



Moore, BJS. (2008, Dec 18). Chantry certificates, 1546-8, and the Diocesan Census of 1563: a comparison (introductory document). Unpublished. <http://hdl.handle.net/1983/1255>

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available: <http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

**Chantry Certificates, 1546-8, and the Diocesan Census of
1563: a Comparison.**

Introduction:

The purpose of this data-set is to provide the materials for a detailed comparison at parish level of estimated populations in 1546-8 and in 1563. For 1563, there is an exemplary reliable modern edition: A. Dyer, D.M. Palliser, eds, The Diocesan Population Returns for 1563 and 1603 (Oxford, 2005). Most of the chantry certificates which provide numbers of 'Houseling people' (persons of a suitable age to receive Communion) have been printed in a variety of publications since the 1850s of varying reliability.

Neither source provides numbers of inhabitants like a modern census; in both, populations are derived from the original data using 'multipliers' to produce approximate totals, though the effect of using multipliers is to produce a series of apparently exact figures with a spurious air of exactitude. The best that can be hoped for is these are of the right order of magnitude. Where the original data can be

checked against other near-contemporary sources, for example the 1548 Gloucestershire chantry certificates with the 1551 Gloucester Diocesan Visitation (J.S. Moore, 'Episcopal Visitations and the demography of Tudor Gloucestershire' (Southern Histor, vol.22 (2000), pp.72-130).), or the 1563 diocesan census with other Canterbury diocesan returns between 1557 and 1569 (J.S. Moore, 'Canterbury Visitations and the demography of mid-Tudor Kent' (Southern History, vol.15 (1993), pp.36-85).), or with later returns (Moore, 'Episcopal Visitations'), they in the main stand up well to such comparison.

The 'multipliers' used to convert the original data into population estimates are derived from work by other historical demographers. For 1563, I have used the well-known estimate of 'Mean Household Size' by Peter Laslett of 4.75; though the known range of individual household sizes in the early modern period is quite wide, for covering a large number of communities in both town and country, the figure of 4.75 seems about right. For 1546-48, I have followed Wrigley and Schofield in assuming that the age of first communion is not likely to have risen much above the age of seven of the medieval period, and have selected 10 as an estimate (by 1563 the age of first communion had risen to

12-14 and by 1563 to 16) (E.A. Wrigley, R.S. Schofield, The Population History of England and Wales, 1541-1871 (Cambridge, 1981, repr. London, 1989), pp.565-6). Since children under the age of 10 constituted roughly a quarter of the Tudor population, multiplying the number of communicants ('houceling people') by $100/100-25$, i.e. 1.33, will produce a reasonable population estimate for 1546-8.

From these two sets of population-estimates, it is possible to calculate the rate of change for any population-unit, whether parish or county, for which data survive at both dates: again, it is quite unnecessary to quote percentage rates of change beyond one place of decimals. But are the 'multipliers' used reasonable? In parts of Kent where data for both households and communicants exist in 1557, 1563, 1565 and 1569, the resulting population-estimates for each place from the two sets of data are between 3.9 per cent and 6.9 per cent, suggesting that both sets of data and the 'multipliers' used are reliable (Moore, 'Canterbury Visitations', Tables 1-3). The same convergence can also be verified on rare occasions even in 1546-8. In 1546 the Suffolk chantry commissioners reported that in Botesdale, which was being absorbed into Redgrave, there were '46 householders in the street, by estimation 160 houceling

people'. Using the same 'multipliers' of 1.33 for communicants and 4.75 for households, the resulting population-estimates are 213 from the communicants and 219 from the households. In 1548 Dogdyke hamlet in Billingham (Lincs) was said to contain 'certen households to the noubre of 18 ... ther being 70 houseling people'. Again there is a close correspondence between the resulting estimates of 93 from 'houseling people' and 86 from the households.

In general, therefore, it seems that both the sources and the methodology are generally reliable. This is not to say that every result is reliable, and it is often clear that this cannot be true. As a check we can use the percentage rate of change between 1546-8 and 1563. Even allowing for the 'sweat' in 1550-2 and repeated attacks of influenza and typhus between 1556 and 1560, together with outbreaks of 'plague', it is doubtful whether population in any English village or town fell by much more than 50 per cent unless special, non-medical factors are at work. Equally, the only areas known to have escaped high death-tolls from epidemic disease between 1546-8 and 1563 were Cornwall and the City of London. English population in the period 1541-56 is thought to have risen by at most 4-5 per cent per

quinquennium (Wrigley and Schofield, eds, Population History of England, Table A3.1; E.A. Wrigley et al, English Population History from Family Reconstitution, 1580-1837 (Cambridge, 1997), Table A9.1), so that any calculated rise in population over 15 per cent probably results from faulty data, which need to be corrected if possible or else discarded.

It is necessary to say that by no means every parish is represented in those areas where the records generally survive: even in 1563, not every incumbent reported the number of households in his parish, and in some counties, notably Durham and Northumberland, many parishes had no reported population. In 1546-8, by no means every parish had a chantry, some chantries escaped being reported, many certificates were subsequently lost for entire counties (Cheshire, Dorset, Huntingdonshire, Rutland, Somerset, Surrey and Yorkshire, North Riding in 1546; Devon, Leicestershire and Lincolnshire in 1548), and many certificates failed to record numbers of 'houceling people' (Berkshire, Cambridgeshire, Cumberland, Derbyshire, Durham, Gloucestershire, Hampshire, Herefordshire, Kent, Norfolk, Northamptonshire, Northumberland, Nottinghamshire, Oxfordshire, Staffordshire, Sussex, Westmorland, Wiltshire

and Worcestershire in 1546; Cambridgeshire, Cumberland, Huntingdonshire, London, Middlesex, Norfolk, Staffordshire and Westmorland in 1548). Finally, the distribution of chantries was 'skewed' across the country as a whole: northern counties had relatively more chantries than southern counties (A.J. Krieder, English Chantries: the road to dissolution (Cambridge (USA), 1979), pp.15-18).

The raw data and the resulting percentage rates of change are given for each parish for which data exist in Table 1 in each accompanying county spreadsheet. Because such tables therefore include exceptional rates of change deriving from faulty data, Table 2 in each accompanying county spreadsheet simply removes all these problem results to provide a rough idea of the overall rate of change. Table 3 in each accompanying county spreadsheet then reintegrates the places removed in Table 2, but substituting amended data which in each case result in acceptable overall rates of change, i.e. under -50/+15 per cent. The substitution of amended data has been done with considerable care, having regard to the form in which the original information was presented: invariably roman numerals in 1546-48, mostly arabic numerals in 1563. A comparison of the total overall change in Table 3 in each county with the total overall change in Tables 1 and 2 in

the same county, which suggests that there is little if any observable bias in the process of amending faulty data in each county. The Appendix below discusses the necessary emendations required to clearly faulty data in each county, or refers the user to the place where faulty data was amended in print.

Appendix: Commentary on Adjusted Data:

Note:

The county spreadsheets compare the data for 1546-8 and 1563 only for those places where a direct comparison is possible, which can be found in the **Sources** listed for each county. For each county a commentary deals with the emendation of scribal errors in the original data.

Bedfordshire:

Bedfordshire, being in Lincoln diocese, has the advantage of data from 1603 for most parishes to assist in scrutinising the figures from the chantry certificates for both 1546 and 1548 and the 1563 ecclesiastical census. For **Biddenham** and **Biggleswade**, both with apparent rises in population, 1548-

63, no figures for 1603 survive: the chantry certificates for 1546 and 1548 give the same numbers of houseling people, so the household data for 1563 (which in Lincoln diocese were given in roman numerals: Dyer and Palliser, eds, Diocesan Population Returns, p.184) are more likely to be wrong; correcting these to 20, xx instead of xl for Biddenham and 116, cxvi instead of clxvi for Biggleswade, converts improbable rises in population into quite plausible falls. **Chalgrave:** The estimated population in 1548 is lower than in 1546 and, being based on a less rounded number of houseling people, has been preferred. **Dunstable:** the chantry certificate figures in 1546 and 1548, though different, are of the same order of magnitude, whilst the 149 households of 1563 produce an estimated population of 708 which looks high when compared to 880 in 1671 (Clark and Hosking, Population Estimates of Small English Towns, p.1; there is no 1603 return for this town), as well as leading to a population-rise of 20.6 per cent between 1548 and 1563 which is unlikely: a corrected figure of 99 households (lxxxxix instead of cxxxxix), estimated population 470, produces a reasonable fall of -19.9 per cent. **Elstow:** the 1546 and 1548 numbers of houseling people are identical, so the high decrease of -42.2 per cent between 1548 and 1563 may be due to an erroneous figure of 52 households in 1563; correcting

this to 62 households yields a more likely fall of -30.9 per cent. **Luton:** here, population change is also high, -43.6 per cent, even with the lower houseling people figure for 1548, and a comparison of the estimated populations for 1563 and 1603, the latter being 77.2 per cent higher, rather suggests that the 190 households of 1563 may be too low, and the only obvious scribal error, given the roman numerals used, is 290 households, with a higher estimated population of 1378. This would result in a fall of -13.9 per cent between 1548 and 1563 followed by a rise of 16.1 per cent between 1563 and 1603. **Westoning:** the raw data result in an improbably high decrease of -72.9 per cent between 1548 and 1563, but the estimated population of 1563 (181) seems reasonable when compared to that for 1603 (259): probably the 1548 figure for houseling people is erroneous, and a correction to 200, estimated population 267, would yield a more acceptable fall of -32.2 per cent.

Buckinghamshire:

Buckinghamshire, also in Lincoln diocese, again has the advantage of data from 1603 for most parishes to assist in scrutinising the figures from the chantry certificates for both 1546 and 1548 and the 1563 ecclesiastical census.

Aylesbury: the houseling people of 1546 (1100), estimated population 1467, looks rather high compared to estimates for 1563 (907) and the later seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries (1400-2250: Clark and Hosking, Population Estimates of Small English Towns, pp.5-6); if the 1546 figure was an estimate of total population, the resulting fall by 1563 of 17.5 per cent is quite plausible.

Buckingham: the number of houseling people (700) in 1546 looks low, since the resulting estimated population (933) is half that of 1563 (1900) and of later seventeenth-century figures (1540-2100: Clark and Hosking, Population Estimates of Small English Towns, pp.7-8). Correcting 700 to 1700 results in a more likely population-estimate of 2267 in 1546 and a decline of 25.0 per cent. **Dorney:** this village is clearly suffering from population-decline throughout the sixteenth century, and though the population-fall in 1546-63 is very high (-50.9 per cent), correcting the 1563 figure to 45 households, estimated population 219, would result in an even higher fall in population, -63.5 per cent, between 1563 and 1603. **Edlesborough:** the number of houseling people (300) in 1546 looks low, since the resulting estimated population (400) is below those of both 1563 (480) and 1603 (533), yielding an improbable growth of 20.0 per cent between 1546 and 1563; substituting 400 houseling people in 1546, with a

resulting population-estimate of 533, produces a more plausible change of -10.0 per cent in that period. **Ivinghoe:** The number of houseling people in 1546 is lower and less rounded than in 1548 and has been preferred. The estimated population for 1563 based on 120 households suggests an improbable increase in population of 25.8 per cent. The main section of Ivinghoe, excluding two hamlets mainly in other parishes, had 90 households, yielding an estimated population of 428 and a fall of -5.5 per cent. **Fenny Stratford:** again, the number of houseling people in 1546 looks high, compared to the figures for 1563 (-59.4 per cent) and 1603, even allowing for an atypical falling population between 1563 and 1603; if 120 (cxx) was miscopied as 220 (ccxx), a much more reasonable scenario can be reconstructed.

Derbyshire:

For this county, data survive for only two dates, 1548 and 1563. Most of the data, and the derived rates of change, appear reasonable, and only one parish, **Sawley**, has an improbably high fall in population, -57.3 per cent, in the period 1548-63, and the only likely correction is to the 1563 household figure: if 36 is a mistake for 86, either as

a misread arabic number or a miscopied original roman number (xxxvi instead of lxxxvi), a slight rise of population, as at Eckington, results.

Durham:

See J.S. Moore, 'Population Trends in North-East England, 1548-1563' (Northern History, vol.XLV (2008), p.257.

Gloucestershire:

See J.S. Moore, 'Episcopal Visitations and the demography of Tudor Gloucestershire' (Southern Histor, vol.22 (2000), pp.94-130.

For a detailed consideration of the plentiful material available for this county (apart from the far south in Bristol diocese) in 1551, 1563, 1603 and 1650, see Moore, 'Episcopal Visitations', and for a commentary on data requiring emendation, see ibid, pp.94-130. The existence of the 1551 Visitation giving numbers of communicants (J. Gairdner, ed., 'Bishop Hooper's Visitation of Gloucester Diocese, 1551' (English Historical Review, vol.19 (1904), pp.98-121) provides a valuable check on the number of

householding people in 1548. Clark and Hosking, Population Estimates, pp.57-60, omit the number of households at **Lydney** (105) and give incorrect totals for **Berkeley** (recte 192), **Thornbury** (recte 225) and **Winchcombe** (recte 148).

Lancashire:

See J.S. Moore, 'Population Trends in Lancashire, 1548 to 1563' (Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, forthcoming).

Leicestershire:

Although Leicestershire, being in Lincoln diocese, has figures for 1603 as well as 1563, the former are not helpful in assessing the latter, because, unless the 1603 totals for communicants are faulty, three out of the four parishes represented appear to have declining populations in the period 1563-1603. The calculated rates of change in population between 1546 and 1563 in both **Leicester St Martin** and **Garthorpe** are improbably high (-57.3 per cent, -78.6 per cent), and in both parishes the number of households in 1563 is probably too low. Amending these numbers leads to

reasonable rates of decline in 1546-63 (-21.6 per cent, -34.0 per cent), but at the cost of high rates of decline in 1563-1603 (-55.8 per cent, -58.8 per cent), though the population of Leicester, St Mary, also fell in the Elizabethan period. But Leicester's population grew very slowly in the sixteenth century (VCH (Leics), vol.IV, p.76). Only Loughborough displays the normal pattern seen in other counties, with a fall of -34.5 per cent in 1546-63 followed by a rise of 41.0 per cent in 1563-1603; this typifies the situation generally in Leicestershire where, apart from Leicester, the Elizabethan period saw 'a remarkable increase' except for scattered examples of depopulated or shrinking villages of which Garthorpe may have been one (VCH (Leics), vol.III, pp.139-41).

Lincolnshire:

The existence of data for communicants in 1603 again assists the determination of the reliability of the data from the chantry certificates of 1548 and the ecclesiastical census of 1563. In some cases the 1563 data appears doubtful: at **Coningsby** the 1563 estimated population is 27.0 per cent higher than in 1548 and 1.8 times that of 1603, but correcting 221 households to 121 produces an acceptable

revision; at **Somerby**, 5 households leads to a large population-fall of -65.2 per cent since 1548, but substituting 10 for 5 (x for y) again leads to a more probable fall in population of -30.4 per cent, though this may well be a place within an abnormal history: its population in 1603 was only 40, still below the level of 1548. In every other parish where the data need to be corrected, it is the 1548 data that requires revision, for the 1563 data appears reasonable by comparison with that for 1603. At **Algarkirk** 208 parishioners communicating yields an estimated population 23.5 per cent above that of 1563; altering this figure to 308 produces a more likely situation. **Benington's** 85 parishioers communicating lead to a near tripling of population by 1563; 285 produce a reasonable fall in population of -13.7 per cent. Similarly at **Bicker**, 115 parishioners communicating would lead to a population-increase of two and a half times by 1563; changing this figure to 315, produces an estimated population of 420, falling by -9.5 per cent by 1563. **Burgh le Marsh's** 520 parishioners communicating in 1548, equivalent to an estimated population of 693, results in a population-fall of -36.9 per cent by 1563 which is probably too high for Lincolnshire; substituting 420 for 320 reduces the fall to -22.0 per cent. At **Claypole** population

apparently virtually stagnated between 1563 and 1603; the ostensible trebling of population between 1548 and 1563 can be corrected by changing 85 parishioners communicating to 285. 400 communicants at **Donington** in 1548 are too low, whereas 600 seem about right by comparison with 1563 and 1603. Again at **Freiston with Butterwick**, the 1548 figures for parishioners communicating (250, 113) seem too low, leading to large increases in population by 1563; substituting 550 and 213 produces much more acceptable results. At **Gedney Hill** 32 households in 1563 result in an estimated population $1\frac{1}{2}$ times that of 1548 and very near that of 1603, but both Gedney Hill and its mother-parish of Gedney saw population atypically falling between 1563 and 1603, so the 1548 figure of 77 (lxxvii) parishioners communicating was probably a miscopying of 127 (cxxvii), with an estimated population of 169. The population of **Great Hale** apparently quadrupled between 1548 and 1563; revising 90 parishioners communicating to 390 resolves the problem. At **Heckington**: a doubling of population between 1548 and 1563 is most improbable, so 180 parishioners communicating must be amended to 480. The population of **Leake** apparently rose by one-third between 1548 and 1563, but altering 343 parishioners communicating to 443 produces a stable situation. At **Sleaford** again, an apparent high rise in

population, 1548-63, can be resolved by amending 478 parishioners communicating to 578. **North and South Somercotes** both have apparent increases in population in the period 1548-63 because the figures for parishioners communicating (200 and 162) are too low; changing these to 300 and 262 modifies the situation satisfactorily. At **Stamford St Mary** the number of parishioners communicating in 1548 (449) is probably too high and has been reduced to 349. The numbers of households at **Donington** (161) and **Grantham** (252) in 1563 are incorrectly reported in Clark and Hosking, Population Estimates, p.97).

Northumberland:

See J.S. Moore, 'Population Trends in North-East England, 1548-1563' (Northern History, vol.XLV (2008), p.257).

Shropshire:

Three **Shrewsbury** parishes are the only Shropshire parishes with data from both the chantry certificates and the 1563 ecclesiastical census (half of Shropshire was in Hereford diocese, for which no return in 1563 exists). The number of houseling people in Shrewsbury, St Mary, in 1546 is higher

than that in 1548, which could be the result of mortality in the intervening period. Since the two figures for houseling people are of the same order of magnitude, the lower figure has been preferred. Nevertheless the resulting decline by 1563 is high, -57.6 per cent, which suggests that the number of households in 1563, 143, should be 243. With that correction, the mortality in all three Shrewsbury parishes is very similar: -28.7 per cent, -25.2 per cent and -27.9 per cent.

Warwickshire:

Although the county was divided between the two dioceses of Coventry and Lichfield and Worcester, neither diocese has a surviving return to the 1603 ecclesiastical census. We are again confined to amending or eliminating parishes where the calculated rates of change are improbably high. The number of communicants in 1548 (400) at **Aston by Birmingham** cannot be correct if compared to the 250 households, estimated population 1188 by 1563, an impossibly high rate of increase of 122.9 per cent. Yet Aston was a centre of rural industry whose population had quadrupled to 5,000 by 1650 (R. Holt, 'The Early History of Birmingham, 1166-1600' (Dugdale Soc., Occ. Papers, vol.XXX (1986), p.20); VCH (Warws), vol.VII,

p.270). The most likely emendation assumes that mcccc (1400) was miscopied in the chantry certificate as cccc (400): the resulting estimated population of 1,867 then fell by 36.4 per cent by 1563. The rate of population-decline at **Atherstone** between 1546 and 1563 (when it is entered as Mancetter) is very high, -62.9 per cent: if the number of houseling people in 1546, 1,000, was an estimate of population, the rate of decline would become a more possible -50.6 per cent. The 1563 population had doubled by the Restoration (Clark and Hosking, Population Estimates, p.153). The 200 households reported at **Birmingham** in 1563 may be a rounded figure, perhaps standing for 220 - 240, which would reduce the rate of population-decline to nearer 50 per cent. At **Coventry Holy Trinity** both sets of data are erroneous. As Dyer and Palliser have noted, both in the earlier sixteenth century and in 1672, Coventry St Michael had between 62 per cent and 67 per cent of Coventry's total population, and the number of households in 1563 must be amended to either 249 or 349 (Dyer and Palliser, eds., Diocesan Population Returns, p.122, n.117). But 4,000 houseling people, estimated population 5333, in 1548 also seems far too high, given that Coventry's total population has been estimated as 6,000 in 1523, falling allegedly to about 3,000 in 1550 and had only risen to 6,500 in 1586, and

comparable to the 'special pleading' that had assigned 11 - 12,000 houseling people to the city in 1550 (C. Phythian-Adams, Desolation of a City: Coventry and the urban crisis of the late Middle Ages (Cambridge, 1979), pp.197, 236-7). Taking the higher figure for 1563 and substituting 2000 houseling people, estimated population 2667, in 1548 produces a population-fall of -37.8 per cent, fairly similar to the 28.1 per cent decline in population at Coventry St Michael's. At **Harbury**, doubling the 100 houseling people of 1546 leads to a revised population of 267 and a slight rise in population by 1563 of 3.4 per cent. The 1563 household data for **Henley-in-Arden** is omitted from Clark and Hosking, Population estimates, p.155. It is noteworthy that the rate of population-decline is much higher in Coventry and Lichfield diocese than in Worcester diocese, covering the south-west of the county, where three out of five parishes show slightly rising populations.

Worcestershire:

There is no surviving return to the 1603 ecclesiastical census for Worcester diocese. We are again confined to considering three parishes where the calculated rates of change are improbably high. In all three cases it is the

1548 totals of houseling people that appear faulty. At **Eldersfield**, raising 80 communicants to 280 (cc omitted before lxxx) converts an impossible increase in estimated population to a reasonable decline; similarly at **Kidderminster**, 700 (dcc) communicants is too low a figure: it could even be 1700 (mdcc) but is more probably 1200 (mcc). Finally, at **Kington** the opposite error has occurred, 60 (lx) being miscopied as 160 (clx). The number of households at **Bromsgrove** is omitted, and that for **Droitwich St Andrew** wrongly reported, in Clark and Hosking, Population Estimates, p.165.

Yorkshire:

See J.S. Moore, 'Population Trends in North-East England, 1548-1563' (Northern History, vol.XLV (2008), pp.257-8).

Sources:

Bedfordshire:

1546: TNA E 301/4, mm.8-16; E 301/133 (Lidlington parish only); TNA E 301/108-9 (extracts).

1548: TNA E 301/1, printed in J.E. Brown, F.A. Page-Turner, eds, Chantry Certificates for Bedfordshire with Institutions of Chantry Priests in Bedfordshire (Bedford, n.d. [1908]).

1563: BL, Harleian MS.618, fols.34r-7r, printed in Dyer and Palliser, eds, The Diocesan Population Returns for 1563 and 1603, pp.244-9.

Buckinghamshire:

1546: TNA E 301/4, mm.1-7; E 301/108-9 (extracts).

1548: TNA E 301/5; E 301/77 (pensions only).

1563: BL, Harleian MS.618, fols.28r-32v, printed in Dyer and Palliser, eds, The Diocesan Population Returns for 1563 and 1603, pp.234-44.

Derbyshire:

1546: TNA E 301/13, mm.11-7; E 301/131 (Shirland only) (no 'houseling people' recorded).

1548: TNA E 301/14 (abstract), 78 (full return).

1563: BL, Harleian MS.594, fols.156r-60r, printed in Dyer and Palliser, eds, The Diocesan Population Returns for 1563 and 1603, pp.104-10.

Durham:

1546: TNA E 301/18, mm.5v-11.

1548: TNA E 301/17; SC 12/7/26.

J.E. Raine, ed., 'The Injunctions and other Ecclesiastical Proceedings of Richard Barnes, Bishop of Durham' (Surtees Soc., vol.22 (1850), Appendix VI, prints E 301/17. [No 'houseling people' are recorded in 1546]

1563: BL, Harleian MS.594, fols.187v-91r, printed in Dyer and Palliser, eds, The Diocesan Population Returns from 1563 and 1603, pp.135-8; household totals tabulated in B.J.D. Harrison, 'A Census of Households in Co. Durham, 1563' (Cleveland & Teesside Local History Soc. Bulletin, vol.11 (1970), pp.11-18).

Gloucestershire:

1546: TNA E 301/21 [No houseling people'].

1548: TNA E 301/22-3, printed in J. Maclean, ed., 'Chantry Certificates, Gloucestershire (Roll 22)' (Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Arch. Soc., vol.8 (1884), pp.229-308).

1563: Bodleian Library, Oxford, Rawlinson MS. C 790,
printed in Dyer and Palliser, eds, The Diocesan Population
Returns for 1563 and 1603, pp.154-73.

Lancashire:

1546: TNA DL 38/1.

1548: TNA DL 38/3.

F.R. Raines, 'A History of the Chantries within the County
Palatine of Lancaster' (Chetham Soc., OS, vols.59-60,
1862), prints TNA DL38/1 for 1546 and adds notes from
TNA DL38/3 for 1548 ('Duchy of Lancaster Liber B') with
some omissions.

1563: BL, Harleian MS.594, fols.100-2, 108, printed in
Dyer and Palliser, eds, The Diocesan Population Returns for
1563 and 1603, pp.82-7, 95-6.

Leicestershire:

1546: TNA E 301/31, mm.28-42; E 301/32.

1548: No returns known.

A. Hamilton-Thompson, ed., 'The Chantry Certificates for
Leicestershire returned under the Act of 37 Henry VIII,
Cap. IV' (Reports and Proceedings of the Associated

Architectural Societies, vol.30 (1910), pp.463-570, prints E 301/31-2. ['Houseling people' are recorded for only four parishes in 1546]

1563: BL, Harleian MS, 618, fols.15v-20v, printed in Dyer and Palliser, eds, The Diocesan Population Returns for 1563 and 1603, pp.214-26.

Lincolnshire:

1546: No returns known.

1548: TNA E 301/33; DL 38/2; DL 43/6/22.

C.W. Foster, A. Hamilton-Thompson, eds, 'The Chantry Certificates for Lincoln and Lincolnshire' (Reports and Proceedings of the Associated Architectural Societies, vol.36 (1922), pp.183-294; vol.37 (1925), pp.18-106, 247-75), prints TNA E301/33 for 1548 but not TNA DL 38/2 or DL43/6/22 for the Duchy of Lancaster estates. [No 'houseling people' are recorded for the Duchy estates]

1563: BL, Harleian MS.618, fols.2r-15r, printed in Dyer and Palliser, eds, The Diocesan Population Returns for 1563 and 1603, pp.185-214.

Northumberland:

1546: TNA E 301/18, mm.1-5v.

1548: TNA E 301/62; E 301/94 (pensions only).

Raine, ed., 'The Injunctions and other Ecclesiastical Proceedings of Richard Barnes, Bishop of Durham', Appendix VII, prints E 301/94. [No 'houceling people' are recorded in 1546]

1563: BL, Harleian MS.594, fols.191v-5r, printed in Dyer and Palliser, eds, The Diocesan Population Returns for 1563 and 1603, pp.138-42.

Shropshire:

1546: TNA E 301/40, mm.1-5.

1548: TNA E 301/41. A. Hamilton-Thompson, ed., 'Certificates of the Shropshire Chantries under the Acts of 37 Henry VIII, cap.IV, and 1 Edward VI, cap.XIV' (Transactions of the Shropshire Arch. and Natural History Soc., 3rd ser. vol.10 (1910), pp.269-392, prints both returns. 'Houseling people' are recorded for only seven parishes in 1546 and for only three parishes in 1548]

1563: BL, Harleian MS.594, fols.160r-2r, printed in Dyer and Palliser, eds, The Diocesan Population Returns for 1563 and 1603, pp.110-4.

Somerset:

1548: TNA E 301/42, printed in E. Green, ed., 'The Survey and Rental of the Chantries, Colleges, Free Chapels, Guilds, Fraternities, Lamps, Lights and Obits in the County of Somerset' (Somerset Rec. Soc., vol.2, 1888).

1563: BL Harleian MS.594, fols.46r-56v [Population figures for only 61 out of 374 parishes (those with chapelries)], printed in Dyer and Palliser, eds, The Diocesan Population Returns for 1563 and 1603, pp.18-32.

Warwickshire:

1546: TNA E 301/31, mm.1-27.

1548: TNA E 301/53.

1563: BL, Harleian MS.594, fols.165r-70r, printed in Dyer and Palliser, eds, The Diocesan Population Returns for 1563 and 1603, pp.120-8 (Coventry and Lichfield diocese); BL, Harleian MS.594, fols.211v-2v, printed in Dyer and Palliser, eds, The

Diocesan Population Returns for 1563 and 1603, pp.292-6

(Worcester diocese).

Worcestershire:

1546: TNA E 301/25, mm.2-21 [No 'houseling people' are recorded in 1546], printed in F.C. Morgan, P.E. Morgan, 'The survey of chantries ... in Worcestershire made by command of King Henry VIII in 1546', Trans. Worcs. Arch. Soc., 1974, 3rd ser, vol.4, pp.75-80.

1548: TNA E 301/60.

1563: BL, Harleian MS.594, fols.209r-11v, printed in Dyer and Palliser, eds, The Diocesan Population Returns for 1563 and 1603, pp.284-92.

Yorkshire:

1546: TNA E 301/65, 67-71 (West Riding), /72 (East Riding).

1548: TNA E 301/63 (York City, North Riding), 64 (West Riding). W. Page, ed., 'The Certificates of the Commissioners Appointed to Survey the Chantries, Guilds, Hospitals, etc, in the County of York' (Surtees Soc., vol.91-2, 1892-3), prints E 301/63-71, 119.

1563: BL, Harleian MS.594, fols.103-7, printed in Dyer and Palliser, eds, The Diocesan Population Returns for 1563 and 1603, pp.87-95.