

HOW RELIABLE IS MEN AND ARMOUR?

The information available in John Smith's Men and Armour for Gloucestershire, 1608, has been sadly neglected by historians except for an article in Economic History Review (1934) by A.J. and R.H. Tawney and brief references in Gloucestershire village histories and the Victoria County History. Probably this is because the accuracy of Smith's compilation has been in doubt. In this article an attempt is made to assess the value of Men and Armour as a source of information. The assessment is not yet complete and this article should be regarded as in the nature of an interim report.

We now know that Men and Armour is a list of the able-bodied men in Gloucestershire in 1608 between the ages of eighteen and sixty years with the exception of clergy, the aristocracy and their 'menial and household servants', and possibly a few others. A list of all men liable for service, stating the occupation and giving some indication of the age and physique of most, was drawn up by the constable of each town, village, manor or tithing and sent to Lord Berkeley, Lord Lieutenant of Gloucestershire and of the City of Gloucester. Not long afterwards the lists were copied by John Smith, barrister and steward of the Hundred of Berkeley, and his clerk, William Archard, into the three large folios which comprise Men and Armour.(1)

To test the reliability of Men and Armour the number of men listed in it for each parish, hundred, and the whole county has been compared with the number of communicants stated to be resident in the corresponding area in an ecclesiastical survey carried out in 1603 by the order of Archbishop Whitgift. This survey has been transcribed by Dr. Alicia C. Percival and is included in An Ecclesiastical Miscellany, published by Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society, Records Section, Vol.XI pp.59-102.

First, because the parish was the basis of the ecclesiastical survey, while Men and Armour was based on manors, or groups of manors, it was necessary to match the manors against the parishes. This was not so simple a task as might appear for manor and parish boundaries did not always coincide; boundaries of hundreds sometimes cut through parish boundaries, and parts of some Gloucestershire parishes were in neighbouring counties; e.g. part of Great Barrington was in Berkshire; two of the three hamlets in Welford-on-Avon were in Warwickshire. The chief source of reference used for this purpose was R. Atkyns The Ancient and Present State of Gloucestershire (1712), but further checks are necessary in some instances by reference to the Victoria County History for those hundreds for which it has been completed. The full comparison for each parish in the county is much too long for inclusion here but comparisons for the totals of each hundred, for the whole county, and for individual parishes in some hundreds, is given below. Because some parishes were divided

between two or more hundreds it has been necessary to bring all parts of each parish into the same hundred. E.g. parts of Westbury-on-Severn lay in the hundreds of Westbury, St. Briavels, and the Duchy of Lancaster. In this survey the whole parish has been included in Westbury Hundred. Similarly the City of Gloucester, as given in Men and Armour, consisted only of the area within the city walls. But the city parishes included Tuffley, Kingsholm, Longford, etc., in the Hundred of King's Barton, so, to enable comparison to be made, those areas are included in the city in the tables which follow. In consequence the hundreds as given below, though basically the same, differ to a certain extent from the historic hundreds of Gloucestershire.

Before comparing the information derived from each of these sources the merits and defects of each should be considered.

The Ecclesiastical Survey states the number of communicants in each parish and also the number of recusants and the number of persons who refused to take communion. In some instances the same people appear to be included twice. At Preston-on-Stour 4 men and 3 women were stated to be recusants and 4 men and 3 women to refuse communion, and at Weston-on-Avon 6 men and 2 women are stated to be recusants, 6 men and 2 women to refuse communion. The number of recusants recorded was small, only 69 and Mrs Greville's household at Sezincote 'who are for the most part recusants'. The total number of those stated to refuse communion was 133 of whom 42 at Westbury-on-Severn were stated to be Puritans.

The number of communicants in the parish is in many instances only an estimate. Sometimes this is stated, as at Little Rissington, 90 'or thereabouts', Guiting Power, 100 'or thereabouts'. For many parishes an estimate may be inferred, for of 293 churches for which the number of communicants was given, for 42 the number ends with two zeros and for 125 with one zero. By the law of averages one would expect about 3 exact multiples of 100 and 27 exact multiples of ten. Obviously for at least half the parishes the number of communicants was an estimate.

To compare the number of men listed in Men and Armour with the number of communicants it is necessary to know the age at which young people started to come to communion. Information about this is difficult to obtain. In an article on Gloucestershire village populations, Dr. Percival, referring to a similar ecclesiastical survey in 1676, suggests that the age was then sixteen 'as the age for coming to communion was rising'(2). Presumably it was below sixteen in 1603. In the calculations which follow in this article the age of coming to communion is taken as being fifteen. This may be wrong; the age may have been less or even have varied from parish to parish according to custom or the whim of the minister.

The ecclesiastical survey of 1603 does not include a number of parishes in the south of Gloucestershire which were in the diocese of Bristol. Minety was not included, for,

though the greater part of that parish was in Gloucestershire, the church was in Wiltshire. For some reason unknown Churchdown, which included Hucclecote, was omitted. These places have been omitted from the tables which follow and from any calculations made.

The number of communicants stated for some parishes must be regarded as suspect, e.g. Thornbury, 1705. According to similar surveys there were 700 communicants in 1551; 740 in 1676; and according to Atkyns 1,100 inhabitants in 1712. Hinton-on-the-Green stated to have 200 communicants in 1603 had only 100 in 1551; 85 in 1676 and only 100 inhabitants in 1712 (3). Generally the figures given in the various ecclesiastical surveys reveal a plausible pattern but they should always be subjected to scrutiny.

Men and Armour as a statistical source has the advantage that it does not give numbers but the names of men who certainly existed: we know the occupation, approximate age and physique of most: the employer or employees, the father, sons, or brothers of some. If the number given for a certain place errs it can only err by being too low - it cannot be too high.

Its defect as a statistical source is that it does not include all the men in the 18 to 60 age group, only those 'fitt for his Ma'ties service in the warrs' and liable for militia service. We do not know how many were exempt, or what percentage of men were judged to be unfit, though an attempt to discover this follows later in this article.

The original returns from the constables are in the Muniment Room at Berkeley Castle, not available for scrutiny, and not in fit condition to be handled by the public. It is unlikely that John Smith and William Archard made any serious mistakes when transcribing them. No parish except Weston-on-Avon on the Warwickshire border has been omitted and there may be a reason for this omission. Nevertheless the possibility that a page from a long list may have been mislaid or omitted cannot be completely ignored.

A comparison of the number of men listed in Men and Armour with the number of communicants in 1603 in each of the thirty hundreds and in the whole county is made in Table 1. Column (1) shows the number of communicants plus any recusants and any refusing communion. Column (2) shows the number of men listed in Men and Armour. Column (3) makes a comparison by giving the number of men in Men and Armour for every hundred communicants in 1603.

Of all the hundreds in the county the most likely to present true and accurate lists of the men liable for militia service was Berkeley Hundred, for there lived the Lord Lieutenant who owned much of the land in it. He and John Smith knew almost every farm and household; Smith wrote a massive history of the hundred. Moreover the compilation of the Berkeley muster rolls was to be a model for the rest of the county.

HUNDRED	(1) Com.1603	(2) W.Men 1608	(3)
<u>INSHIRE</u>			
City of Gloucester (Parishes)	3584	702	19.6
Dudstone and King's Barton	2225	665	29.89
	<u>5809</u>	<u>1367</u>	<u>23.53</u>
<u>KIFTSGATE DIVISION</u>			
Kiftsgate	5412	1292	23.87
Deerhurst and Westminster	2760	674	24.42
Cleeve	520	235	45.19
Tibblestone	603	134	22.22
Cheltenham	1246	352	28.21
Pewkesbury (Inc. Borough)	2725	893	32.77
Slaughter	2188	670	30.62
	<u>15456</u>	<u>4250</u>	<u>27.50</u>
<u>BERKELEY DIVISION</u>			
Berkeley (Bristol Diocese omitted)	6632	1932	29.13
Grumbolds Ash	2605	828	31.79
Langley and Swineshead	754	335	44.43
Fucklechurch	816	269	32.97
Barton Regis (All in Bristol Diocese)	-	-	-
Henbury (Yate only)	195	83	42.56
Thornbury	3143	651	20.71
	<u>14145</u>	<u>4098</u>	<u>28.97</u>
<u>DIVISION OF CIRENCESTER and SEVEN HUNDREDS</u>			
Cirencester (Borough)	1838	384	20.89
Crowthorne and Ninety	1233	398	32.28
Rapsgate	855	250	29.24
Brightwells Barrow	1572	449	28.56
Bradley	1425	442	31.02
Longtree	2462	664	35.09
Bisley	2883	732	25.39
Whitstone	3253	1179	36.24
	<u>15521</u>	<u>4698</u>	<u>30.27</u>
<u>FOREST DIVISION</u>			
St Briavels	2395	892	37.24
Westbury	2376	853	35.90
Bledisloe	938	331	35.29
Botloe	1451	624	43.00
Duchy of Lancaster	726	268	36.81
	<u>7888</u>	<u>2968</u>	<u>37.63</u>
<u>TOTAL FOR COUNTY</u>	<u>58819</u>	<u>17381</u>	<u>29.55</u>

In Berkeley Hundred, omitting those parishes which were in Bristol diocese, there were said to be 6,632 communicants in 1603 and 1,932 men fit for militia service in 1608, a ratio of 29.13 militiamen for each 100 communicants. Of the 28 hundreds as shown in Table 1 (Deerhurst and Westminster Hundreds have been combined, and Barton Regis Hundred omitted because all of it was in Bristol diocese) 18 have a higher ratio of militiamen, only 9 a lower ratio, than Berkeley Hundred. The ratio for the whole of the Berkeley Division, which would be well known to the Lord Lieutenant and to John Smith, was 29.00. That ratio was exceeded in the Division of Cirencester and the Seven Hundreds (30.1), and greatly exceeded in the Forest Division (37.6). The ratio was slightly less in Kiftsgate Division, 27.5, and considerably less in the Division of Gloucester City and the In-shire, (Dudstone and Kings Barton Hundreds), where it was 23.5. This was because of the very low return for Gloucester City (19.6). The ratio for Dudstone and Kings Barton was 29.9.

More research is necessary to discover the reason for the very low ratio of militiamen in Gloucester City. The ratio for the borough of Cirencester was not much higher (20.9). For Tewkesbury borough, the only other town of considerable size, the ratio was slightly above average, 31.37.

In the whole of Gloucestershire covered by the survey of 1603, there were 58,819 communicants and 17,381 militiamen; 29.55 militiamen for every 100 communicants. Is it reasonable to suppose that of every hundred persons over fifteen years of age 29.55 were males between 18 and 60 years of age and fit for military service? No reliable statistics concerning the relative numbers of persons within various age groups existed before the census of 1821. Table 2 below gives information from the census returns from Gloucestershire concerning male inhabitants.

TABLE 2 CENSUS 1821 GLOUCESTERSHIRE (4)

Age Group	No. of Males	Over 15 Years	18-60 Years
Under 5	1488	-	-
5-10	1323	-	-
10-15	1172	-	-
15-20	1004	1004	(18-20) 384
20-30	1480	1480	1480
30-40	1102	1102	1102
40-50	960.7	960.7	960.7
50-60	686.8	686.8	686.8
Over 60	781.86	781.86	-
Total	9998.36	6015.36	4613.5

What would be the Numbers of Males of several specified Ages on 28 May 1821, supposing the Number of Males to have been 10,000. (See footnote to Table 3).

From these figures two calculations may be made:

- A. That in 1821 of all males over 15 years of age 76.70% were between 18 and 60 years of age.

$$\left(\frac{4613.5 \times 100}{6015.36} = 76.70 \right)$$

- B. That in 1821 of all men between 18 and 60 years of age 14.89% were between 50 and 60 years of age.

$$\left(\frac{686.8 \times 100}{4613.5} = 14.89 \right)$$

An historian may well be horrified that statistics relating to 1821 should be used to determine the relative composition of age groups in 1608. There are, however, reasons for supposing that the application of this procedure to the age groups with which we are concerned is not so outrageous as might at first appear.

First, the population had been rising in the century ending in 1821 and it is generally believed that a similar rise in population occurred in the century preceding 1608.

Secondly, the principal factors determining the relative sizes of various age groups since 1608 have been dramatic reduction in infant and child mortality in the 19th century, and the almost as dramatic increase in the over-60 age group in the 20th century. As we are concerned only with persons born before 1806 the first factor would have little effect and the second none. It is doubtful whether the expectation of life of a child who survived to the age of 15 years changed much between 1608 and 1821.

Thirdly, in the calculation made in A above, comparison is made between one age group (18 to 60 years) and the sum of the age group immediately above and below it. (15 to 18 years and over 60 years.) This would tend to have a stabilising effect, particularly as the two groups were almost equal and remained so until about 1911, the over-60 group being slightly larger than the 15-18 group.

Fourthly, as shown in Table 3, the number of men between 18 and 60 years of age, as a percentage of all males over 15 years of age, changed very little in the 130 years after 1821. It is therefore not too unreasonable to suggest that it did not change materially between 1608 and 1821.

For these reasons, and through lack of any more reliable statistics, the following calculations have been made based on the assumption that the percentages in A and B above are substantially correct.

The number of communicants in that part of Gloucestershire covered by the Ecclesiastical Survey of 1603 was 58,819.

If we assume that the sexes were equally divided the number of male communicants was 29,409.

If 76.70% of these were of militia age (18 to 60 years) the number of men of militia age in that part of Gloucestershire covered by the survey was 22,556 of whom 14.89% (3,358) were 50-60 years of age, 19198 aged 18-50 years.

TABLE 3

CENSUS RETURNS, ENGLAND AND WALES. MALES. THOUSANDS.

Showing number of men aged 18 to 60 years as a percentage
of all males over 15 years of age.

AGE GROUP	1821	1841	1861	1881
10 - 15	603.6	880.4	1059.9	1402.1
15 - 20	509.6	781.6	957.9	1268.3
15 - 18	509.6	317.0	480.8	586.9
18 - 20	509.6	192.6	300.8	371.0
20 - 60	2174.0	3580.1	4542.1	5767.2
Over 60	378.46	533.9	888.5	876.1
<u>TOTALS</u>				
Over 15	3062.06	4895.6	6188.5	7911.6
18 - 60	2366.6	3880.9	4913.1	6258.4
	77.32%	79.27%	79.39%	79.10%
AGE GROUP	1901	1921	1951	
10 - 15	1671.0	1837.1	1428.6	
15 - 20	1607.5	1727.0	1335.3	
15 - 18	972.1	1049.0	812.6	
18 - 20	635.4	678.0	522.7	
20 - 60	7784.4	9480.9	11820.9	
Over 60	1071.5	1581.4	2910.7	
<u>TOTALS</u>				
Over 15	10463.4	12790.1	16066.9	
18 - 60	8419.8	10158.9	12343.6	
	80.47%	79.43%	76.83%	

(From B.R. Mitchell & Phyllis Deane. Abstract of British Historical Statistics, Cambridge 1962, pp.11, 12).

NOTE. The numbers in the 15 to 18 years and 18 to 20 years groups are not given in the tables but have been calculated on the assumption that the fall in numbers from the 10 to 15 years group to the 15 to 20 years group was uniform in each successive single-year age group. This may not have been so but any difference would be too small to make any appreciable alteration to the calculations.

The same method was used in Table 2.

Of these men the names of 17,381 appear in Men and Armour. (77.06%).

This leaves 5,175 men (22.94% of the total) to be accounted for. These would include:

- a) Those exempt from service: any royal servants (customs officials, etc.); the aristocracy and their 'menial or household servants.' (The clergy are ignored as it is unlikely that they were counted among the communicants).
- b) Any constables who, as at Cheltenham Hundred, did not put their own names on the list, though they had to attend the musters.
- c) One hundred men who had been sent for service in Ireland in June 1608.
- d) By far the largest group; those unfit for service.

More research is necessary concerning the aristocracy and their servants. In Men and Armour 54 knights or men of higher rank are named as lords of manors, but many of these were not resident in the county. Nor do we know how many menial and household servants they had. In several instances men stated to be servants, but not menial or household, are listed in Men and Armour. At Frocester 13 men were stated to be servants to Sir George Huntley. At Sapperton one gentleman, 14 yeomen and 9 husbandmen, and at Pauntley a gardener, a miller and 6 husbandmen are all stated to be servants to Sir Henry Poole. Yet men stated to be household servants to Sir William Throckmorton - a warrener, a keeper, a brewer, and 6 others - are included in the list for Tortworth. Moreover the term 'menial and household servants' appears subject to curious interpretations for at Dodington 8 yeomen and 6 husbandmen were stated to be 'menyall and household servants to Mrs Richard Codrington'.

No servants to Lord Berkeley, household or otherwise, are listed, nor are any to Lord Chandos at Sudeley Castle, though there must have been a considerable number at both Berkeley and Sudeley. No servants are mentioned to Viscount Lisle at Wotton-under-Edge or Lord Stafford at Thornbury. At Kempsford Sir Thomas Thynne, a very wealthy and influential nobleman, was resident in the old castle, but no servants to him were listed. There were 240 communicants at Kempsford so one would expect about 70 men to be fit for the militia. Only 35 were listed. Were about 35 omitted as household servants?

For the purpose of further calculation, the small but arbitrary number of 175 for the aristocracy and their servants, and any others exempt from service, is suggested. This figure, with a further hundred for the men sent to serve in Ireland leaves 4,900 men to be accounted for as unfit for military service, 21.72% of the men of militia age. Is that the percentage which might be reasonably expected?

The men would not have been subjected to a medical examination such as is given to recruits in the modern army. Ability to march to the musters or, in time of war, to the coast was probably the prime consideration. It was only twenty years since some of the men of Gloucestershire had marched to Tilbury camp in readiness to repel the armies of the Spanish Armada. Many of the men would remember that march.

In an age when most men were engaged in heavy manual labour and spent much time weilding scythes, axes, and hammers, accidents causing severe physical injury must have been common. Children were put to work at a very early age and were particularly liable to permanent injury. Skilled surgical attention was almost non-existent - only 5 apothecaries, 2 physicians and 4 surgeons are recorded in Men and Armour - and, in the absence of X-rays, few who suffered a fractured bone in leg or foot would not suffer from a permanent limp.

The percentage of men unfit for service in the 50 to 60 years age-group might be expected to be high. This is the only one of the three age groups into which the men were divided for which definite age limits were given; the other groups were vaguely defined as 'about 20' and 'about 40' years of age. In the hundreds of Longtree, Bisley and Whitstone the age groups of 2,443 men are recorded. Of these, 2344 were in the age groups 'about 20' and 'about 40', that is 18 to 50 years. According to the 1821 census (see calculation E, above) 14.89% of men of militia age were between 50 and 60 years of age. For every 85.11 men in the 18 to 50 age groups therefore one would expect to find 14.89 in the 50 to 60 years group. In these three hundreds therefore

$$\left(\frac{2344 \times 14.89}{85.11} \right) = 410.08 \text{ men}$$

should have been recorded in the 50 to 60 age group. In fact, only 99 were recorded in that group so one may conclude that only 99 out of 410 were fit for service i.e. 24.15%. According to our previous calculations there were 3,358 men in Gloucestershire in that age group. If only 24.15% of these were fit for military service, then

$$\left(\frac{3,358 \times 75.85}{100} \right) = 2,547 \text{ were unfit for service.}$$

We have already calculated that about 4,900 men of all three age groups were unfit for service. If 2,547 of these were in the 50 to 60 age group, then 2,353 were in the 18 to 50 years group which numbered 19,198. The percentage of men in that group who were unfit for service, therefore, was

$$\left(\frac{2,353 \times 100}{19,198} \right) = 12.26\%.$$

To summarise this section: if we accept that the ecclesiastical survey of 1603 was correct; that the age distribution of the population in 1608 was similar to what it was in 1821; that 275 men were exempt from militia service for various reasons: then Men and Armour records the names of 87.74% of all men liable for service aged 18 to 50 years; 24.15% of those between 50 and 60 years of age. These percentages are much as might be expected; This, and the fact that the returns from the Hundred and the Division of Berkeley are likely to be accurate, and that returns from most of the other hundreds and divisions compare favourably with them, lead one to believe that Men and Armour is a reliable source of statistical information.

So far, however, only the totals of communicants and militiamen in the whole county and the the thirty hundreds into which it was divided have been considered. When the numbers for each single parish are examined other problems arise. On average there were about thirty militiamen for every hundred communicants and, as shown, this appears to be an acceptable ratio. Variations from the average are to be expected, for some parishes would have a higher or lower proportion of women, fifteen to eighteen year olds, old people, or unfit men. A variation of between 24 and 36 militiamen might reasonably be expected; an even wider variation in small parishes. Table 4 shows the number of parishes in each of the five divisions of the county which returned: (a) 24 to 36 militiamen per 100 communicants, (b) more than 36, (c) less than 24.

The numbers in brackets refer to small parishes with 100 or less communicants.

TABLE 4

Division	24 -- 36	Above 36	Below 24
1. Inshire; Gloucester, Dudstone & King's Barton	- 10 (5)	- 4 (1)	1 2 (1)
2. Kiftsgate	32 (12)	17 (11)	31 (9)
3. Berkeley	32 (3)	13 (7)	7 (2)
4. Cirencester and the Seven Hundreds	- 43 (18)	- 26 (19)	1 16 (8)
5. Forest	11 (1)	20 (9)	-
Total	266 (106)	128 (39)	80 (47)
	58 (20)		

Future research will involve investigation of each individual parish where there appears to be an unacceptable disparity between the number of communicants and the number of militiamen. There are several possible explanations.

- a) Overlapping of manor, parish and county boundaries. (It is noticeable that many of the parishes with a low percentage of militiamen were on the county border)
- b) Omission of household servants to the aristocracy.
- c) Possible changes in parish boundaries between 1603 and 1712 when Atkyns wrote The Ancient and Present State of Gloucestershire on which the grouping of manors into parishes in this article has been based.
- d) More likely is the over or under-estimation of the number of communicants in the Ecclesiastical Survey of 1603.

In comparing two sets of statistics, neither of which can be relied upon completely, the danger of circular argument is always present and so is the danger of preferring one set of statistics to the other as and when it supports the argument. Instances have already been given in which the number of communicants in a parish appears to have been over-estimated. Under-estimation is even more apparent for parishes such as Rodborough where there were stated to be only 115 communicants but 118 militiamen are named. Not only in single parishes,

HUNDRED OF DUDSTONE & KING'S BARTON

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Maiseacre	179	53	29.61
Preston	48	14	29.17
Churchdown	-	62	(Not inc.)
Hucclecote (Not in 1603 survey)	-	29	in total)
Sandhurst (232+1 Ref.Com.)	233	70	30.04
Hartpury	250	102	40.80
Wilcombe	70	19	27.14
Shurdington Magna	37	10	35.14
Up-Hatherley	37	3	13
Brockworth	140	43	30.71
Mortor	157	51	32.48
Radgeworth	220	73	33.18
Down Hatherley	55	24	43.64
Brockthorpe	86	21	24.42
Hempsted	106	14	13.21
Whaddon	84	24	28.57
Elmore	236	87	35.86
Upton St Leonards	287		
Matson	37	57	17.59
Saintbridge	37		

APPENDIX

HUNDRED OF BERKELEY

PARISH	(1)	(2)	(3)
	Com. 1603	M. Men 1608	
Berkeley		97	} 412 29.43
Ham		26	
Pedington		16	
Bevington		19	
Clapton		17	
Saniger	1400	8	
Wanswell		25	
Halmore		41	
Alkington		106	
Hinton		46	
Breadstone		11	
Hill	140	37	26.43
Stone	190	34	17.89
Wotton-under Edge		146	} 300 24.67
Huntingford		3	
Synwell	1216	70	
Combe		38	
Wortley		43	
Cromhall		60	} 80 33.33
Cromhall Abbots	240	20	
Dursley		101	} 158 30.21
Woodmancote	523	57	
Uley	180	56	31.11
Newington Bagpath	120	} 46	} 63 33.16
Ozleworth	70		
Owlpen			
Kingscote	118	33	27.97
Beverstone	115	41	35.65
Nymphsfield (90 + 1 Ref. Com.)	91	26	28.57
North Nibley	413	126	30.51
Cam	400	121	30.25
Stinchcombe	220	61	27.73
Coaley	330	102	30.91
Slimbridge and Hurst	300	115	38.33
Arlingham	366	96	26.23
Ashleworth	200	71	35.50
TOTAL	6632	1932	29.13

HUNDRED OF KIPPSGATE

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Winchcombe		153	
Greet		10	
Gretton	862	33	223 25.87
Stanley Pontlarge		16	
Postlip		11	
Sudeley	20	-	-
Stanton	176	44	67 38.07
Snowhill		23	
Guiting Power	100	29	41 41.00
Farmcote		12	
Buckland and Laverton	195	48	24.62
Aston Somerville (Not in 1603 survey)	-	7	(Not inc. in total)
Batsford	60	5	8.33
Hawling	40	10	25.00
Dumbleton	170	36	21.18
Toddington	130	30	23.08
Temple Guiting (160)		45	
Pinnocke (7) Hyde and Ford	167	12	57 34.13
Errington & Hidcote (20 + 1 Ref. Com.)	201	42	58 28.86
Charingworth		16	
Wickleton (240 - 6 Ref. Com.)	246	71	28.86
Willersey	120	36	30.00
Didbrook		28	
Hailes	94	10	38 40.43
Aston Subedge	74	11	14.86
Longborough	144	44	30.56
Pebworth	200	29	14.50
Broad Marston (Long Marston)		13	
Dry Marston (Marston Sicca)	209	23	36 17.22
Upper Swell (Over Swell)	47	9	19.15
Chipping Campden		123	
Barrington		21	161 22.80
Broad Campden	706	12	
Wesington		5	
Combe		22	11.00
Saintbury	200	41	14.64
Childs Wickham and Murcot	280	35	
Quinton, Lower or Church		34	
Over Quinton		8	81 20.25
Admington	400	4	
Rodbrook			
Weston Subedge (130 + 1 R.C. + 4 Ref. Com.)	135	20	14.81
Dorsington	40	10	25.00
Cow Honeybourne	40	21	52.50
Wormington, Little	40	15	37.50
Twynning	280	65	23.21
Charlton Abbots	36	7	19.44
TOTAL	5412	1292	23.87

but in whole hundreds, under-estimation of the number of communicants is almost certain. If sexes were equally divided more than 90% of males over 15 years of age were able-bodied and between 18 and 60 years of age in Cleeve Hundred; 89% in Langley and Swineshead; 72% in Whitstone Hundred. Under-estimation of communicants is apparent in the whole of the Forest Division for it is very improbable that 75% of males there over 15 years of age were of militia age and fit for service. Constables did not invent names of men for the militia; Men and Armour can only err by understating, not over-stating the number of men eligible for service.

· Is Men and Armour a better basis for estimating population than the Ecclesiastical Survey of 1603?

Further research and time for reflection will probably result in some modification, but not in substantial alteration, of the conclusions arrived at in this article. In the totals for the county, Men and Armour and the Ecclesiastical Survey of 1603 are in agreement. In most of the Hundreds, and in about half of the parishes, they also agree. Some of the other parishes had so small a population that a wide divergence from the average ratio of militiamen to communicants is not surprising. In about half of the remaining parishes the Survey of 1603 has obviously underestimated the number of communicants. As the totals for the county agree, it seems probable that the survey over-estimated the number of communicants in the other half, the under and over-estimations approximately balancing each other.

JOHN W. WYATT

SOURCES

1. J. Smith, Men and Armour for Gloucestershire in 1608 (1902)
2. C. Percival, 'A Survey of the Diocese of Gloucester, 1603', An Ecclesiastical Miscellany, B.G.A.S. Records Section, Vol.XI, pp.59-102.
3. A.C. Percival, 'Gloucestershire Village Populations', Local Population Studies, No.8 (Spring 1972).
4. R. Atkyns, The Ancient and Present State of Gloucestershire (1712)
5. B.R. Mitchell & P. Deane, Abstract of British Historical Statistics (1962).

REFERENCES

1. J.W. Wyatt, 'Men and Armour for Glos. in 1608', Gloucestershire Historical Studies, VIII (1977)
2. A.C. Percival, 'Glos. Village Populations', Local Population Studies, No.8, p.43.
3. Ibid. Appendix.
4. Population Tables 1841. Abstract of the Answers and Returns. (H.M.S.O.) p.20.