

POPULATION IN DERBYSHIRE IN THE REIGN OF KING CHARLES II: THE USE OF HEARTH-TAX ASSESSMENTS AND THE COMPTON CENSUS

By DAVID G. EDWARDS

Now that a fairly comprehensive tabulation of the numbers of hearths and entries in the hearth-tax assessments for individual places in Derbyshire between 1662 and 1670 has become available, thanks mainly to the work of the late C.A.F. Meekings¹, it is tempting to try to compare estimates of population based on the numbers of entries with estimates based on the 'Compton census' of 1676. A transcript of the Derbyshire section of the latter from the Salt MSS at Stafford has twice been published². Apart from the figures for the totals of conformists and papists (which should be 49,533 and 592 respectively), the transcript is accurate, but it is worth emphasising that the manuscript is an eighteenth-century copy of the original returns, which are lost.

Problems

The task at first sight may appear to be one of merely selecting suitable multipliers: one for hearth-tax entries and another for the Compton totals (conformists + papists + nonconformists). However, closer examination of the two sources and a more critical consideration reveal several problems which make the business much more complex, and the final result is in fact a combination rather than a comparison of the two sources. The problems fall into two main groups: geographical, and numerical.

Let us take the geographical problems first. For one thing, the Compton returns do not cover the whole of the county. Not only are the extra-parochial districts absent (the inquiry was conducted on a parochial basis, so their omission is not surprising), but a number of parishes are also missing — more than those noted by J. C. Cox in the first publication of his transcript — as well as those districts in the county which were parts of parishes centred in Leicestershire or Staffordshire. The complete list of obvious omissions is as follows.

Parishes	Extra-parochial districts	Parts of Leics./Staffs. parishes
Barton Blount	Beauchief	Appleby
Blackwell ¹	Dale Abbey	Chilcote
Calke	Hulland Ward Intakes	Edingale
Hartington ²	Peak Forest	Packington
Heath		Winhill
Sawley ³		
Willesley		
Wirksworth ⁴		

¹ in Scarsdale

² including Earl Sterndale chapelry

³ including Breaston, Long Eaton, Risley and Wilne chapelries

⁴ including Alderwasley and Cromford chapelries

In contrast, the hearth-tax assessments cover all Derbyshire, except that it is uncertain where a few minor places fit in, including Derby Hills and Sinfin Moor (which perhaps

should be added to the above list of extra-parochial districts) and some other places believed to be included under the heading of Hulland.

Secondly, it is not clear whether the dependent chapelries which do not have a distinct return in the Compton list are included in the figures for the corresponding mother parishes. However, for the purposes of this article, it is assumed in the first place that all such chapelries are so included. The table published by Lysons³ has been taken as the primary authority for identifying parishes, chapelries and extra-parochial districts, but there appears to be at least one omission from this table: Snelston as a chapelry of Norbury. A few other corrections to the table may be found to be required. Although some of the chapelries without separate returns may well have been omitted in fact, the reverse possibility — that some chapelries with distinct returns were also included in the figures for the mother parishes — seems less likely, but it must be borne in mind.

The third geographical problem is how to match the districts into which the hearth-tax assessments are divided with the parishes and chapelries of the Compton census. The basic units for the collection of the hearth tax were the petty constablewicks, and these, essentially of manorial origin, often by no means coincided with ecclesiastical units. Fortunately, most of the constablewicks which comprise two or more settlements have hearth-tax assessments which distinguish the individual villages or hamlets. Some however do not (in the case of the list headed Hulland, it is not even certain what settlements it includes), and where the component settlements lay in different parishes, the population comparison can be made only by combining the parishes concerned, or cannot be made at all, as in the case of Ault Hucknall, unless a reasonable estimate can be made of the numbers of hearth-tax entries corresponding to the individual settlements (which is least liable to error if one of the settlements is small compared with the other). Both courses have been adopted in the present work in suitable cases. Another difficulty is that certain constablewicks or their subdivisions may well have included minor areas which were the other side of a parish boundary from the settlement nominally covered; so much is suggested by a seventeenth-century survey of Scarsdale hundred which details the makeup of the constablewicks⁴. Such anomalies have had to be ignored here, without too much error, it is hoped.

As regards the 'numerical' problems, it is convenient to consider the hearth-tax assessments first. To get anything like a realistic figure for the households in any place, we must choose an assessment which lists the persons not liable for the tax as well as those who were to pay. For most of Derbyshire, this means the assessment for Lady Day 1664, but for many places in Repton & Gresley hundred the 'returns' of those who paid and those who were exempt at Michaelmas 1662 must be chosen. Even with the listed exempt included, we still cannot be sure that we have the full complement of households for each place. However, short of an independent complete listing or figure, we have to take the existing data as being as near the truth as it is possible to arrive. For a few places the 1664 assessment (or the 1662 return in Repton & Gresley hundred) is missing or defective, so these places must be excluded from our population comparison, since the proportion of exempt households varies so much from one place to another. For a few other places, the assessment of 1662 or 1670 gives a rather higher total than that of 1664, so the former figure has been adopted. Of course, the lapse of time between 1662 or 1664 and 1676 (the year of the Compton census) is rather too great for comfort; some places may have experienced a significant rise or fall in population in the interval, and this must be borne in mind when considering the comparison for each place.

Finally, the numerical problem associated with the Compton returns can be considered in conjunction with the question of appropriate multipliers to convert the hearth-tax and Compton figures into population estimates. The primary difficulty lies in deciding what category of people is covered by the Compton returns. Traditionally it has been assumed that they refer to persons of an age to receive communion, i.e. 16 years and over (though some writers have erroneously suggested an age of 14 or even 12 years). However, it is now recognised⁵ that the questionnaire sent out was interpreted in different ways by individual incumbents or their superiors, and that some returned not the numbers of potential communicants but those of total inhabitants or, less frequently, those of adult males or households. It is impossible to decide from the returns alone what category of persons was meant in each case. However, we can use

the hearth-tax figures to decide between the alternatives, assuming that these figures represent something like the true numbers of households at the time of the Compton census. To do this, we have to decide on suitable multipliers, to represent (a) the average number of persons per household, (b) the average ratio of total population to total adults (communicants), and (c) the average ratio of total population to adult males, as follows.

(a) Evidence for the average number of persons per household in the late seventeenth century is rather thin, and various writers have suggested different figures. However, a recent analysis has proposed⁶ that the most appropriate value is about 4.25 or, rounded to one place of decimals, 4.3, and this is the mean value adopted here. It is evident that although this may be valid on a country- or county-wide basis for rural areas and smaller towns at least, the actual value for an individual settlement or parish will have varied to some extent around 4.3. We must therefore choose a range of values which encompasses the great majority of places; it is not realistic to cater for absolutely all the possible variation. The choice of limits has to be something of a guess, for lack of evidence, but 3.6 to 5.0 seems a reasonable suggestion: the number of places averaging less than 3.6 or more than 5.0 persons per household at that time should be very small (though a high value could be envisaged for a small village dominated by a large country house).

(b) Similarly a range of values must be assumed for the ratio of total population to total adults, or its inverse, the proportion of children. Again from the analysis already quoted⁶, we take limits of 1.4 and 1.7, equivalent to 29 and 41 per cent of children respectively.

(c) For the ratio of total population to adult males, we may take a range of 2.7 to 3.5, rather wider than double 1.4 to 1.7 to allow for some imbalance between males and females.

Method

The procedure which follows may be felt to be rather like applying a strait-jacket but, on the basis of the assumptions that have been made, it is a rational one. It is best approached by making use of elementary algebra. Let the Compton total for a given place be denoted as 'x', and the hearth-tax total for the same district as 'y'. The ratio x/y then gives a clue to the meaning of the Compton figure. Thus if $x/y = 1$ it appears that the incumbent returned the number of households in 1676. For the other possibilities we have to take into account the above multipliers. Thus $2.7x$ and $3.5x$ are the population limits from the Compton figure if adult males were returned, and $1.4x$ and $1.7x$ the limits if total adults were returned; for the hearth-tax figure the population limits are $3.6y$ and $5.0y$. So we get the following ranges for the ratio x/y :

Compton return	x/y
Adult males	1.03 (= $3.6/3.5$) to 1.85 (= $5.0/2.7$)
Total adults	2.12 (= $3.6/1.7$) to 3.57 (= $5.0/1.4$)
Total inhabitants	3.6 to 5.0

However, it seems unlikely that a high proportion of children in a community would be associated with a low household size. Drawing the line here is bound to be arbitrary: we assume that a mean household size of 3.6 is valid only for Compton multipliers of 1.5 or less when total adults were returned, or 3.0 or less when adult males were returned. This increases the first two of the above lower limits of x/y from 1.03 to 1.20 and from 2.12 to 2.40. Also, the gap between 3.57 and 3.6 is so small that the former figure can be rounded up to the latter. Finally, for greater safety we extend each range of x/y by roughly 5 per cent at both ends (which might accommodate at least some real change in population between the hearth-tax and Compton dates), obtaining the following table.

Class	Compton/hearth-tax ratio x/y	Likely meaning of Compton return
A	0.95-1.05	Households
B	1.35-1.95	Adult males
C	2.30-3.40	Total adults
D	3.41-3.79	Total adults or inhabitants
E	3.80-5.25	Total inhabitants

The nearer the centre of any range (except that of 3.41-3.79) that the value of x/y lies for a particular place, the more certain can we be that our interpretation of the Compton census is correct. If however the ratio is less than 0.95, between 1.05 and 1.35, between 1.95 and 2.30 or greater than 5.25, the Compton and hearth-tax figures appear to be incompatible. In such cases we may suspect that the Compton figure or the hearth-tax figure is erroneous (for instance, if the ratio is higher than 5.25, that the latter does not include all the exempt households); that there was a major change in population between the two dates; that our geographical assumptions are incorrect; that the age structure of the population was abnormal; or that more than one of these possible causes operates.

The round numbers in which many of the Compton totals appear makes us suspect that they are only rough estimates, even guesses. Equally however they may represent cautious rounding of a figure obtained by quite careful counting. Certainly the roundness of the Compton figure is no indication of incompatibility with the hearth-tax figure, as can be seen from the results of the present analysis.

Having established the ratio x/y for each place in the Compton census for which suitable data are available, we are in a position to estimate the population. In Derbyshire, none of the ratios falls in class A, i.e. no incumbent seems to have returned the number of households (except possibly in Dronfield, as discussed later), so we may disregard this case. For classes B and C we multiply the Compton figure by 2.7 and 3.5 and by 1.4 and 1.7 respectively and the hearth-tax figure by 3.6 and 5.0, to give two sets of feasible upper and lower population levels. The overlap of the two sets then gives us a population range (and ranges of multiplying factors) within which the two sources of data are compatible. The width and relative position of the overlap will depend on the position of the value of x/y within the class; if this value falls within the 5 per cent extensions which we have applied, there will of course be no actual overlap and we must take the upper limit of the lower set of population levels and the lower limit of the upper set as indicating a possible range (obviously narrow). For class E, the actual total of the Compton return must be taken as the population estimate (corresponding to one particular mean household size only), though again a narrow range has to be quoted when x/y lies in the upper 5 per cent extension (i.e. between 5.0 and 5.25). For class D, two alternative narrow population ranges are possible, the upper one — based on a Compton return of total adults — being rather more probable when x/y is less than 3.60 and the lower one — based on a Compton return of total inhabitants — rather more so when x/y is greater than 3.60.

Results

In Table 1, which presents the results of the treatment of the Derbyshire data in the above fashion, the x/y ratios have been worked out to the second place of decimals merely to facilitate placing in the appropriate class, and not to give a spurious appearance of accuracy. The population figures quoted have been rounded to the nearest 5 in the range up to 100, to the nearest 10 between 100 and 500, to the nearest 20 between 500 and 1000, and to the nearest 50 above 1000.

It must always be borne in mind what assumptions have been made, and stressed that the population figures in the table have only a certain degree of probability. Some of them may be shown to be in error by evidence from other sources, but at least the present analysis does form a basis for further investigation and has made an inroad upon what may have seemed to other people to be an intractable problem. It also has to

be noted that where two or more parishes or chapelries have had to be combined in order to make the comparison, the class within which the x/y ratio falls represents only a convenient average; in other words, it is not possible to be certain what category of people the Compton return for each constituent place represents. For instance, adult males returned in one parish and total inhabitants in another could average out meaninglessly as total adults. However, the overall population estimate may still be of value for regional studies.

Because of the gaps in the data, it is impossible to calculate a combined population estimate for the whole county from the two sources, but since (as mentioned earlier) the possible range within which the mean household size lies will be (on statistical grounds at least) much less for the county than the 3.6-5.0 applied to individual parishes, the hearth-tax assessments alone can be used with rather more confidence than for a single parish. Multiplying by a factor of 4.3 and rounding to the nearest 5000, we get a figure of 70,000 from c. 16,200 hearth-tax entries. However, this must be regarded as no more than a likely minimum population for Derbyshire in the 1660s, bearing in mind that the hearth-tax assessments may exclude a number of poor households.

The results of our analysis may be summarized as follows. There are 136 separate returns in the Compton census for Derbyshire, and of these, 19 have had to be combined into groups (one of four returns, one of three, and six of two) for the comparisons with the hearth-tax data. This makes 125 places or combinations for which the comparisons can be made, or 118 excluding all the combinations except that of the Derby parishes (which can reasonably be taken as homogeneous). Of these 118, 41 or just over a third appear to have returned total adults (i.e. communicants) in the census, 30 or just over a quarter returned total inhabitants, and 2 returned adult males. For 15 or one-eighth we cannot be sure whether total adults or inhabitants were returned. This leaves 30, again a quarter of the total, for which no answer can be provided immediately. For 21 of these 30 the ratio x/y suggests that the Compton and hearth-tax figures are incompatible, whereas for the remainder the ratio cannot be calculated because the available hearth-tax totals are probably deficient.

To put it another way, for about two-thirds of the places in the Compton census we can be fairly certain what category of people the figures represent, allowing us to make a reasonable estimate of the population in conjunction with the hearth-tax data. Making allowance for those places absent from the census, this represents something like half of the county, area- or population-wise. If we began the present exercise with only a moderate hope of success, then our hope has been fulfilled. Considering the problems encountered, we should not be too disappointed that the other half of the county cannot be similarly catered for, and in any case it is still possible to make some sort of population estimate for most of the places in this area from the hearth-tax figures alone, though necessarily with a wider range of possible values for each place than if the Compton figure were available or could be made compatible with the hearth-tax figure.

In the cases where the Compton and hearth-tax figures appear to be incompatible, on the basis of the ratio x/y , it is worth re-examining the geographical assumptions which have been made. Here we restrict this to the question of whether or not chapelries are included under the mother parishes, thus limiting ourselves to only five of the twenty-one places where the figures are incompatible: Ashbourne, Chesterfield, Dronfield, Eckington, and Stapenhill. For Dronfield the ratio x/y falls within class B if the Compton return did not in fact include the chapelries of Dore and Holmesfield. On the other hand, with the ratio 1.07 given in Table 1 it is also possible that the incumbent returned the number of households in Dronfield itself and the two chapelries but that there was a small increase in the population of the parish between 1664 and 1676. For the other four places the ratio can be made to fall within class E (Ashbourne, Chesterfield, and Eckington) or class B (Stapenhill) if the incumbents actually included in the Compton return one or more of the dependent chapelries which in fact made separate returns: Alsop, Hognaston and Parwich in Ashbourne; Brampton and Wingerworth in Chesterfield; Killamarsh in Eckington; and Cauldwell in Stapenhill.

Although earlier we said that such duplication was perhaps less likely than exclusion of chapelries, it is at least a possibility. As in the case of Dronfield, in Stapenhill there may also have been a small increase in population in the interval between the hearth-tax assessment and the Compton census. For Ashbourne, Chesterfield and Eckington however, we would have to consider population increases of around 12 per cent in order to account for the differences between the x/y ratios in Table 1 and the upper limit, 5.0, which we have allowed for the mean household size. This is a moderate increase, but if the mean household size were 4.3 in these places (the mid-point of our range), the population rise would have to have been in the region of 30 per cent. Thus we cannot arrive at any definite conclusion; we may merely suggest a series of possibilities, including of course a deficiency in the hearth-tax figures, between which we can decide only with the aid of independent evidence, if it exists.

Among the other sixteen places in the 'incompatible' category, the ratios for Brampton, Kirk Langley, Ravenstone and Sutton cum Duckmanton are not much higher than the upper limit of 5.25, so the discrepancy might again be explainable by some increase in population between 1662/4 and 1676 in these places. The same might be true of, say, Stoney Middleton with its ratio of 2.01, similar to that of Stapenhill considered above. However, for Mugginton, Newton Solney and Stretton en le Field at least, the ratio is so high (8.45, 9.59 and 13.29 respectively) that either or both of the hearth-tax and Compton figures must be seriously wrong.

The same sort of speculation may be applied to the places in class D, but enough has already been said on the subject to warn against uncritical acceptance of the data in Table 1, which represent only a first approximation. Table 2 gives an idea of the changes that would be caused by assuming that chapelries without separate returns in the Compton census were not in fact included under the mother parishes.

Finally, a reminder may be necessary that, as is evident from the third column of Table 1, headings in the Compton returns which are ostensibly the names of towns such as Ashbourne, Bakewell, Chesterfield and Derby actually cover considerable areas outside those towns, so caution should be observed in making use of the corresponding population estimates. It should also be borne in mind that the average household size in a town may well have been greater than in the surrounding rural district. For Derby this may not matter too much, since the areas outside the town which are included with it in the Compton census are of relatively small population, so the likely population of the town itself can be calculated pro rata from the hearth-tax figures. The result is 2550-3050. For the Ashbourne and Chesterfield areas of course, we have not been able to arrive at a definite population estimate because the Compton and hearth-tax figures appear to be incompatible.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am particularly grateful to Mr Tom Arkell of Solihull for the suggestion of how to combine the hearth-tax and Compton data and for recommending suitable multipliers (see reference 6 below). I must also thank Mr Richard Wall of Cambridge for putting me in touch with Mr Arkell; Dr Anne Whiteman of the University of Oxford for helpful comments on the nature of the Compton census (see reference 5 below); Mr Dudley Fowkes of the Staffordshire Record Office for kindly checking the accuracy of J. C. Cox's transcript of the Compton returns; and Miss Joan Sinar, County Archivist of Derbyshire, for originally suggesting the idea of comparing the two sources.

REFERENCES

- ¹ D. G. Edwards (ed.), *Derbyshire Hearth Tax Assessments 1662-1670*, Derbyshire Record Society, Vol. VII (1982). The introduction to this volume incorporates material by the late C. A. F. Meekings who prepared tables of the numbers of hearths and entries recorded for each place in the county from the assessments of 1662 and 1664 preserved at the Public Record Office and those of 1670 held at Derby Central Library.

- ² William Salt Library, Stafford, SMS 33. The transcript of the Derbyshire section by J. C. Cox has been published in the *D.A.J.*, vii (1885), 31-36 and in *Victoria History of the County of Derby*, ii (1905), 39-40.
- ³ D. and S. Lysons, *Magna Britannia V: Derbyshire* (1817), xiii-xvii. There are several differences between this table and a map of the parishes in Derbyshire c. 1800 issued by the Derbyshire Record Office.
- ⁴ Sheffield City Library, Beauchief Muniments, BM80 (untitled).
- ⁵ Private communication from Dr E. A. O. Whiteman of Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford, whose comprehensive study of the Compton census is shortly to be published in book form.
- ⁶ T. Arkell, paper prepared for submission to *Local Population Studies*. Mr Arkell kindly lent me a copy of the draft.

Table 1 Results of the Comparison between the Compton Census and the Hearth-Tax Assessments

Parish (with chapelry included) or Chapelry*	Deanery*	Corresponding Hearth-tax District(s)	Compton Return	Hearth-tax Entries	Ratio	Basis of Compton Return*	Population Estimate	Note
Alfreton	Che	Alfreton	461	168	2.74	TA	640-780	
Allestree (C)	Der	Allestree	95	38	2.50	TA	140-160	
Alsop en le Dale (C)	Ash	Eaton & Alsop	40	15	2.67	TA	55-70	
Alvaston (C) & Boulton (C)	Der	Alvaston & Boulton	143	47	3.04	TA	200-240	
Ashbourne (Hulland C)	Ash	see note 1	2500	450	5.56	??	???	1
Ashover (Dethick & Lea C)	Che							
Crich Morton (Brackenfield C)	Der	see note 2	1331	455	2.93	TA	1850-2250	2
Aston on Trent	Der	Aston on Trent Wilne & Shardlow	300	104	2.88	TA	420-520	
Atlow (C)	Ash	Atlow	100	26	3.85	I	100	
Ault Hucknall	Che	Rowthorne Stainsby	141	??	??	??	???	3
Bakewell (see note 4)	HP	see note 4	4500	1041	4.33	I	4500	4
Ballidon (C)	Ash	Ballidon	100	25	4.00	I	100	
Barlborough Whitwell	Che	Barlborough & Whitwell	490	193	2.54	TA	700-840	
Barlow (C)	Che	Great Barlow	380	96	3.96	I	380	5
Barrow on Trent (Twyford C)	Der	Barrow on Trent Sinfyn & Arleston Twyford & Stenson	194	73	2.66	TA	270-330	
Beighton	Che	Beighton	200	80	2.50	TA	290-340	
Bolsover	Che	Bolsover Glapwell Oxcroft	451	131	3.44	TA I	640-660 450-470	6
Bonsall	Ash	Bonsall	614	(103)	??	??	???	7
Boylestone	Cas	Boylestone	170	29	5.86	??	???	
Bradbourne	Ash	Bradbourne	110	24	4.58	I	110	8
Bradley	Ash	Bradley	120	36	3.33	TA	170-180	
Brailsford (Osmaston C)	Cas	Brailsford Ednaston Osmaston	300	81	3.70	I TA	300 410-420	9
Brampton (C)	Che	Brampton 'Brampton in Morton'	1100	207	5.31	??	???	
Brassington (C)	Ash	Brassington & Aldwark	380	93	4.09	I	380	10

* Column 1: C = chapelry. Column 2: Ash = Ashbourne; Cas = Castillar; Che = Chesterfield; Der = Derby; HP = High Peak; Rep = Repington. Column 7: AM = adult males; I = inhabitants; TA = total adults (communicants)

POPULATION IN DERBYSHIRE IN THE REIGN OF CHARLES II

113

Breadsall	Der	Breadsall	200	71	2.82	TA	280-340	
Carsington	Ash	Carsington	200	??	??	??	??	11
Castleton (Edale C)	HP	Castleton & Losehill Edale	500	154	3.25	TA	700-780	
Cauldwell (C)	Rep	Cauldwell	69	20	3.45	TA I	95-100 70	
Chaddesden (C)	Der	Chaddesden	160	46	3.48	TA I	220-230 160-170	
Chapel en le Frith	HP	Bowden Edge Bradshaw Edge Coombes Edge	598	69	3.54	TA I	840 600	
Chellaston	Cas	Chellaston	102	40	2.55	TA	140-170	
Chesterfield (Brimington C; Temple Normanton C)	Che	See note 12	3500	617	5.67	??	??	12
Church Broughton	Cas	Church Broughton Sapperton	185	45	4.11	I	190	
Clowne	Che	Clowne	278	42	6.62	??	??	
Crich: see Ashover above								
Croxall	Rep	Croxall Catton	100	??	??	??	??	13
Cubley	Cas	Cubley	138	30	4.60	I	140	
Dalbury	Cas	Dalbury	115	31	3.71	I TA	120 160	
Darley	HP	Darley Wensley & Snitterton	500	172	2.91	TA	700-860	
Denby (C)	Der	Denby	176	63	2.79	TA	250-300	
Derby (See note 14)	Der	See note 14	2119	711	2.98	TA	2950-3550	14
Doveridge	Cas	Doveridge	311	61	5.10	I	310	
Dronfield (Dore C; Holmesfield C)	Che	See note 15	517	481	1.07	??	??	15
Duffield (See note 16)	Der	See note 16	1800	447	4.03	I	1800	16
Eckington	Che	Eckington Mosbrough Ridgeway Spinkhill	1200	214	5.61	??	??	
Edensor	HP	Edensor Pilsley	300	69	4.30	I	300	17
Edlaston	Ash	Edlaston & Wyaston	69	33	2.09	??	??	
Egginton	Cas	Egginton	223	54	4.13	I	220	
Elmton	Che	Elmton & Creswell	94	46	2.04	??	??	18
Elvaston	Der	Elvaston	215	70	3.07	TA	300-350	
Etwall	Cas	Etwall	170	49	3.47	TA I	240-250 170-180	
Eyam Hope (Fairfield C)	HP HP	See note 19	1332	804	1.66	AM	3600-4000	19
Fenny Bentley	Ash	Fenny Bentley	80	26	3.08	TA	110-130	
Foremark & Ingleby (C)	Rep	Foremark Ingleby	96	31	3.10	TA	130-160	
Glossop (Hayfield C; Mellor C)	HP	See note 20	2040	549	3.72	I TA	2040 2750-2850	20
Gresley Measham (C)	Rep Rep	See note 21	666	196	3.40	TA	940-980	21
Hartshorne	Rep	Hartshorne	156	54	2.89	TA	220-270	
Hathersage (Derwent C)	HP	Hathersage Derwent Bamford Outseats	580	162	3.58	TA I	820 580	
Heanor	Der	Heanor Codnor & Loscoe Codnor Castle & Park Shipley	540	207	2.61	TA	760-920	
Hognaston (C?)	Ash	Hognaston	200	33	6.06	??	??	

Hope: see Eyam above

Horsley	Der	Horsley	293	113	2.59	TA	410-500	
Ilkeston	Der	Ilkeston	280	79	3.54	TA I	390 280	
Kedleston	Der	Kedleston Ireton	78	20	3.90	I	80	22
Killamarsh (C)	Che	Killamarsh	160	96	1.67	AM	430-480	
Kirk Hallam	Der	Kirk Hallam Mapperley	100	26	3.85	I	100	
Kirk Ireton	Ash	Kirk Ireton	300	61	4.92	I	300	23
Kirk Langley	Der	Kirk Langley	216	41	5.27	??	???	
Kniveton	Ash	Kniveton	110	(36)	??	??	???	24
Langwith Pleasley (Shirebrook C)	Che Che	Langwith & Pleasley	244	105	2.32	TA	380-420	
Longford	Cas	Longford Alkington Hollington Rodsley	330	87	3.79	I TA	330 440-460	25
Lullington Rosliston (C)	Rep Rep	Lullington Coton & Rosliston	212	70	3.03	TA	300-350	26
Mackworth	Der	Mackworth Markeaton	350	(76)	??	??	???	27
Mapleton Thorpe	Ash Ash	Mapleton & Thorpe	150	46	3.27	TA	210-230	28
Marston on Dove	Cas	Marston on Dove Hatton Hilton Hoon	260	75	3.47	TA I	360-380 260-270	
Marston Montgomery	Cas	Marston Montgomery	187	44	4.25	I	190	
Matlock	Ash	Matlock	1000	256	3.91	I	1000	
Measham: see Gresley above								
Melbourne	Rep	Melbourne & King's Newton	455	177	2.57	TA	640-780	
Mickleover (Findern C; Littleover C)	Der	Mickleover Findern Littleover	420	133	3.16	TA	580-660	
Morley (Smalley C)	Der	Morley Smalley	229	88	2.60	TA	320-390	
Morton: see Ashover above								
Mugginton	Der	Mugginton & Mercaston Weston Underwood	718	85	8.45	??	???	29
Newton Solney (C)	Rep	Newton Solney	326	34	9.59	??	???	
Norbury	Ash	Norbury	139	47	2.96	TA	200-240	
North Wingfield	Che	Pilsley Stretton Tupton	650	169	3.85	I	650	30
Norton	Che	Norton	496	155	3.20	TA	700-780	
Ockbrook	Der	Ockbrook	240	(49)	??	??	???	31
Osmaston (C)	Der	Osmaston	85	26	3.27	TA	120-130	32
Parwich (C)	Ash	Parwich	250	58	4.31	I	250	
Pentrich	Der	Pentrich Ripley	400	152	2.63	TA	560-680	
Pinxton	Che	Pinxton	190	39	4.87	I	190	
Pleasley: see Langwith above								
Radbourne	Der	Radbourne	73	19	3.84	I	75	
Ravenstone	Rep	Ravenstone	121	23	5.26	??	???	
Repton (Bretby C)	Rep	Repton Bretby	475	???	??	??	???	33
Rosliston: see Lullington above								
Sandiacre	Der	Sandiacre	120	35	3.43	TA I	170-180 120-130	
Scarliffe	Che	Scarliffe & Palterton	200	67	2.99	TA	280-340	
Scropton	Der	Scropton & Foston	214	93	2.30	TA	340-360	
Shirland	Che	Shirland & Higham	76	62	1.23	??	???	
Shirley (Yeaaveley C)	Der	Shirley & Yeaaveley Stydd	180	61	2.95	TA	250-310	

Smisby (C)	Rep	Smisby	84	35	2.40	TA	130-140	
Snelston (C)	Ash	Snelston	220	51	4.31	I	220	
Somersal Herbert	Cas	Somersal Herbert	100	21	4.76	I	100	
South Normanton	Che	South Normanton	302	59	5.12	I	300	
South Wingfield	Che	South Wingfield & Oakerthorpe	335	54	6.20	??	???	
Spondon	Der	Spondon	304	(58)	??	??	???	34
Stanley (C)	Der	Stanley	77	20	3.85	I	75	
Stanton by Bridge	Rep	Stanton by Bridge	100	35	2.86	TA	140-170	
Stanton by Dale	Rep	Stanton by Dale	106	45	2.36	TA	160-180	
Stapenhill	Rep	Stapenhill Stanton Ward & Newhall	203	102	1.99	??	???	
Staveley	Che	Staveley	500	158	3.16	TA	700-800	
Stoney Middleton (C)	HP	Stoney Middleton	239	119	2.01	??	???	
Stretton en le Field	Rep	Stretton en le Field	226	17	13.29	??	???	
Sudbury	Cas	Sudbury	200	68	2.94	TA	280-340	
Sutton on the Hill	Cas	Sutton on the Hill Osleston & Thurvaston	210	53	3.96	I	210	
Sutton & Duckmanton	Che	Sutton & Duckmanton	400	76	5.26	??	???	
Swarkestone	Rep	Swarkestone	100	28	3.57	TA I	140 100	
Thorpe: see Mapleton above								
Tibshelf	Che	Tibshelf	210	82	2.56	TA	300-360	35
Ticknall (C)	Rep	Ticknall	215	48	4.48	I	220	
Tideswell (Wormhill C)	HP	Tideswell & Miller's Dale Litterton Whetton Wormhill	500	346	1.45	AM	1350-1750	36
Tissington (C)	Ash	Tissington & Lea Hall	175	42	4.17	I	180	
Trusley	Cas	Trusley	104	14	7.43	??	???	
Walton on Trent	Rep	Walton on Trent	207	41	5.05	I	210	
West Hallam	Der	West Hallam	150	39	3.85	I	150	
Weston on Trent	Der	Weston on Trent	129	42	3.07	TA	180-210	
Whittington	Che	Whittington	218	72	3.03	TA	310-360	
Whitwell: see Barlborough above; also note 18								
Willington	Der	Willington	87	24	3.63	I TA	85 120	
Wingerworth (C)	Che	Wingerworth Swathwick	157	58	2.71	TA	220-270	37
Winster	HP	Winster	305	100	3.05	TA	430-500	
Youlgreave (Elton C; Stanton C)	HP	see note 38	820	306	2.68	TA	1150-1400	38

Notes to Table 1

¹ The corresponding hearth-tax districts are: Ashbourne, Clifton & Compton; Sturston & Compton; Offcote & Underwood; Hulland; Yeldersley; and Newton Grange. However, since the heading Hulland in the hearth tax appears to cover more places than Hulland proper, an estimate (33) of the number of households in the latter has been made in order to bring the total to a round number.

² The corresponding hearth-tax districts are: Ashover; Dethick, Lea & Tansley; Crich & Fritchley; Brackenfield & Wessington; and Morton. The combination of parishes is necessary because the hearth-tax lists for Dethick, Lea & Tansley and for Brackenfield & Wessington are not subdivided and Tansley and Wessington are both in Crich parish. The 20 not-chargeable households in 1664 in Morton and Pilsley combined are assumed here to have been split equally between the two places.

- ³ In the hearth-tax assessments, Rowthorne is inseparably combined with Glapwell, and Stainsby with Heath. Since there is no Compton return for Heath, the comparison is not possible, even by combining parishes.
- ⁴ The chapelries assumed to be included are: Ashford; Baslow; Beeley; Buxton; Chelmorton; Longstone; Monyash; Sheldon; and Taddington. The corresponding hearth-tax districts are: Bakewell; Rowsley; Over Haddon; Hassop; Rowland; Buxton; Cowdale; Staden; Kingsterndale; Chelmorton; Flagg; Taddington & Priestcliffe; Blackwell; Brushfield; Great Longstone; Little Longstone; Holme; Ashford; Sheldon; Monyash; Baslow; Beeley; Bubnell; Calver; and Curbar & Froggatt. See also note 38. In the hearth tax, Beeley includes Chatsworth.
- ⁵ Little Barlow is assumed to be included under Dronfield in the Compton returns.
- ⁶ In the hearth-tax assessments, Glapwell is inseparably combined with Rowthorne, and Oxcroft with Tibshelf; here it is assumed for convenience that Rowthorne and Oxcroft had the same number of households: 10 each.
- ⁷ No hearth-tax assessment is available for 1664, so no valid comparison can be made.
- ⁸ Aldwark is assumed to be included under Brassington in the Compton returns, and Lea Hall under Tissington.
- ⁹ Hollington is assumed to be totally included under Longford in the Compton returns. The heading Osmaston in the Compton returns is assumed to mean Osmaston by Derby.
- ¹⁰ See note 8.
- ¹¹ In the hearth-tax assessments, Carsington is inseparably combined with Hopton, which lay in Wirksworth parish, for which there is no Compton return. At a guess however, the Compton figure of 200 most likely refers to inhabitants.
- ¹² The corresponding hearth-tax districts are: Chesterfield, Calow; Hasland; Walton; Newbold; Dunston; Temple Normanton; and Brimington.
- ¹³ Croxall is inseparably combined with Edingale in the hearth-tax assessments, but the latter is not covered by the Compton returns for Derbyshire, so no comparison is possible.
- ¹⁴ The chapelries assumed to be included are: Little Eaton; Normanton; and Quarndon. For Osmaston see note 9. The corresponding hearth-tax districts are: Derby; Little Chester; Little Eaton; Litchurch; Normanton; Quarndon; and Darley Abbey. The four Compton returns for the five Derby parishes are combined here, as the hearth-tax assessments are subdivided only in the case of the chargeable households.
- ¹⁵ The corresponding hearth-tax districts are: Dronfield; Coal Aston; Dore & Totley; Holmesfield; Unstone; and Little Barlow (see note 5). See also note 37.
- ¹⁶ The chapelries assumed to be included are: Belper; Heage; Holbrook; and Turnditch. The corresponding hearth-tax districts are: Duffield; Hazelwood; Heage; Belper; Holbrook; and Shottle & Postern. Turnditch may have been included under Hulland, not Duffield, in the hearth tax, but that possibility is ignored here.
- ¹⁷ Chatsworth is assumed to be excluded from the Compton return (see note 4).
- ¹⁸ Although part of Creswell was in Whitwell parish, the whole of it is assumed here to be included under Elmtun in the Compton returns.
- ¹⁹ The corresponding hearth-tax districts are: Eyam; Foolow; Eyam Woodland; Hope; Hope Woodlands; Abney; Aston; Bradwell; Brough & Shatton; Grindlow; Hazlebadge; Great and Little Hucklow; Offerton; Thornhill; Fairfield; and Fernilee. Eyam and Hope parishes are combined here because Highlow and possibly other parts of Hope parish are included under Eyam in the hearth tax. No supporting evidence has yet been found for the extra-parochial status of Hope Woodlands indicated on a map of Derbyshire parishes c. 1800 issued by the Derbyshire Record Office. See also note 36.
- ²⁰ The corresponding hearth-tax districts are: Glossop; Charlesworth; Chunal; Dinting; Hadfield; Padfield; Simmondley; Whitfield; Mellor; Ludworth; Chisworth; Beard; Oller-set; Thornsett; White; Great Hamlet; Kinder; Phoside; Chinley; Buxworth; and Brown-side.
- ²¹ The corresponding hearth-tax districts are: Castle Gresley; Church Gresley; Swadlincote; Donisthorpe; Oakthorpe; and Measham. All of Oakthorpe and Donisthorpe is assumed here to be in Gresley and Measham, but in fact parts were in Seal parish (then in Leics.)
- ²² Three households are added to the hearth-tax total for Kedleston as an estimate for Ireton (which is combined with Mercaston & Mugginton in the hearth tax).
- ²³ Ireton Wood in Kirk Ireton parish may be included under Hulland in the hearth tax, but this possibility is ignored here.
- ²⁴ See note 7.
- ²⁵ See the first sentence of note 9.

- 26 The two places must be combined, because Coton in Lullington parish is inseparably
combined with Rosliston in the hearth tax.
- 27 See note 7.
- 28 The hearth-tax assessment includes Hanson Grange in Ashbourne parish.
- 29 The hearth-tax figure does not include any allowance for Hulland Ward Intakes, where
the chapel annexed to Mugginton is of later date. See also note 22.
- 30 The hearth-tax figure includes an estimate of 15 for Tupton, which is combined with
Wingerworth in the assessments. See also the last sentence of note 2.
- 31 See note 7.
- 32 See the second sentence of note 9.
- 33 The hearth-tax assessments of 1662 and 1664 are incomplete for Repton.
- 34 See note 7.
- 35 The hearth-tax figure excludes an allowance of 10 for Oxcroft, inseparably combined with
Tibshelf in the assessments (cf. note 6).
- 36 The hearth-tax figure for Tideswell in 1664 is assumed to include Litton. It is possible that
the figure for Wormhill in 1664 includes Fernilee (Hope parish), but this possibility is
ignored here.
- 37 Estimates of 15 households in Tupton (see note 30) and 49 in Unstone (see note 15) are
deducted from the hearth-tax total for Wingerworth *cum membris* in 1664.
- 38 The corresponding hearth-tax districts are: Youlgreave; Birchover; Elton; Gratton;
Middleton & Smerrill; Stanton in Peak. No allowance is made for Alport, which is
combined with Rowsley (Bakewell parish) in the hearth tax.

Table 2. Changes brought about by assuming that chapelries without separate returns in the Compton census were not in fact included under the mother parishes.

PARISH (for chapelries excluded, see Table 1)	HEARTH-TAX ENTRIES WITHOUT CHAPELRIES	CHANGE IN RATIO OR BASIS OF COMPTON RETURN
Ashbourne	c.420	further into "incompatible" region
Ashover, Crich & Morton	figure not available	
Bakewell	-	from I into "incompatible"
Barrow on Trent	43	from TA to I
Brailsford	57	from I/TA into "incompatible"
Castleton	106	from TA to I
Chesterfield	548	further into "incompatible"
Derby	631	(remains TA)
Dronfield	315	from "incompatible" to AM
Duffield	-	from I into "incompatible"
Eyam & Hope	750	(remains AM)
Glossop	185	from I/TA into "incompatible"
Hathersage	122	from TA/I to I
Mickleover	72	from TA into "incompatible"
Morley	35	from TA into "incompatible"
Shirley	38	from TA to I
Tideswell	276	(remains AM)
Youlgreave	201	from TA to I