{70}$	1,664
Buckingham, 1524	723 × $\frac{100}{70}$	1,023
Chiltern, 1524	1,911 × $\frac{100}{70}$	2,730
Cottesloe, 1525	915 × $\frac{100}{63}$	1,452
Newport (except Newport Pagnell), 1524	1,635 × $\frac{100}{70}$	2,336
Newport Pagnell	73 × $\frac{100}{63}$	116
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7,987</b>	<b>11,805</b>
Add for five small parishes missing		45
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>11,850</b>

We may add the same number for adult women, and 40 per cent of the whole for children under 16, which results in a grand total of not less than 39,500 persons living in the county in 1522-5. A similar computation in the case of Sussex shows 11,882 taxpayers<sup>40</sup> representing 56,580 inhabitants, while in Rutland the actual total of 2,174 males produces a population of 7,248. In every case this total is little more, if not less than the poll tax population as computed by Professor Russell<sup>41</sup> — Bucks., 37,008; Sussex, 54,292; Rutland, 8,991. Suffolk shows a large discrepancy, viz., 93,843 in 1377, as against roughly 81,000 in 1522-5.<sup>42</sup>

To sum up for Bucks., the history of the population would appear to be as follows:<sup>43</sup>

1	2	3	4
1-86	1377	1522-5	1563
26,382	37,008	39,500	39,188

All these figures are open to criticism. In the case of the Domesday population, it may well be incorrect to treat all the serfs as householders. As to the second and third figures, the tax lists from which they derive may be defective by reason of evasion, although the combination of survey and subsidy in 1522-5 should produce a tolerably realistic total. The estimate of children as one-third of the population of 1377 is almost certainly a minimum figure.

If the ecclesiastical survey of 1563 was in furtherance of a move to increase clerical stipends, then so far as the laity, who would have had to foot the bill, was concerned, there was good reason for understating the population. On the other hand, it may be objected that since it was made through the ecclesiastical machinery the returns were likely to have been made by the parish clergy, i.e., the very persons whose interest it would be to achieve the greatest possible totals. But we know neither who was responsible locally for furnishing the information nor whether the figures were in fact new: they could easily enough have been taken from some earlier visitation record. What is certain is that they are too low; Buckinghamshire excepted, they fall short of Russell's conservative estimates for 1377:

<i>County</i>	<i>Population, 1377</i>	<i>Families, 1563</i> × 4.75 =	<i>Population, 1563</i>
Buckinghamshire	37,008	8,193	39,188
Bedfordshire	30,508	5,700	27,075
Hertfordshire	29,962	3,543	16,829
Huntingdonshire	21,243	4,262	20,245
Leicestershire	50,748	9,164	43,529

In the case of Buckinghamshire, the figure, which has been corrected to make good missing parishes, is not entirely unacceptable. It matches the 1522-5 figure of 39,500. A great effort had been made to ensure the completeness of these earlier returns, and although no one list can be considered perfect, taken together it is likely that they offer something approaching the truth as regards the adult male population. Their weakness lies, as we have said, in the uncertainty in computing the number of persons aged under 16. Is the lack of growth in the forty years following this date acceptable? The answer to this is part of the wider question of population trends.

Given that the population of the county in 1522-5 was really 39,500, it had grown by 7 per cent since 1377, probably much less; in other words, it was very nearly stationary. Bearing in mind that these years were not the first of the booming Elizabethan Age but the last of the waning Middle Ages, this picture is not unconvincing, for although one would naturally look for a marked increase in a century and a half—and Professor Russell on slight evidence states this to be the case<sup>44</sup>—the economic evidence according to Professor Postan,<sup>45</sup> points to a declining population as the corollary to the general picture of recession in the fifteenth century. Food prices were generally low; “wages were rising throughout the greater part of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries in

a manner too uniform and continuous to be wholly fortuitous"; the purchasing power of wages in terms of wheat rising by 220 per cent between 1300 and 1480.<sup>46</sup> If this be so, at what date did the population cease to fall and begin again to rise? There is no evidence on this point. We can only say that during the reign of Henry VIII prices and rents began to rise, helped by monetary inflation, while wages remained nearly unchanged, a fact which points unmistakably to a growing labour force. The end of the first quarter of the century approximately coincides with this change. Under such circumstances, the hypothetical figure of 39,500 may well represent a population that had barely held its own for 150 years, if it had not at least passed its lowest point and was once more on the upgrade. In either case it is an acceptable figure. By the end of the sixteenth century it would not be, for by then the country was bursting its seams, had developed an unemployment and poverty problem, and many of its most active sons were driven to seek their livelihood upon the high seas and in virgin territories.

There is no need to rely exclusively on the hypothesis of a shrinking population, for Buckinghamshire—the northern half at least—was severely affected by enclosure and depopulation during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. One in ten of the vills enumerated in the record of Fifteenths and Tenths of 1334 no longer exist;<sup>47</sup> ten or twelve had probably gone before 1522–5, of which Hogshaw with Fulbrook, Lillingstone Dayrell, Lenborough, Liscombe in Soulbury, and Stantonbury were definitely depopulated within the space of a generation prior to this time, while Shipton Lee had suffered some wastage in 1504 and Fleet Marston had declined throughout the fifteenth century.<sup>48</sup> Most of the wasted townships were, it is true, small,<sup>49</sup> from which it could be argued, as some historians have done, that the total effects of depopulation were negligible. But a more convincing conclusion is that the movement as a whole was symptomatic of a shrinking population, when the smallest and least economic places would be likely to disappear entirely. Many townships decayed sufficiently during the fifteenth century to qualify for tax relief—the incidence of this in Bucks. might well be explored. Of those entirely lost, by no means all were destroyed by *coup de main*; in fact, some of the prosecutions on this score were unjust, like the saddling of Robert Lee with the eviction of forty-five persons at Fleet Marston since 1485, when in fact many had left long before that year.<sup>50</sup> Whatever the trend for the nation as a whole may have been, it is not difficult to accept the hypothesis that, in some districts at least, the population was falling until well after 1500.

By the second half of the sixteenth century the concept of a stationary or declining population is no longer realistic. Not only must it have started to grow at some point prior to the commencement of Elizabeth's reign, it must have done so early enough to give that period its spring-like air of expansiveness. There is nothing extraordinary in so sudden a change. For example, the population is thought to have remained steady from 1700 to 1740, from which date it began to grow rapidly.<sup>51</sup> Between the censuses of 1801 and 1831 it rose by 50 per cent; that of Ireland was halved between 1841 and 1901. Thus the situation could alter rapidly. And in contrast to the trends of the previous century rents and prices rose throughout the sixteenth. That between 1510 and 1550 rents



in many cases doubled, and the prices of agricultural products increased by half<sup>52</sup> can only mean a growing demand.

How, finally, shall we evaluate these returns? As regards their compilation, we have noted that it is just possible that they could have been derived from earlier ones: the element of haste provided a motive; there is a total lack of evidence for correspondence between the bishops and their clergy on this subject. However, without direct evidence for it, we must necessarily reject a theory of invention, although the returns bear every sign of having been edited at some stage. The incidence of fives, tens and dozens is excessive, while the lack of numbers ending in 2, 3, 7 and 8 suggests the arbitrary addition or subtraction of one to rounded estimates. And estimates they undoubtedly are, not enumerations.

Taken as a whole, it must be concluded that this "census" understates the population. Against a total of at least 39,500 persons in 1522-5, we may reasonably expect about 45,000 in 1563; in other words, the apparent decline between 1522 and 1563 which we have already noticed is misleading. The "census" would seem, therefore, to be defective not only in terms of the actual population, but also proportionately to the situation suggested by earlier records. None the less, the figures must have some basis in fact, since, with reasonable exceptions, the parishes stand in much the same ratio one to another as in both the survey of 1522 and the subsidy of 1524. Like other lists and returns of the period, this ecclesiastical survey fails to give a complete account of contemporary demography, yet this does not prevent its being an important piece of evidence which we are fortunate to possess.

It is a great pleasure to acknowledge the assistance of our Vice-President, Mr. A. Vere Woodman, particularly in connection with the parishes and chapels of Mursley Deanery, and of Dr. W. G. Hoskins, Reader in Economic History in the University of Oxford, who has read the draft of this paper and given much valuable advice.

#### SURVEY OF THE DIOCESE OF LINCOLN, 1563

(*British Museum, Harleian MS. 618*)

*The volume has no title.*

*Fo. 27r.*

BUCKINGHAM ARCHIDIACONATUS	Magister Johannes Langlond Archidiaconus habet sub suam Jurisdictionem vij decanatus viz.
----------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Fo. 27v. blank.*

*Fo. 28r.*

BUCKS. DECANATUS BUCKS. in quo sunt site parochie de				
	<i>Familie</i>	<i>Capelle</i>	<i>Hamlette</i>	<i>Familie in Hamlettis</i>
Buckingham	cccli	Burton Caldcot <sup>58</sup> Lenberow	Burton Caldcot Lenberow	xix xxviiij ij
Hadstock	xxij			
Adington	xx			
Stiple Claydon	xlviij			

	<i>Familie</i>	<i>Capelle</i>	<i>Hamlette</i>	<i>Familie in Hamlettis</i>
Edgcot	xviiij			
Marshe	xxxviiij			
Catesfeld <sup>54</sup>	v			
Twyford	xxxj	Powndon Charnden	Powndon Charnden	xj xviiij
Preston	xxiiij			
Thorneborow	xlix			
Helsdon	xxxvj			
Lechimsted	xl			
Padbury	xlvi			
Turweston	xvj			
Chetwood	vij			
Tyngwike	xlj			
Racklif	xvj			
Barton	viiij			
Waterstratford	viiij			
Bydlesden	viiij			
<i>Fo. 28v.</i>				
Lyllingston Darrell	iiij			
Westbury	xxj			
Shaldestone	xviiij			
Stowe	xx		Dodford Lamporte	xxj xiv
Akeley	xvj			
Maydesmorton	xxv			
Foxcoate	x			
Thornton	xvj			
<b>DECANATUS MURSLEY in quo sunt site parochie de</b>				
Mursley	xxiiij	Sulden		j
Drayton Parslow	xxviiij			
Stitley <sup>55</sup>	xlviij			
Slapton	xxiiij		Horne <sup>56</sup>	iiij
Edsborow	xlj			
Northhall <sup>57</sup>	xxxiiiiij	Dagnall Hudnall	Dagnall Hudnall	xvj x
Limplond <sup>58</sup>	xxxviiij		Surcott	xxj
Ivingho	lx	Aston	Bugshe <sup>59</sup>	xx
			Horton	x
Pychthorne	xxxviiij	Netleden	Netleden	xvj
Marsworth	xxviiij	Tistock House	Tistock <sup>60</sup>	j
<i>Fo. 29r.</i>				
Drayton Becham	xxxiiiiij			
Chedington	xxx			
Myntmore	iiij		Leyburne	xij

	<i>Familie</i>	<i>Capelle</i>	<i>Hamlette</i>	<i>Familie in Hamlettis</i>
Aston Abates	xx		Burston	iiij
Cooblington	xxiiij			
Hardwicke	xvj		Wydone	xlj
Whitechurche	lxiiij			
Hawryge	xv			
Cholesbury	xvj			
Dunton	xij			
Hogstone	xxiiij			
Swantorn	liij			
Wynslowe	xl		Shyptone	xxiiij
Greneborow	xxxij			
Lytle Horwood	xxviiij			
Great Horwood	lviiij			
Whaddon	xxxiiiij		Nash	xxiiiij
Sulbury	xxxviiij	Bragnam	Bragnam	x
			Chernlott <sup>61</sup>	j
			Lyscon <sup>62</sup>	j
Hollingden <sup>63</sup>	vij			
Lytle Hollingden	vj		Tottingho <sup>64</sup>	j
<i>Fo. 29v.</i>				
DECANATUS NEWPORTE in quo sunt site parochie de				
Newporte Pannell	cxxiiij		Caldcott	iiij
Chichley	xxxiiij			
Myltonne Keynes	xxxj			
Broughton	xxiiij			
Waltonne	xiv			
Blechley	xlviij	Bow Bryck- hill <sup>65</sup>	Fenny- Stratford	xxv
			Bow Bryck- hill	xx
			Calcott <sup>66</sup>	iiij
Simpson	xxxj			
Lytlebrickhill	xxxiiij			
Stokehamonde	xxij			
North Crawley	lxx			
Bradwell	xvj			
Stantonbury	iiij			
Hansloppe	lxxiiij	Castlethorpe	Castlethorpe	xxj
Lynford Parua	xj			
Astwood	xix			
Hardmede	xv			
Lowtonne	xxix			
Mulso	xxvj			
Stoke Goldington	xxvj			
<i>Fo. 30r.</i>				
Emberton	xxxviiij			
Petsoe	j			
Cliftonne Raygnes	xxij			

	<i>Familie</i>	<i>Capelle</i>	<i>Hamlette</i>	<i>Familie in Hamlettis</i>
Newton Blossomvile	xxv			
Lawndon	xxxv	Brayfeld <sup>67</sup>	Brayfeld	vijj
Shenley	xliiij			
Wouington on the Grene	xviiij			
Willyon	x			
Woluerton	xxxj	Stone	Stone	
		Stratford	Stratford	
		egidii	egidii	lvj
Haversham	xxj			
Ravenston	xxix			
Woolston Magna	xxv			
Olney	iii <sup>x</sup> viiij		Warrington	xvj
Sherington	xlj			
Lathbury	xxxiiij			
Woolston parua	xj			
Wawndon	xxxiiij			
<i>Fo. 30v.</i>				
Newton Longvile	xxxiiij			
Tyringham	ix			
Fylgraue	v			
Lynford Magna	xxxj			
Caluerton	xxvj	Stone	Stone	
		Stratford	Stratford	
		Magdelene	Magdelene	xxx

DECANATUS WADDES DON in quo sunt site parochie de

Wadson	lxxij
Queenton	lxxxiiij
Oven <sup>7</sup>	xxj
Pychecoate	xv
Hogston <sup>68</sup>	iiij
Northmarston	xlviij
Eastcleadon	xlvi
Mydleclaydon	xxv
Grendon Vnderwood	xxxij
Loorgarsull	xliiij
Wootton Vnderwood	xl
Ashendon	xxv
Chilton	xxxiiij

*Fo. 31r.*

Okeley	xxxv
Lrill <sup>69</sup>	xxxiiij
Bostall	xxij
Dorton	xxij
Worminghall	xxviiij
Hickford	xviiij
Shabington	xvij
Crendon	lxviij

	<i>Familie</i>	<i>Capelle</i>	<i>Hamlette</i>	<i>Familie in Hamlettis</i>
Chersley	xvj			
Nether Wynchindin	xvj			
Over Wynchindon	viiij			
DECANATUS WENDOVER in quo sunt site parochie de				
Hadnam	lxxxx	Codington <sup>70</sup>	Codington	xxxvij
Dynton	xl	Ford	Ford	xij
Stone	xxvj	Bissherton <sup>71</sup>	Bissherton	xv
Hartwell	xx	Handon parua <sup>72</sup>	Handon parua	x
Kyngshey	xx			
Aston Sandford	xiv			
Ilnor	xj			
Bledlow	lxiiiij			
<i>Fo. 31v.</i>				
Horsington	iiij			
Risborow principis	c			
Kuebell <sup>73</sup> parua	vj			
Kuebell <sup>73</sup> magna	xxviiij			
Elesborow	xxxix			
Handon Magna	xxxiiij			
Missendon parua	lviiij			
Missendon magna	cxviiij	Lee	Lee	xiiij
Wendover	ciij			
Weston Turvile	xl			
Aston Clinton	xlvj	St Leonardi Buckland <sup>74</sup>	St Leonardi Buckland	viiij xvj
Byrtonne <sup>75</sup>	xliij	Stoke Munfeld <sup>76</sup>	Stoke Munfeld	xxiiij
Hulcott	xj			
Flytmarston	iiij			
Ailesbury	clxix		Waltone	xxij
Quaringdon	iiij			
DECANATUS BURNHAM in quo sunt site parochie de				
Burnham	lxxxx	Bovendon <sup>77</sup>	Bovendon	xxiiiij
Hicham	vj			
Taplow	xxiiij			
<i>Fo. 32r.</i>				
Dorney	xxvj			
Dachet	xxxj			
Wyrardsbury	xxxvij	Langley <sup>78</sup>	Langley	xliiiij
Horton	xxix	Colebrooke	Colebrooke Trynley <sup>79</sup>	xxxij xxx
Iver	lxxxviiij			
Denham	lv			
Chalfont Petri	xlviij			
Chalfont Egidij	xl			
Amersham	cxxxix			

	<i>Familie</i>	<i>Capelle</i>	<i>Hamlette</i>	<i>Familie in Hamlettis</i>
Cheynes	xxxj			
Latimers	vij			
Chesham	clxx	Chesham	Chesham	
		Boyes	Boyes	xj
Pen	lxj			
Beconsfeld	iiij <sup>xx</sup> iiij			
Hegeley	xj			
Farneham Ryall	xlxx			
Stokepoges	lxj			
Wyxham	xv			
Fulmer	viiij			
Vpton	xxvj			
<i>Fo. 32v.</i>				
DECANATUS WYCOMBE	in quo sunt parochie de			
Wycombe Magna	clxxxiiij		Foren	
			housholds	lxx
Sanderton	xxiiij			
Ragnage	xxiiij			
Twyngest <sup>80</sup>	xxiiij			
Turvile	xxxvj			
Falley	xix			
Hambledon	lxix			
Medemenham	xxvij			
Marlow magna	cxliij			
Marlow parua	liij			
Wooburne	lxix			
Hedsore	viiij			
Bradnham	xviiij			
Huchindon	lx			
West Wycombe	lxxvij			

<sup>1</sup> F. C. Dietz, *English Government Finance, 1485-1588* (Illinois Social Studies, ix, 1920), p. 225.

<sup>2</sup> The largest portions are for Rutland, P.R.O., E.36/55, and Buckinghamshire—a seventeenth-century copy, Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. Hist., e. 187. Returns also survive for Berkshire, Cornwall, Norfolk and Worcestershire in the P.R.O. and Coventry and Exeter, in the archives of these cities.

<sup>3</sup> The subsidy yielded less than half as much as a forced loan in 1523 assessed directly upon the Survey. (Dietz, loc. cit.)

<sup>4</sup> C. Read, *Mr. Secretary Cecil and Queen Elizabeth* (1955), 120-1.

<sup>5</sup> S. T. Bindoff, *Tudor England* (1950), 193.

<sup>6</sup> J. A. Froude, *History of England*, vii (1863), 466. His estimate that a third of the parishes in England were without a minister is surely an exaggeration.

<sup>7</sup> R. W. Dixon, *History of the Church of England* (1902), v, 341.

<sup>8</sup> Froude, op. cit., vii, 484.

<sup>9</sup> J. E. Neale, *Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments, 1559-1581* (1953), 116-7.

<sup>10</sup> Bindoff, op. cit., 227.

<sup>11</sup> Read, op. cit., 271.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., 276.

<sup>13</sup> Neale, op. cit., 129.

<sup>14</sup> Dixon, op. cit., v, 423.

<sup>15</sup> Wilkins, *Concilia Magnae Britanniae*, iv, 244.

<sup>16</sup> Loc. cit.

<sup>17</sup> A. L. Rowse, *The England of Elizabeth* (1950), 325.

<sup>18</sup> B.M., Harl. MS. 594, a volume in which are bound up returns from several dioceses of the province of Canterbury.

<sup>19</sup> The editors of "The State of the Church", *Lincoln Record Society*, 23, pp. 444-5, estimated 1562-4, from the dates of institutions of archdeacons.

<sup>20</sup> All facts concerning parishes are taken from the topographical volumes of the *V.C.H., Bucks.*

<sup>21</sup> *V.C.H., Bucks.*, I, 289n.

<sup>22</sup> It is assessed in sixteenth-century clerical taxation, of. F. W. Ragg, "Schedule of Tenths and Fifteenths of the Archdeaconry of Buckingham", *Records of Bucks*, x, 407-34. The parishes as of 1563 may be checked here.

<sup>23</sup> *V.C.H., Bucks.*, I, 286-7. The eleven are Addingrove in Oakley, Hundridge in Chesham, Lidcote in Stewkley, St. Michaels in Radclive, St. Margarets in Biddlesden, Little Crawley in North Crawley, Cippenham in Eton, Lee and Brondes in Weston Turville, St. Werburga's in Brill, SS. Stephen and Lawrence in Chetwode, and Eckney in Emberton.

<sup>24</sup> Rowse, *op. cit.*, 217.

<sup>25</sup> *British Medieval Population* (Albuquerque, U.S.A., 1948).

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 23.

<sup>27</sup> "The Medieval Household: Large or Small?", *Econ. Hist. Rev.*, ser. 2, vol. IX (1956), 420-32.

<sup>28</sup> H. E. Hallam, "Some Thirteenth-century Censuses", *Econ. Hist. Rev.*, ser. 2, vol. X (1957-8), 340-61.

<sup>29</sup> Printed in G.M. Trevelyan, *English Social History* (1944), 277; a better version in G. N. Clark, *The Wealth of England, 1496-1760* (1946), 192-3.

<sup>30</sup> Including country towns. Peers, higher officials, eminent merchants, lawyers, clergy, professional men, and the army and navy are excluded.

<sup>31</sup> *Econ. Hist. Rev.*, ser. 2, vol. VIII, no.3 (1956), 284.

<sup>32</sup> *Op. cit.*, 23-4.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, 281, The ratio of increase in Bucks., 1:2.67, would give a population in 1545 of 90,000, almost as many as in 1801.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, 53.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 132.

<sup>36</sup> A. C. Chibnall and A. V. Woodman, *Subsidy for the County of Buckingham, Anno 1524* (Bucks. Record Society, vol. 8, Aylesbury, 1950).

<sup>37</sup> Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. Hist., e. 187.

<sup>38</sup> Survey in P.R.O., E. 36, vols. 54 and 55; Subsidy in P.R.O., E. 179/165, rolls 110, 112, 113. I hope to complete a study of these documents at some future date.

<sup>39</sup> Twyford with Charndon and Poundon, Shalstone, Gawcote, Lenborough, Marsh Gibbon, Lillingstone Dayrell, Beachampton, and Beaconsfield.

<sup>40</sup> J. Cornwall (ed.), *The Lay Subsidy Rolls for the County of Sussex, 1524-25* (Sussex Record Society, 56, Lewes, 1957).

<sup>41</sup> *Op. cit.*, 132-3.

<sup>42</sup> S. H. A. H[ervey] (ed.), *Suffolk in 1524* (Suffolk Green Books No. X, Ipswich, 1910). There were 17,000 Taxpayers.

<sup>43</sup> Russell estimates that the population of a group of Midland counties, including Bucks., increased in the ratio 1:2.35 between 1066 and 1279; also that the ratio between 1377 and 1346, just before the Black Death, was 1:1.66. (*Op. cit.*, 80.) But these must be considered very doubtful.

<sup>44</sup> National population declined from 1348 to around 1400, and "probably held even" from then till 1436 (*op. cit.*, 266-70). He concludes that it increased by about one-half between 1377 and 1545 (p. 281).

<sup>45</sup> "Some Economic Evidence of Declining Population in the Later Middle Ages", *Econ. Hist. Rev.*, ser. 2, vol. II (1950), 247-64.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, 255.

<sup>47</sup> M. W. Beresford, *The Lost Villages of England* (1954), 237.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, 340-3.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, 247-57.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, 125.

<sup>51</sup> A. M. Carr-Saunders, *World Population* (1932), 40.

<sup>52</sup> See E. Kerridge, "The Movement of Rent, 1540-1640", in *Econ. Hist. Rev.*, ser. 2, vol. VI (1953), 24-31.

<sup>53</sup> Gawcot.

<sup>54</sup> Caversfield, since transferred to Oxfordshire.

<sup>55</sup> Stewkely; there are many variants of this name.

<sup>56</sup> Horton, part of which is in Ivinghoe.

<sup>57</sup> Northall, Dagnall and Hudnall are all hamlets of Edlesborough.

<sup>58</sup> Linslade.

<sup>59</sup> Ringshall.

<sup>60</sup> Tiscote. Mr. A. V. Woodman writes: "Tiscote was formerly a hamlet or farm in the Bedlow Grounds which lies within the parish of Great Tring. Part of these grounds were parcel of the parish of Marsworth, though probably . . . now . . . in Long Marston which . . . was formerly a chapelry of Tring. There was formerly a chapel at Tiscote which has now entirely disappeared."

<sup>61</sup> Chelmscott.

<sup>62</sup> Liscombe.

<sup>63</sup> Hollingdon is a hamlet in Soulbury. Little Hollingdon is not otherwise on record, but Jeffery's map, 1770, gives both Upper and Dark Hollingdon. There is no record of a chapel there, though there was at Bragenham, as indicated.

<sup>64</sup> Tattenhoe, now a separate parish. A chapel there was given to Snelshall Priory, 1200-15, *The Cartulary of Snelshall Priory* (ed. J. G. Jenkins), *Bucks. Record Society*, vol. 9 (1952), p. 2.

<sup>65</sup> There is no evidence of Bow Brickhill ever having been a chapelry of Bletchley.

<sup>66</sup> Caldecotte in Bow Brickhill.

<sup>67</sup> The vicarage of Cold Brayfield has always descended with that of Lavendon, *V.C.H., Bucks.*, IV, 327.

<sup>68</sup> Hogshaw.

<sup>69</sup> [Sic] for Brill.

<sup>70</sup> The vicarage of Cuddington was appendant to Haddenham, *V.C.H., Bucks.*, II, 270-1.

<sup>71</sup> Bishopstone.

<sup>72</sup> Little Hampden was appendant to Hartwell until separated and united with Great Hampden in 1892, *V.C.H., Bucks.*, II, 293.

<sup>73</sup> Kimble.

<sup>74</sup> Buckland, Stoke Mandeville and Quarrendon were chapelries of Bierton; the first two were made benefices in 1858, *V.C.H., Bucks.*, II, 365. The linking of Buckland with Aston Clinton is erroneous. N.B. that Quarrendon is treated as a separate parish.

<sup>75</sup> Bierton.

<sup>76</sup> See note <sup>72</sup>.

<sup>77</sup> Boveney.

<sup>78</sup> Langley was made a separate benefice in 1856. *V.C.H., Bucks.*, III, 300. Note that in the Subsidy of 1524 (*Bucks. Record Society*, 8, pp. 20, 23) Langley is a separate township containing part of Colnbrook, the other part of which is in Horton.

<sup>79</sup> Probably Thorney in Iver.

<sup>80</sup> Fingest.