

ART. XI – *The plague in Kendal in 1598: some new evidence*

By C.B. PHILLIPS

WHILE the presence of plague in Kendal borough in 1598, attested by the parish register, and by corporation records, has long been accepted, its significance has been hard to estimate because gaps in the register conceal the numbers of deaths.<sup>1</sup> At the same time, a seemingly incredible figure of 2,500 plague deaths in 1598 in Kendal obtained from a long lost carving in Penrith church has heightened the mystery.<sup>2</sup> Plague also occurred in that year in Carlisle, and in Penrith itself, as well as in a few rural parishes. For Kendal, the plague came on top of severe mortality recorded in the parish register for the eighteen months or so prior to the late summer of 1598. This extended mortality, widely paralleled over Cumbria and well documented by a number of parish registers, has seemed the more important influence on the town's demographic development and, indeed, on that of Cumbria as a whole. It is currently attributed by historians to epidemic disease(s) thriving on a population living in dearth conditions.<sup>3</sup> Our estimate of the significance of the 1598 plague for the borough of Kendal, though not for Cumbria as a whole, can now be revised. Two recently discovered single sheet documents throw new light on the impact of the plague in Kendal in the summer of 1598.<sup>4</sup> They comprise a fair copy and a rough version, both containing the same information except that the rough version lacks a formal heading and has an additional, annotated date.

The fair copy is in a hand and style of layout common to Kendal corporation documents of the later sixteenth century. It is headed: "Corporacion of Kirkbye Kendall A true note taken from the Clerk of Kendall church mencyoning the nomnumber of those which dyed of the Infectious syknes, thar and on the Kirkland, this Tennthe of Marche 1598 [/99], before [space] vizt Mr Edward Wilkinson Alderman thar". It gives the number for the Highgate as 500, and for Stricklandgate and Marketstead at 326. It gives for "Stramongate 400/ wherof beyond the bridge 160".<sup>5</sup> Then follow the names of those included in the above totals who had died since 1 December 1598 and, separately, those who had died of "other syknesses"; both sets of names are listed in two columns, headed respectively, "Towne", and "Beyond Stramangate bridge". Finally, a note at the bottom of the page gives the number of deaths in Kirkland at 245. The draft is annotated with the date 19 December and appears to suggest that deaths are noted subsequent to that date, rather than subsequent to 1 December.

The veracity of the corporation document is supported by comparison with the parish register. As now bound up, burial registration ended in August 1598 and began again on Christmas Day 1598. Throughout January and February 1598/99 the register distinguished between plague and non-plague deaths.<sup>6</sup> The corporation document refers to "Infectious syknes" whereas the register refers to the plague. Nevertheless, the names listed in the document of those who died of the "Infectious syknes" agree with those of townsmen listed in the parish register as dying of the plague, except that the document additionally records the burial of a child of Thomas Doddinge (Thomas was also recorded and appeared in the register). The

names in the document's list of those who died "of other syknesses" since the first of December 1598 cannot be found in the parish register, presumably because they died before registration records reappear at Christmas 1598.<sup>7</sup> In other words the corporation's "Infectious syknes" was plague.

There are five uncertainties about the document. First, the numbers: for Highgate (500) and for Stramongate (400) they are perhaps suspiciously round. The Stramongate figure poses further problems. Kendal borough was divided for many administrative purposes into three townships, Highgate, Stricklandgate, and Stramongate; Kirkland was outside the borough. Stramongate included the houses on the east side of Stramongate bridge in Crossbank or Farcrossbank.<sup>8</sup> In the fair copy the word "wherof" ("therof" in the draft) probably refers back to the figure 400, but could refer to the word "Stramongate", so that 400 died in Stramongate street and another 160 over the bridge. My own reading is that the 160 beyond the bridge are included in the 400. I therefore total these figures for Kendal borough at 1,226, and for the borough plus Kirkland at 1,471 (the higher alternatives would be 1,386 and 1,631).

The second uncertainty is that there is no starting date given for the count in the corporation document: when did the "Infectious syknes" begin? The date of the first death from plague recorded in the register depends on how we construe various annotations in it.<sup>9</sup> Two annotations for 7 July 1598 read "plag" "nill", and the annotation "pla" had been used from 22 July 1598 to describe nine burials that month though none in August. The register also used the annotation "p" to describe four other burials in late July, though again this annotation was not used in August. In the manuscript register all these annotations look to be contemporary, though of course one cannot be absolutely sure of this. Although apparently contemporary they may, however, have been written after the entries were made, for they are placed in the left hand margin in the manuscript (and not at the end of the line as in the printed edition). I can think of no other interpretation for "plag" and "pla" than as abbreviations for plague.

The annotation "p" is more problematic. Its use overlaps with "pla", so perhaps the two annotations refer to different symptoms; the shape of the letter p suggests a different hand from "pla". On the other hand, it is clear from the annotation at the end of the August 1598 entries,<sup>10</sup> that some system of payment is connected with the register entries from 25 March 1598, and apparently with the entries in the previous twelve month period. A number of entries are annotated "nill" or "nihill", and two of these annotations have been deleted.<sup>11</sup> The annotation "p" might be part of this payment system,<sup>12</sup> which would explain its overlap with "pla", and also the doubly annotated entry "plag nill". Such annotations, though not "p", are to be found in entries for 1593 and 1594, and in 1595 the annotation "o" is commonly used in the manuscript register. The significance of the "p" annotation is that if "p" refers to plague then the first cases were noted in October 1597, though between then and the end of registration in August 1598 "p" was only used twenty-five times. But, if "p" does not refer to plague, then the first annotations to indicate plague appear in late July 1598.<sup>13</sup> It seems likely that the corporation figures total epidemic burials from late July 1598 to 10 March 1598/99. Even if they do include deaths before July, only twenty-five early plague cases are identified in the register, so that the great majority of the deaths enumerated in the corporation document occurred in late August, September, October, and November 1598.<sup>14</sup>

The third uncertainty is the term “Infectious syknes”. The parish register clearly refers to plague, so that there is a difference between the register and the document as to the cause of most of the deaths. There may have been a contemporary difference of opinion, and as the corporation paid men and women to look at corpses it would have had its own reports on the appearance of the dead, independent of the parish clerk.<sup>15</sup> A more likely explanation lies in the purpose of the corporation document. It meshes with known steps taken by the corporation to re-establish routine economic life in the aftermath of the autumn epidemic, and in the face of some panicky rumours about the epidemic’s revival which overtook the corporation’s decision to re-open the town’s market and close down the unofficial, temporary market which had sprung up on Hay Fell. Some were reportedly worried about

. . . (the subtiltye of the sykenes latelye rulinge heare) the properties of which (as hath bene sayd) is to lye hydlie lurking for and by a longe space together and then afterwarde to begynn to stirr and growe of newe agayne . . .<sup>16</sup>

In such circumstances it may well have been better to report on an “Infectious syknes” than upon plague, as well as being able to show, as the document does, who had died of it and who had died of some other cause. The document is dated a week after the corporation’s latest proclamation of 3 March 1598/99 to reopen the town’s market. Other corporation documents refer to the plague,<sup>17</sup> and, despite the description “Infectious sykenes”, on balance, that attribution does not offer sufficient evidence to doubt the presence of plague.

The penultimate uncertainty stems from the enumeration of “those which dyed of the Infectious syknes” and is strengthened by a later phrase in the corporation document, “The number of such as dyed of other syknesses synce the same first of dec[ember]”. The names listed under “other syknesses” imply an additional five deaths to the 1,226 enumerated for the borough, and that in the period of the plague there were deaths due to other causes not counted in the enumeration. The last uncertainty concerns the special emphasis on Stramongate beyond the bridge: 160 (40%) out of 400 Stramongaters who died lived across the bridge. That was neither an especially densely nor extensively populated part of the town. Perhaps the plague began here or was more persistent here, or perhaps the interest in Crossbank was merely that infection there made containment more difficult.

The new corporation document raises issues about two other historical sources. One of the earliest references to the impact of the plague in Kendal in 1598 used to be found carved in Penrith parish church, though it has been lost for well over a hundred years now. This gave deaths from plague<sup>18</sup> in 1598 as 2,500 in Kendal, 2,200 in Richmond, 2,266 in Penrith, and 1,196 in Carlisle. There are three problems about the Penrith church figure: first, no source is known for the information in this now lost carving, the text of which was recorded in various forms by different authorities; second, no corroborating figures have hitherto been discovered; and third, uncertainty as to what is meant by the place names – city, borough, honor, manor, parish, ward, barony, dale, or deanery. Kendal was the name of a number of these; there was more than one parish in Carlisle, and all were the names of deaneries (Penrith was an alias for Cumberland).<sup>19</sup>

The figure of 1,471 plague deaths in Kendal and Kirkland is smaller than the figure given from Penrith parish church. Either the corporation figure is an underestimate, or the carved figure includes deaths from some wider meaning of the word Kendal than just the borough; or the carved figure is an exaggeration. It seems reasonable to suppose that the church might record figures for an ecclesiastical jurisdiction, like the whole of Kendal parish including its rural chapelries, or the rural deanery of Kendal. There is, however, little direct evidence of plague in the rural areas of the parish, most obviously because the parish register itself does not survive, though Cuthbert Fisher from Natland and Ed Sommer from Whinfell buried in January 1598/99 had died of the plague. But the possibility of rural plague is raised by trips from Kendal by the corporation's viewers to look at corpses in Whinfell, Staveley, and Crooke; the chamberlains' accounts do not record what judgement as to the cause of death was made.<sup>20</sup> Plague was not a major rural killer, but the routine trade between market town and country, not to mention the contacts with those who attended baptisms, or marriages, or burials in Kendal in July and August 1598, could have spread the disease there. The one surviving burial register for a rural parish in Kendal deanery is for Halton, some distance to the south, and it shows no signs of a mortality crisis in the late summer and autumn of 1598.<sup>21</sup> It is thus impossible, for Kendal deanery, to test the Rev. H. Whitehead's idea that the Penrith figures refer to totals for deaneries.<sup>22</sup> If there was rural plague, it was not everywhere in Kendal parish, for as we have seen, there was a market on Hay Fell; Cornelius Nicholson's story that provisions were left at Coneyheads on Hay Fell for Kendal people to collect, implying that the town was in some way isolated from the surrounding area, may have substance.<sup>23</sup>

The carved figures for Carlisle, Penrith, and Richmond cannot be reconciled with figures for plague deaths in those towns in 1598. Plague deaths in Carlisle have been estimated at ninety-one, and at 149. For Penrith itself, the parish register records over 100 burials in each month for July, August, and September 1598, falling to over fifty in October, after an earlier peak of over eighty in May and about fifty in June, but nothing approaching the 2,266 carved on the church wall. There is a little evidence for rural plague which might swell the numbers in Cumberland, though some registers do not survive. At Richmond in Yorkshire, between August 1597 and December 1598, 1,050 burials from "pestilence" were registered, and more are known to have been buried in unconsecrated ground. Like Kendal, Carlisle and Richmond were also the names of deaneries, and the carved mortality figures might refer to those larger jurisdictions rather than simply to the towns.<sup>24</sup> The point of these excursions to Cumberland and Yorkshire towns is to show that the carved figures for them are not well enough supported for the carved figure of 2,500 for Kendal to represent a challenge to the veracity of the Kendal corporation document. The Penrith carvings remain a puzzle.<sup>25</sup>

The second source brought into focus by the new corporation document is Kendal parish register. Although the corporation employed men and women to view the corpses (the first named were Robert Fisher and Ned Harrison; Harrison did not survive that harrowing task, and others were subsequently used), there is no evidence that any of them made and/or kept a count. It is thus quite credible that the corporation should turn to the parish clerk for information about the trend of mortality. The parish clerk may also have been regarded as a source independent of

the corporation, a significant consideration if we view the generation of the corporation document as part of the efforts already mentioned to normalise the town after the epidemic. The corporation document is quite clear on the origins of the information – from the parish clerk of Kendal church, and this raises the question of where he got the information from, for, as we have seen, no such burials are now contained in the parish register. The fact that the parish clerk could divide deaths/burials into the townships of the borough plus Kirkland, and distinguish beyond Stramongate bridge, implies the existence of some sort of records (even if two totals are suspiciously round). Marriage registrations stopped after 29 July 1598, recommenced on a new page on 1 January 1598/99; a baptism was registered for 17 August, then one on 6 September 1598, then nothing until registration began again, on a new page, on 7 January 1598/99. It is entirely possible that baptisms, marriages, and formal burials were suspended under the threat of plague, as other communal activities were. It is also possible that registration stopped because the parish clerk died, and the one who provided the figures in March 1598/99 was a new clerk. Indeed the registration of burials in August 1598 ends in the middle of a page in the manuscript register, whereas September follows on immediately in most other years in the register. If this stop seems sudden, the annotation “unpaid to my Mr but receap Sir Henrie”,<sup>26</sup> written under it suggests a reasoned end to registration (unless the annotation is significantly later).

On the other hand, it is clear from the manuscript of the register that in December 1598 and January 1599 the plague burials and other burials were recorded on separate sheets. From changes in hands and in inks, entries were written at the time, rather than fair copied at some later date, which raises the possibility that the parish clerk had been keeping separate sets of plague and non-plague burials for some time before December 1598, and that it was the adoption of this dual registration format that caused the usual form of the register to end in the middle of a page in August 1598, rather than the catastrophe of the plague.<sup>27</sup>

Overall, there seem to be no grounds for doubting that the corporation document offers, at least, an approximation of the number killed by the plague in Kendal in 1598. Although mortality in the previous eighteen months had been unusually high (297 had been buried from the borough between 1 January 1596/7 and 31 December 1597, and eighty-four to the end of June 1598), it bore no comparison to the shock that was to come in the autumn of 1598. Then, according to Richard Leake of Killington, people were “diligent shunning each of others presence for fear of infection”.<sup>28</sup> What impact did the loss of 1,226 people in some three or four months, and the accompanying terror of plague, have on the borough of Kendal? Those who died would have been town residents. This is not to say that they had all been born in Kendal town, but they were settled there. Between March 1597 and March 1598 the parish register recorded the burial of less than thirty from outside the parish, the name and home residence of a few were known, but many were anonymous itinerants. Equally, it seems unlikely that many of those who died in the plague would have drifted in from the countryside to the town, rather people would have kept away from the plague infested town; indeed the corporation appointed men to keep “cripples” away in the summer of 1598.<sup>29</sup>

Such a high level of mortality in three or four months makes it easier to appreciate the odd pieces of evidence about the dislocation of town life that we have. The court

of record did not meet that autumn, and the weekly market, as we have seen, was moved away from Kendal because of the plague, and market traders were reluctant to return to the town. The Chamberlains' accounts for the year beginning Michaelmas 1598 were headed "*Tempori Plagi*", though they were probably not written up until after the plague had ended. Taxation to support those who were confined in houses which became infected, to build isolation houses on the Fell, and to pay for watchmen to keep them in their houses, and for men to examine the dead, was high.<sup>30</sup> A "booke of sessment for the poor in the begynnyng of the plague" assessed 289 households throughout the town for a total of £10 14s.2d. This assessment was levied at least four and perhaps five times.<sup>31</sup> The corporation lost revenue, court leet income was not collected, and rents due before April 1599 were not received. Their income from the castle mills dried up from July to November 1598. The chief officer of the corporation, the alderman, is said in the book of record to have died of the plague, as are one of the twelve burgesses and four of the twenty-four assistants; the alderman had made his will on 26 July 1598 "Seeinge the uncerteintie of mans liffe here in this world especially in this tyme of god his visitacion. Yett god be praised in good health . . .".<sup>32</sup>

The impact of the plague on the town persisted for some years. The corporation was still trying to collect rent arrears from 1598 in 1614. In 1604 a house on the west side of Stricklandgate was described as "ruinated", its last occupant, Elizabeth Carter, widow, having "died in the late plague tyme".<sup>33</sup> In the longer term and in a national perspective England's population, and the population of many of the other towns that were affected, continued to grow despite the plague's spectacular mortality. Plague might, however, check urban populations in the medium term, as the 1637 outbreak did at Newcastle-upon-Tyne.<sup>34</sup> Kendal's population may have exceeded 3,200 in 1576. No evidence for the seventeenth century indicates a population in excess of 2,200 to 2,600. We have no precise enumeration of the resident town population before the plague, but a muster return of 1595 suggests it was between 2,200 and 2,600. The muster list is supported by a list of Kendal "inhabitants" for 1587/88, which suggests a population also in the range 2,200–2,600 but the term "inhabitant" might exclude some residents. "Views" of eleven of Kendal's thirteen wards in 1606/7, adjusted for the missing two wards, give a figure in the same range, and so do crude calculations based on what survives of the parish register for the first decade of the seventeenth century. Natural increase may have played a part in the recovery to the pre-plague level, for the parish register shows a fragile surplus of baptisms over burials in a few years in the first two decades of the seventeenth century. No doubt much of the ravaging was repaired by migration, and once the population had begun to adjust towards its 1595 levels, the corporation, as the views of 1606/7 instance, perhaps became concerned to monitor as much to encourage new arrivals.<sup>35</sup>

If these estimates of Kendal's population and plague deaths are anywhere near accurate, some of the mystery about 1598 is removed. The town's population had fallen significantly after 1576 but before the plague struck in 1598. The 1598 plague killed about a half of the townspeople. If we assume that the population sources of 1587/88 and 1595 underestimate the population, and that the suggested 1576 level still obtained, 40% of the population died. Such mortality was worse than the 30–33% for Norwich in 1587 calculated by Dr Slack, the highest proportion noted

in his detailed urban studies, though it is lower than Fieldhouse and Jennings' estimate that two-thirds of the population of the market town of Richmond died.<sup>36</sup> The plague of 1598 was by a long way the most severe, but not the only curb on population in the 1590s, and it was a curb from which the town's population level had made at least a modest recovery within a decade.

## Notes and References

- <sup>1</sup> *The registers of Kendal, pt. III* [hereafter *KPR III*], trs. R.N. Birley (CWAAS, Parish Register Section, 1952), 90; *The Booke off Recorde of Kirkbie Kendal*, ed. R.S. Ferguson (CWAAS, Extra Series, VII, 1892), [hereafter *B. of R.*] 23, 27, 28, 33, 34.
- <sup>2</sup> William Nicholson, *Miscellany accounts of the Diocese of Carlile*, ed. R.S. Ferguson (London, 1877), 154, writing in 1704, seems to be the earliest record of this carving in print. This judgement discounts the version printed in Daniel Fleming, *Description of the County of Cumberland*, ed. R.S. Ferguson (CWAAS Tract Series, III, 1889), 18, as a later corruption of Fleming's original manuscript of 1671, see *Fleming Senhouse Papers*, ed. E. Hughes (Cumberland Record Series, II, Carlisle, nd), xi, 52.
- <sup>3</sup> The latest regional work on this is A.B. Appleby, *Famine in Tudor and Stuart England* (Liverpool, 1978), 109–121. See also E.A. Wrigley and R.S. Schofield, *The Population History of England 1541–1871* (London, 1981) for a survey of the national demographic history of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, and especially 670–673, for studies of local crisis mortality in the 1590s (though only Cumberland and Furness parishes are in their sample). D.M. Palliser, "Tawney's century: Brave New World or Malthusian trap", *Economic History Review*, 2nd series, XXXV (1982), is an optimistic view of the demography of this period.
- <sup>4</sup> Now Cumbria County Record Office, Kendal [hereafter CROK], WD/Cat A1339. I am grateful to Mr Richard Hall for bringing these documents to my attention. His discovery of them was covered in the local and national press in 1989, e.g. *Daily Telegraph*, 5 June 1989. They were in the possession of the previous owner for some thirty or forty years. I would also like to thank all the staff of the office for their help in preparing this paper.
- <sup>5</sup> The draft reads "Stramongate iiiic. Beyond the bridge thereof [erasure] 160".
- <sup>6</sup> *KPR*, III, 90. The manuscript register (CROK, WPR38/2) appears to be a collection of sheets subsequently bound, sometimes not in the correct chronological order.
- <sup>7</sup> One of these, "Richard Bratwhette's wyfe a wyddow" might be Anne wife of Richard Brathwett of Highgate, burial registered 8 March 1598/99 (*KPR*, III, 90). If so, "A child of same wyves" listed in the document does not appear in the register.
- <sup>8</sup> For these divisions see A.H. Smith, *The place names of Westmorland* (English Place Name Society, XLII, 1967), 116–117.
- <sup>9</sup> The annotations quoted below are *KPR*, III, 88, 89; for an earlier nihil see 68, and for the first "p" see 79 (October 1597).
- <sup>10</sup> *KPR*, III, 90.
- <sup>11</sup> The printed version does not have all the annotations (e.g. the entry in *KPR*, III, 73 for 27 May is annotated), and it does not have the two annotations which were deleted, see 8 May and 10 May.
- <sup>12</sup> It is not clear what the payments are for. See also *KPR*, III, 36.
- <sup>13</sup> Appleby, *Famine in Tudor and Stuart England*, 109, note 1, says that the plague in Carlisle, Penrith, and Kendal began in autumn 1597, then went dormant over the winter, but gives no source for this statement for Kendal.
- <sup>14</sup> The count in the parish register (*KPR*, III, 85; it looks roughly contemporary in the manuscript) of the unusually high mortality in the eighteen months or so before late summer 1598 gives a figure of 668 for the burials for the whole parish, and not just for the borough of Kendal plus Kirkland, for the period from 26 March 1597 to 25 March 1598. This count does not appear to be connected with the "infectious syknes" document, which refers to the borough and Kirkland. If, however, the corporation document were to include the mortality of 1597, it would still leave us with substantial plague mortality, of 1,175.
- <sup>15</sup> CROK, Kendal Chamberlains' accounts [hereafter *KCA*], 1597–98, extraordinary expenditure.

- Individual items in these accounts are not dated, and it is unclear as to what the relationship is between position in the accounts, the order of events, the order in which payment was sanctioned, and the order in which payment was made.
- <sup>16</sup> CROK, WD/Cat A1339, part of the corporation's proclamation to re-open Kendal market, 3 March 1598/99. A facsimile of one version of this, and a transcript of the other, are printed in [John Marsh], *A celebration of 800 years of Market Kendal 1189–1989* (Kendal, nd).
- <sup>17</sup> See notes 1 and 15 above, and notes 30 and 31 below.
- <sup>18</sup> The records of this inscription cited in notes 2 and 19 are both in Latin and use the word *pestis*, which means both plague and infectious disease.
- <sup>19</sup> H. Barnes, "Visitations of the plague in Cumberland and Westmorland", *CW1*, x–xi, 173. Cf. the version in note 2 above with that in N. & B., (reprinted Wakefield, 1976), II, 410 which has a different text but the same numbers except, for Penrith given as 2260.
- <sup>20</sup> KCA, 1597–98, extraordinary payments.
- <sup>21</sup> *The registers of Halton*, trs. H. Brierley (Lancashire Parish Register Society, XLIV, 1912), 42. There may be gaps in the autumn of 1598. The registers for Grasmere (CROK, WPR 91/1) and for Warton – *The Register of Warton 1568–1812*, trs. W. H. Chippindall (Lancashire Parish Register Society, LXXIII, 1935) – survive, but there are substantial gaps in the 1590s, including 1598.
- <sup>22</sup> Barnes, *op.cit.*, 174.
- <sup>23</sup> Quoted in Barnes, *op.cit.*, 177.
- <sup>24</sup> For Carlisle cf. Appleby, *Famine in Tudor and Stuart England*, 109, with J. Hughes, "The plague in Carlisle 1597/8", *CW2*, lxxi, 53. For Penrith, Appleby, *op.cit.*, 110. Hughes, *op.cit.*, 54 also thought the carved figures must refer to deaneries. Barnes, *op.cit.*, 175, 176 cites evidence of rural plague in northern Cumbria. For Richmond see R. Fieldhouse and B. Jennings, *A history of Richmond and Swaledale* (London, 1978), 104–105; they also postulated that the 2,200 figure referred to the deanery of Richmond.
- <sup>25</sup> Two population estimates for the parish of Kendal, both, however, a long time prior to 1598, suggest that 2,500 deaths for the whole parish is not out of the question. The 1548 chantry return (Public Record Office, London, Exchequer, Certificates of Colleges and Chantries, E. 301/11) gives 6,000 "houselinge people", that is, of communicant age or 60% of population, so perhaps about 10,000 individuals in all (W.B. Stephens, *Sources for English local history* (Manchester, 1973), 31). The 1563 ecclesiastical return (British Library, London, Harleian MS. 594, f. 105) which (for what it is worth for Kendal – C.B. Phillips, "The population of the borough of Kendal in 1576", *CW2*, lxxxii, 57) enumerates 2,122 households (perhaps 10,000 people).
- <sup>26</sup> If this is the Rev. Henrie Wilkinson, a curate of Kendal, he made his will 1 August 1598, though it was not proved until 25 June 1599 (Lancashire County Record Office, Preston, Archdeaconry of Richmond probate records, WRW/K [hereafter LRO, WRW/K]).
- <sup>27</sup> An alternative is that the present gaps in the parish register result from loss of parts of the register between 1599 and modern times, and that the parish clerk had detailed information on burials to hand in March 1598/99, from the normal parish records.
- <sup>28</sup> Quoted in E.M. Wilson, "Richard Leake's plague sermons 1599", *CW2*, lxxv, 160.
- <sup>29</sup> KCA, 1597–98, extraordinary payments.
- <sup>30</sup> KCA, 1597–98; 1598–99.
- <sup>31</sup> CROK, WD/MB, HMC A4.
- <sup>32</sup> KCA, 1597–98; 1598–99. See note 1 above for the deaths. Alderman Armer died before his term of office finished at the end of September, but his inventory was not drawn up until 2 May 1599 (LRO, WRW/K pr. 27 June 1599).
- <sup>33</sup> KCA, 1614–15. CROK, Kendal Corporation Deeds, bdle 78/2.
- <sup>34</sup> For a general survey see P.A. Slack, *The impact of plague in Tudor and Stuart England* (London, 1985), especially chs 5, 7. For Newcastle see R. Howell, *Newcastle-upon-Tyne and the puritan revolution* (Oxford, 1967).
- <sup>35</sup> These sources are discussed in Phillips, *CW2*, lxxxii. Note the point made there that the 1576 source is uncorroborated.
- <sup>36</sup> Slack, *Impact of plague*, 130. Fieldhouse and Jennings, *Richmond and Swaledale*, 104.