Pastoral Roles of the JACOBEAN Episcopate in Canterbury Province,

by

Kenneth Charles Fincham

(University College, London)

Submitted for the Ph.D Degree, December 1984

Abstract

This thesis investigates the theory and practice of episcopal government in the English Church between 1603 and 1625. The source material consists of the records of seventeen diocesan archives in the province of Canterbury, in conjunction with primary printed and manuscript sources, such as sermons, theological treatises and polemics, and, where appropriate, the records of central ecclesiastical and secular government.

It is proposed that the dominant image and practice was of the bishop as preaching pastor. The exemplar of the Apostolic bishop, which was set out in Pauline writings, could not be easily adapted to the realities of seventeenth-century church government. Not merely had the episcopal office accumulated a series of non-pastoral functions, but its government also had a primarily judicial character. Nevertheless it is argued that, as a group, the Jacobean episcopate managed to incorporate many aspects of the Pastoral ideal of St. Paul into their diocesan rule. Most bishops resided in their sees, attended their visitations in person, took a part in the running of their consistory courts, preached fairly regularly and supervised the clergy entrusted to their care. Extraneous circumstances helped to provide the right conditions in which this pastoral government could flourish. The divisive issue of ceremonial nonconformity, which could so easily sour relations between the bishop and his flock, was largely stilled by James I's accommodating attitude to 'moderate' nonconformists and the consequent de facto toleration of occasional conformity. The King also supported the proselytising mission of the Church, and he restrained the hostility of Arminian prelates both to excessive preaching and to ceremonial nonconformity. This thesis, in short, seeks to demonstrate the strength and vitality of the Pastoral ideal among the Jacobean episcopate.

Table of Contents

List of Tables		p.4.
List of Appendices		p.5.
List of Abbreviations		p.6.
Dedication		p.7.
Quotations		p.8.
Preface		pp.9-10.
Explanatory Notes		p.11.
Chapter One:	Introduction	pp.12-25.
Chapter Two:	The Episcopate at the Court of James I	pp.26-54.
Chapter Three:	The Spiritual Jurisdiction of the Episcopate (i) The Visitation	pp.55-93.
Chapter Four:	The Spiritual Jurisdiction of the Episcopate (ii) The Consistory	pp.94-136.
Chapter Five:	The Provision of Pastoral Care by the Episcopate (i) To the Laity	pp.137-163.
Chapter Six:	The Provision of Pastoral Care by the Episcopate (ii) To the Clergy	pp.164-222.
Chapter Seven:	Styles of Churchmanship among the Jacobean Episcopate	pp.223-275.
Chapter Eight:	The Supreme Governor, the Episcopate and Jacobean Nonconformity	pp.276-328.
Chapter Nine:	Conclusion	pp.329-334.
Appendices I - XV		pp.335-373.
Bibliography:	(i) Manuscript Sources	pp.374-383.
	(ii) Primary Printed Sources	pp.384-407.
	(iii) Secondary Sources	pp.408-415.
	(iv) Theses	pp.416-417.

List of Tables

Table One:	Episcopal attendance at Visitations, 1597-1627	pp.58-59.
Table Two:	The role of resident bishops in the administration of ecclesiastical justice 1593-1627	pp.108-109
Table Three:	Ex Officio Mero cases instigated in Chichester Consistory, November 1626 - May 1628	p.120
Table Four:	Royal Chaplains among the Episcopate, 1603-1625	pp.304-305.

List of Appendices

I.	The itinerary of Thomas Bilson, Bishop of Winchester, for 1603-1616	pp.336-8
II.	The itinerary of William Barlow, Bishop of Rochester (1605-1608) and of Lincoln (1608-1613)	pp.339-40
III.	The itinerary of Lancelot Andrewes, Bishop of Chichester (1605-1609), of Ely (1609-1619) and of Winchester (1619-1626)	pp.341-50
IV.	The itinerary of James Mountagu, Bishop of Bath & & Wells (1608-1616) and of Winchester (1616-1618)	pp.351-3
V.	The itinerary of John Overall, Bishop of Coventry & Lichfield (1614-1618) and of Norwich (1618-1619)	pp.354-5
VI.	The itinerary of George Montaigne, Bishop of Lincoln, 1617-1621	p.356
VII.	The itinerary of Nicholas Felton, Bishop of Ely, 1619-1626	pp.357-8
VIII.	The composition and acta of Ecclesiastical Commissions in London, 1604-1624	pp.359-61
IX.	'Orders to be observed', issued in Chichester diocese, 1606	p.362
X.	Clerical attendance at visitations and synods in Chichester Archdeaconry 1606-1625	p.363
XI.	Diocesan Administration in Bath & Wells, 1623-1628	pp.364-7
XII.	Bishop Arthur Lake's participation in office jurisdiction, 1617-1625	p.368
XIII.	Bishop Samuel Harsnett's attendance in Chichester consistory, 1610-1619	p.369
XIV.	Bishop George Carleton's attendance in Chichester consistory, 1620-1627	p.370
XV.	Table One. Tabulation of presentments from Wisbech deanery, December 1600 -July 1604 and December 1614 - July 1618.	pp.371-2
	Table Two. Breakdown of presentments for absence from church and profanation of the Sabbath in Wisbech deanery, 1600-1604 and 1614-1618.	p.373

List of Abbreviations

AASRP,	Associated Architectural Societies' Reports and Papers
BIHR,	Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research
BL,	British Library
Bodl.,	Bodleian Library
Borth.,	Borthwick Institute of Historical Research
BRO,	Bristol Record Office
CSPD,	Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series
CUL,	Cambridge University Library
DNB,	Dictionary of National Biography
DRO,	Devon Record Office
DWL,	Doctor Williams Library
EDC,	Ely Dean & Chapter Records
EDR,	Ely Diocesan Records
GDR,	Gloucester Diocesan Records
GL,	Guildhall Library
GLRO,	Greater London Record Office
HDR,	Hereford Diocesan Records
HLRO,	House of Lords Record Office
HMC,	Historical Manuscripts Commission
HRO,	Hampshire Record Office
HWRO,	Hereford & Worcester Record Office
KAO,	Kent Archives Office
LAO,	Lincolnshire Archives Office
LJRO,	Lichfield Joint Record Office
LPL,	Lambeth Palace Library
NNRO,	Norwich & Norwich Record Office
OCRO,	Oxfordshire County Record Office
PRO,	Public Record Office
SRO,	Somerset Record Office
S.T.C.	Short-Title Catalogue of Books printed 1475-1640
TBGAS,	Transactions of the Bristol & Gloucestershire Archaeological Society
WRO,	Wiltshire Record Office
WSRO,	West Sussex Record Office

This thesis is dedicated
to the memory of
Joao Nuno Bettencourt Pires

'The office of a bishop is attended with so many cares, exercised with so many duties, involved in so many dangers, exposed to so many stormes, obnoxious to so heavy judgements, liable to such sharp censures.'
(Henry Burton, A Censure of Simonie, 1624, p.73)

'There is as much agreement betwixt our bishops in their managing of Religion...and those powerfull preachers who have bene the chiefe meanes of revealing Gods arme unto salvation, as there is betwixt the light which commeth down from heaven and that thick mist which ariseth from the lowest pit.'
(Paul Baynes, The Diocesans Tryall, wherein all the Sinnewes of Doctor Downhams Defence are brought into three Heads and orderly dissolved, 1621, sig.A3v)

Preface

I have incurred many debts of thanks in the course of my peregrinations of the record offices of England. Archivists and staff have invariably been kind and helpful, especially at Taunton, Cambridge and Chichester where I was a regular visitor. In particular, Tim and Alison McCann and Peter Wilkinson provided me with expert advice and congenial company during the many weeks I spent at the West Sussex record office in Chichester.

In the very early days of my research, Timothy Peake was extremely hospitable and also very generous in sharing with me the fruits of his own research. I have benefitted from many discussions with numerous friends and colleagues, especially Kenneth Parker and Judith Maltby. Christopher Haigh, Dorothy Owen and Felicity Heal have all given me invaluable advice on innumerable occasions and have also kindly read chapters of the thesis. I have continued to profit from discussions on seventeenth century society with my former tutors, Robert Beddard and Jeremy Catto.

To Andrew Foster I owe a particular debt of thanks (and every man is not my Lord of Durham's biographer). He has allowed me to cite his findings on Richard Neile, and also has acted as an academic midwife to this thesis, as he willingly read each chapter at the moment of its birth. I have profited greatly from discussions with Peter Lake who also kindly read the entire thesis in its final form.

The considerable influence of Patrick Collinson's writings on this thesis is self-evident. It was at Oxford on 2nd of February 1979, as I sat musing amidst the desks of the Examination Schools, while Patrick Collinson read his second Ford Lecture, that the idea of writing a study of the Jacobean episcopate first started to my mind. Since that time, he has been a most sympathetic and generous reader of my work.

My greatest thanks are due to my supervisor Nicholas Tyacke who has

displayed truly apostolic qualities of patience and charity over the last five years. I have been the constant beneficiary of his critical advice and guidance.

Clare Pearson has read the complete typescript with the expert eye of a lexicographer and to her my heartfelt thanks.

Finally I must thank the Master and Fellows of Balliol College for employing me for two splendid years when most of the thesis was written, and also the President and Fellows of St. John's for providing me with the leisure to complete it in agreeable surroundings of Laudian beauty.

Explanatory Notes

Dates are given according to the Julian calendar, except that the year is taken to begin on 1 January and not 25 March.

The original spelling has been retained in quotations, although abbreviations have been expanded. Underlining of individual letters indicates where this has occurred. Punctuation has been modernised where necessary.

Unless otherwise specified, the place of publication of books is London. Greek phrases have been omitted from book titles.

For the sake of brevity, visitation articles are cited by bishop, diocese and year. The full title is reproduced in the bibliography.

The sermons of Arthur Lake are divided into 3 alphabets, which are cited here in roman numerals (i-iii).

Footnotes are placed at the end of every chapter.

For modern spelling of place-names, I have followed J.M. Wilson, The Imperial Gazetteer of England and Wales (6 vols., 1866) and the Ordnance Survey Motoring Map (1983).

Chapter One: Introduction

...all the reign of King James was better for one to live under than to write of, consisting of a champion of constant tranquillity, without any tumours of trouble to entertain posterity with.

These wistful words of Thomas Fuller, written during the fragile stability of the 1650s, partially explains why modern scholarship has largely ignored the government of the Church under James I, so that, until very recently, it remained terra incognita in the history of the reformed Church of England.[1] R.G. Usher's pioneering work on ecclesiastical politics and government under Archbishop Bancroft (1604-10) found no immediate heirs,[2] and only in the last few years has the role of James I as supreme governor received any serious consideration, albeit largely in the context of the Hampton Court conference of 1604.[3] Government in the dioceses has fared a little better. The opening of local archives meant that traditional episcopal biographies[4] have been supplemented by studies of the spiritual administration of individual prelates[5] and particular dioceses.[6] The wealth and economic resources of the reformed episcopate have also been extensively investigated.[7] Until 1982, however, Professor Hugh Trevor-Roper's essay 'King James and his Bishops' was the only general interpretation of Jacobean Church government.[8] Having studied the preferment and preoccupations of the Jacobean episcopate, Trevor-Roper pronounced them as a group to be 'indifferent, negligent, secular'. Although this judgement elicited several critical responses,[9] nevertheless it has remained remarkably pervasive.[10]

This situation was transformed with the publication, in 1982, of Professor Patrick Collinson's The Religion of Protestants. The second chapter outlined the image and reality of episcopal government in the dioceses under Elizabeth and James I.[11] This thesis takes up his challenge to conduct a

systematic investigation of the pastoral work of the English episcopate between 1603 and 1625.

* * * * *

Pastoral care by the episcopate is the unifying theme of this study, as expressed through formal administrative organs, such as the consistory, and also through more informal practices such as preaching. Other episcopal roles are examined in so far as they contribute to an understanding of this subject. Omitted, therefore, is any detailed analysis of the political function of the bishops as lords spiritual in Parliament; nor is the maintenance of episcopal temporalities treated exhaustively. The assumption that the bishops played a major role in convocation also remains untested, due, on this occasion, to the paucity of records.[12]

A wide variety of source material has been consulted for this thesis. Valuable information has been gathered from episcopal and clerical biographies and wills, from sermons, polemics and treatises, from printed and manuscript correspondence as well as from the records of the central courts of the Delegates and the Ecclesiastical Commission. The principal source, however, is the records of episcopal administration in seventeen English dioceses in the province of Canterbury. Like any source, this latter kind of evidence is not without problems. It consists primarily of the judicial records of episcopal government, so that there are few traces of such pastoral activities as preaching, confirming or providing hospitality, a double misfortune since the personal archives of most prelates have not survived.[13] The specific limitations of different classes of diocesan records are discussed below in the appropriate chapters.

A study of four diocesan archives - of Bath & Wells, Chichester, Ely and

Winchester - constitutes the core of the analysis. These dioceses were selected in part because they have reasonable holdings of records, in part because they were governed by five prelates whose contrasting careers and churchmanship are representative of the entire episcopate. The five are Lancelot Andrewes, Bishop of Chichester (1605-9), of Ely (1609-19) and of Winchester (1619-26), James Mountagu of Bath & Wells (1608-16) and of Winchester (1616-8), Samuel Harsnett of Chichester (1609-19) and of Norwich (1619-29), George Carleton of Chichester (1619-28) and Arthur Lake of Bath & Wells (1616-26). Andrewes and Mountagu were both influential court prelates and lived in London for ten months each year, while Harsnett, Carleton and Lake resided in their sees, and therefore had more direct contact with their administrations.[14] In turn, Andrewes and Harsnett were sympathetic to Arminian teaching on the theology of grace and disassociated themselves from both the orthodox Calvinism and the churchmanship of Mountagu, Carleton and Lake.[15] Extensive use has also been made of the archives of Gloucester, Lincoln, London and Norwich; the poor holdings for Bristol, Coventry & Lichfield, Oxford, Rochester and Worcester have been combed fairly thoroughly; and some classes of diocesan records have been sampled from the archives of Canterbury, Exeter, Hereford and Salisbury. Unpublished dissertations on the careers of Bishops Cotton and Neile and on Jacobean episcopal government in Lincoln, London and Peterborough dioceses have further widened the scope of the thesis.[16]

* * * * *

The exemplar of the 'apostolic' or 'primitive' bishop, outlined in the Pastoral Epistles of St. Paul, was an image of great potency in the reformed Church of England, and represented the model for the Jacobean episcopate to

imitate and against which they would be judged by their contemporaries. Although the Pastoral ideal had been the common currency of Christendom for centuries, its features were brought out and sharpened in humanist writings in the early sixteenth century.[17] Consecration sermons and episcopal biographies attest to its widespread dissemination in the Jacobean Church. Archbishop John Whitgift was commended for being 'such a Bishop as Saint Paul requireth in the Church of Christ' while it was claimed on Bishop Morton's behalf that his conduct was a 'paraphrase' of St. Paul's rule, that 'standard or touch-stone whereby every bishop ought to be tryed and examined'.[18] 'The Apostolick Bishop' was the title that Daniel Featley chose for a consecration sermon on the episcopal office in 1623, and in a similar vein, Bishop Bedell was fêted by his biographer for the 'primitive' style of his government.[19] The power of the apostolic image must have been further enhanced by the iure divino theory of episcopacy which commanded increasing acceptance among the Jacobean episcopate, numbering among its exponents Lancelot Andrewes, Thomas Bilson, George Carleton, Arthur Lake, William Laud and, in all probability, George Abbot.[20]

St. Paul's letter to Timothy contains the essential ingredients of the apostolic model of episcopacy. The bishop is portrayed as a pastor who leads through his own example and teaching. Of impeccable moral character, the bishop must preside over an orderly household ('for if a man know not how to rule in his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?') and practise the virtues of sobriety, patience, humility, charity and hospitality.[21] His conduct, in short, must exemplify his teaching. And the bishop is first and foremost a teacher. 'Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season' ran the Pauline injunction, a theme which received great prominence in the writings of the Greek and Latin Fathers.[22] With the revival of the apostolic model in the sixteenth century, the prime episcopal duty of preaching was acknowledged on both sides of the confessional divide. The Council of Trent

repeated the words of St. Gregory Nazianzen when it decreed the ministration of the word to be the chief responsibility of the episcopate.[23] In England, similar sentiments were embodied in the synodal canons of 1571, and were mirrored in the poignant prayer of Bishop Jewel of Salisbury that he might die preaching in the pulpit.[24] Two other responsibilities characterised the episcopal office. One was the power to ordain ministers, which the bishop should use with particular discretion; the exercise of discipline was the second, to be administered with meekness and mercy as part of the teaching role of the office.[25] The pastoral metaphor of the Good Shepherd epitomised the apostolic model. The bishop is endowed with the staff of the gospel and the rod of discipline in order to protect and feed his flock. As one Caroline preacher observed:[26]

> the embelme and image of a shepheard sets out to the life all the sweet and gracious qualities, the tendernesse, providence, innocence, benignitie, fidelitie, prudence, diligence etc that should be in every good governour.

A series of formidable barriers stood in the way of any attempt to marry the image of the apostolic bishop with the realities of episcopal government in the Jacobean Church. The social standing and political responsibilities of the episcopate was a far cry from the Pauline ideal of the teaching bishop. Each Jacobean prelate was a lord spiritual, endowed with temporalities, and a leading member of provincial society. Social pre-eminence necessarily carried with it political obligations. Bishops were summoned to London to attend parliamentary sessions which, as in the 1600s and 1620s, might be convened fairly regularly. A growing number of bishops resided for most of the year at court, acting as ecclesiastical statesmen and advisers to a benevolent monarch who promoted six of them to the Privy Council. At diocesan level, the temporal jurisdiction exercised by the bishops of Durham and Ely was certainly exceptional, but all prelates were placed on the local commission of the peace, collected clerical subsidies on behalf of the Crown, and supervised clerical

contributions to the county militia.[27] The palaces and manor-houses, the households and lands of the episcopate were all visible trappings of their social and political authority, which left the bishops vulnerable to the charge of worldly grandeur. One critic in 1603 noted an obvious tension between Pauline injunctions and the wealth of the episcopate:[28]

> The bishopps are indeede at great charges for their dyet and apparrell, furniture of their howses, their trayne of servants, their stable of horses, and such lyke things as are sutable to an honorable and lordly estate; which if it have any use to set owt the magnificence of the kingdome let it be considered; but to further Religion, wee see not what all this pompe avayleth.

The size and structure of diocesan administration were further obstacles to effective pastoral government. English dioceses in the southern province varied in size from a compact see such as Rochester, which contained about a hundred parishes, to the sprawling diocese of Norwich, numbering over one thousand one hundred livings. The average was a see of about three hundred and eighty parishes.[29] The dioceses being so large, it was unlikely that a bishop would make more than a passing impression on most clergy and laity. Regular journeys throughout the see was one solution, but here too lay difficulties. In a diocese such as Chichester, the problem of poor communications[30] was compounded by the fact that, as a result of episcopal manors being clustered around the Cathedral city, an itinerant bishop was entirely dependent on the hospitality of others.

Moreover, the character of diocesan government was jurisdictional and judicial rather than pastoral. The bishop's spiritual authority was exercised by a hierarchy of consistory and visitation courts, staffed by civil lawyers who had full authority to impose ecclesiastical discipline in his absence. Under the canons of 1604, the formal deprivation of a clergyman was the only disciplinary act specifically reserved for the bishop.[31] The levying of fees in consistory, and of synodals or procurations on visitation, further underlined the judicial rights and jurisdictional privileges of episcopal government. The

bishop had to create his own pastoral role within these formal organs of diocesan administration. For consistory business, this might mean presiding in court whenever possible or hearing certain types of case in private. Formal administration had also to be supplemented by informal pastoral activity, such as frequent diocesan preaching, but such practices varied according to the energy and resources of individual prelates.

The attempt by bishops to act as pastors was often bedevilled by the divisive issue of ceremonial conformity. The eviction of ninety beneficed ministers in 1604-6, for example, made it hard for any bishop to retain the image of a pastor while at the same time ordering the removal of fellow protestant clergy from the ministry. It was a stark reminder to the clergy of the judicial authority invested in the episcopal office, and it not surprising that some bishops found themselves portrayed in polemical literature as the harsh and unyielding governors of the church.[32]

The task of transposing this Pastoral ideal into English diocesan government had proved too difficult for an earlier generation of bishops. Dr Stephen Thompson has studied the entire English and Welsh episcopate between 1500 and 1558, thereby placing the exemplary rule of a Sherburne or a Hooper in a more general context. His findings are that the majority of bishops were not continuously resident in their sees and usually delegated to commissaries the tasks of presiding in consistory and on visitation. Nor, he suggests, is it likely that they were diligent preachers.[33] The diocesan government of their Jacobean successors was very different.

The central argument of this thesis is that, as a group, the bishops of James I did surmount many political, social and administrative barriers in order to incorporate the principal features of the Pastoral ideal into their diocesan government. As Chapter Two demonstrates, contemporary practice softened the potential conflict between the bishop's role as an adviser to the Crown and as a diocesan governor. Most bishops resided in their sees except

at Parliament time, while the small number of court prelates established strong links with their dioceses, to which they returned at regular intervals. Chapter Three shows that the episcopal visitation was usually led by the bishop himself, since it offered important opportunities for pastoral supervision and contact with clergy and laity alike. The subject of Chapter Four is the administration of the episcopal consistory. It is argued that most resident bishops either sat in court themselves or assembled a loyal and responsive team of diocesan officials to serve in their place. The fifth and sixth chapters explore more informal types of pastoral care. The Pauline injunction to preach regularly was observed by many Jacobean prelates, and it seems, on the basis of limited evidence, that several performed the confirmation rite. The episcopate also employed a variety of means, such as rights of patronage, to enhance the calibre of their diocesan clergy.

Chapter Seven, drawing on the evidence presented in the previous five chapters, proposes that the dominant style of churchmanship, in theory and practice, was the bishop as preaching pastor. This model was closely followed by a circle of 'evangelical' bishops, whose courteous and affable deportment towards their flock helped to bridge the gulf between the image of the pastor and the reality of lordly authority and wealth. Memoirs and dedications furnish important evidence that a significant number of Jacobean bishops were regarded by contemporaries as matching the apostolic model. The flowering of this churchmanship owed something to royal policy. Not merely was James I an active supporter of the proselytising mission of the Church, but, as is argued in Chapter Eight, he also sanctioned occasional conformity, thereby removing the most contentious issue between the bishop and his flock. Finally, the Crown largely restrained the small number of Arminian bishops from actively expressing their opposition to excessive evangelism and ceremonial nonconformity.

Footnotes to Chapter One

1. Thomas Fuller, The Church History of Britain, ed. J.S. Brewer (6 vols., Oxford, 1845), v. p.386.

2. R.G. Usher, The Reconstruction of the English Church (2 vols., 1910). See also idem, The Rise and Fall of the High Commission (Oxford, 1913; 2nd ed., Oxford, 1968).

3. M.H. Curtis, 'Hampton Court Conference and its Aftermath', History, xlvi. (1961), pp.1-16; F.H. Shriver, 'The Ecclesiastical Policy of James I: Two Aspects: the Puritans (1603-5) - the Arminians (1611-25)' (Cambridge Ph.D. thesis, 1967); idem, 'Orthodoxy and Diplomacy: James I and the Vortius Affair', English Historical Review, lxxxv. (1970), pp.449-74; idem, 'Hampton Court Re-visited: James I and the Puritans', Journal of Ecclesiastical History, xxxiii. (1982), pp.48-71; P. Collinson, 'The Jacobean Religious Settlement: the Hampton Court Conference' in Before the English Civil War: Essays on Early Stuart Politics and Government, ed. H. Tomlinson (1983), pp.27-51; B.W. Quintrell, 'The Royal Hunt and the Puritans, 1604-1605', Journal of Ecclesiastical History, xxxi. (1980), pp.41-58.

4. G.I. Soden, Godfrey Goodman, Bishop of Gloucester, 1583-1656 (1953); P.A. Welsby, Lancelot Andrewes, 1555-1626 (1958); idem, George Abbot, the Unwanted Archbishop, 1562-1633 (1962).

5. S.B. Babbage, Puritanism and Richard Bancroft (1962); I. Cassidy, 'The Episcopate of William Cotton Bishop of Exeter 1598-1621, with special reference to the State of the Clergy and the Administration of the Ecclesiastical Courts' (Oxford B.Litt. thesis, 1964); A.W. Foster, 'A Biography of Archbishop Richard Neile, 1562-1640' (Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1978).

6. Diocesan studies have been dominated, however, by the quest for

puritans: E.J.I. Allen, 'The State of the Church in the diocese of Peterborough, 1601-1642' (Oxford B.Litt. thesis, 1972); H. Hajzyk, 'The Church in Lincolnshire, c.1595 - c.1640' (Cambridge Ph.D. thesis, 1980); O.U. Kalu, 'The Jacobean Church and Essex Puritans. A Regional Study on the Enforcement of Church Discipline and of the Survival of Puritan Nonconformity 1603-1628' (Toronto Ph.D. thesis, 1973); idem, 'Bishops and Puritans in Early Jacobean England: a Perspective on Methodology', Church History, xlv. (1976), pp.469-89; idem, 'Continuity in Change: Bishops of London and Religious Dissent in Early Stuart England', Journal of British Studies, xviii. (1978), pp.28-45; R.A. Marchant, The Puritans and the Church Courts in the diocese of York 1560-1642 (1960); W.J. Sheils, The Puritans in the diocese of Peterborough 1558-1610 (Northamptonshire Record Society, xxx. Northampton, 1979); M. Stieg, Laud's Laboratory: the diocese of Bath & Wells in the early Seventeenth Century (East Brunswick, N.J., 1982).

7. J.E.C. Hill, Economic Problems of the Church from Archbishop Whitgift to the Long Parliament (Oxford, 1956); P.M. Hembry, The Bishops of Bath & Wells 1540-1640: Social and Economic Problems (1967); R. O'Day, 'Cumulative Debt: the Bishops of Coventry & Lichfield and their Economic Problems c.1540-1640', Midland History, iii. (1976), pp.76-90; C.A. Haigh, 'Finance and Administration in a new Diocese: Chester 1541-1641' in Continuity and Change: Personnel and Administration of the Church of England 1500-1642, ed. R. O'Day and F. Heal (Leicester, 1976), pp.145-66; F. Heal, Of Prelates and Princes: a Study of the Economic and Social Position of the Tudor Episcopate (Cambridge, 1980); idem, 'Archbishop Laud revisited: leases and estate management at Canterbury and Winchester before the Civil War' in Princes and Paupers in the English Church 1500-1800, ed. R. O'Day and

F. Heal (Leicester, 1981), pp.129-51; W.J. Sheils, 'Profit, Patronage or Pastoral Care: the Rectory Estates of the Archbishopric of York, 1540-1640', in Princes and Paupers, pp.91-109.

8. H.R. Trevor-Roper, 'King James and his Bishops', History Today, v. (1955), pp.571-81, reprinted in his Historical Essays (1957), pp.130-45, with the amended title 'James I and his Bishops'.

9. J. Rogan, 'King James's Bishops', University of Durham Journal, xlvii. (1956), pp.93-9; D.E. Kennedy, 'The Jacobean Episcopate', Historical Journal, v. (1962), pp.175-81; and by implication, A.P. Kautz, 'The Selection of Jacobean Bishops' in Early Stuart Studies, ed. H.S. Reinmuth (Minneapolis, 1970), pp.152-79.

10. See, for example, Welsby, Lancelot Andrewes, pp.53-8; F. Higham, Catholic and Reformed: a study of the Anglican Church 1559-1662 (1962), pp.56,59-60; T.M. Parker, 'Arminianism and Laudianism in seventeenth century England' in Studies in Church History, i. ed. C.W. Dugmore and C. Duggan (1964), p.31; J.P. Kenyon, The Stuart Constitution 1603-1688 (Cambridge, 1966), p.147 fn.3; Hembry, The Bishops of Bath & Wells 1540-1640, p.212.

11. P. Collinson, The Religion of Protestants: the Church in English Society 1559-1625 (Oxford, 1982), pp.39-91.

12. T. Lathbury, A History of the Convocation of the Church of England: being an account of the Proceedings of the Anglican Ecclesiastical Councils from the Earliest Period to the Year 1742 (1842), pp.192-218; J. Joyce, England's Sacred Synods. A Constitutional History of the Convocations of the Clergy (1855), pp.616-51. According to Fuller, the southern convocations of 1621 and 1624 had little significant business to transact, a view also found in the vigorous prose of the nonconformist William Ames: 'how much evill hath come from them

[convocations] and more would but that many times their commission serveth not but onely to give subsidies, and then to tell the clock'. Fuller, Church History, v. pp.496,566; [William Ames], A Reply to Dr Mortons Generall Defence of the Three Nocent Ceremonies (1622), sig.B.

13. The illuminating use to which a document such as Archbishop Matthew's diary has been put is a sobering reminder of what we have lost. Collinson, The Religion of Protestants, pp.48-52.

14. See below, Chapter Two.

15. The doctrinal opinions of the Jacobean episcopate have been established in the seminal work of N.R.N. Tyacke, 'Arminianism in England, in Religion and Politics, 1604-1640' (Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1968). See also idem, 'Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter-Revolution' in The Origins of the English Civil War, ed. C. Russell (1973), pp.119-43; idem, 'Arminianism and English Culture' in Britain and the Netherlands, vii. ed. A.C. Duke and C.A. Hamse (The Hague, 1981), pp.94-117.

16. Cassidy, 'The Episcopate of William Cotton, Bishop of Exeter 1598-1621'; Foster, 'Archbishop Richard Neile'; Hajzyk, 'The Church in Lincolnshire'; Kalu, 'The Jacobean Church and Essex Puritans'; Allen, 'The State of the Church in the diocese of Peterborough'.

17. P. Collinson, Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism (1983), pp.156,159-64.

18. George Paule, The Life of the most reverend and religious Prelate John Whitgift, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury (1612), p.82; John Barwick, The Fight, Victory and Triumph of S.Paul. Accommodated to the right reverend father in God Thomas late L.Bishop of Duresme, in a Sermon preached at his Funeral...together with the Life of the said Bishop (1660), pp.141-64. Morton's other biographers suggested that his

government was 'a transcript' of the Pauline model: R(ichard) B(addeley) and J(oseph) N(aylor), The Life of Dr Thomas Morton late Bishop of Duresme (York, 1669), pp.167-72. See also Arthur Lake, Sermons with some Religious and Divine Meditations...whereunto is prefixed by way of preface A Short View of the Life and Vertues of the Author (1629), sig.Sr - +r.

19. Daniel Featley, Clavis Mystica: a Key opening divers difficult and mysterious Texts of Holy Scripture, handled in Seventy Sermons (1636), pp.122-32; Two Biographies of William Bedell Bishop of Kilmore, ed. J.S. Shuckburgh (Cambridge, 1902), p.124 and passim.

20. Lancelot Andrewes, Works, ed. J.P. Wilson & J. Bliss (11 vols., Oxford, 1854), v. pp.64-5, ix. pp.173-216; William Laud, Works, ed. J. Bliss & W. Scott (7 vols., Oxford, 1847-60), iv. pp.310-2; A.J. Mason, The Church of England and Episcopacy (Cambridge, 1914), p.107; Lake, Sermons, iii. p.190; two of Abbot's chaplains, Daniel Featley and Francis Mason, publicly defended the apostolic origin of bishops: Featley, Clavis Mystica, p.129; J.P. Sommerville, 'The Royal Supremacy and Episcopacy Iure Divino 1603-1660', Journal of Ecclesiastical History, xxxiv. (1983), p.554.

21. Acts. xx. 28; I Tim. ii. 1-7, iv. 12,15-6, 2 Tim. ii. 24; Titus i. 7-8, ii. 7-8.

22. 2 Tim. iv. 3. See also I Tim. v. 17; Titus i. 9; The Six Books on the Priesthood of St. John Chrysostom, ed. F.W. Hohler (Cambridge, 1837), pp.113-31; A Select Library of Nicene and post-Nicene Fathers, vii. ed. H. Wace and P. Schaff (Oxford, 1894), p.212, xii. ed. R.L. Feltoe (Oxford, 1895), books 2 ch.4, 3; Richard Humfrey, Saint Ambrose his Christian Offices in 3 Bookes (1637), pp.1-9.

23. H. Jedin, A History of the Council of Trent, tr. E. Graf (2 vols., 1957-61), ii. p.123; A Select Library, vii. p.135.

24. 'Omnes episcopi diligenter docebunt evangelium, non tantum in ecclesiis cathedralibus, quibus praesunt, sed etiam passim, per omnes ecclesias suae cujusque dioeceseos, ubi maxime putabunt expedire': Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae, ab anno MDXLVI ad annum MDCCXVII, ed. D. Wilkins (4 vols., 1737), iv. p.263; John Jewel, Workes (1611), p.33.

25. Titus i. 5; Acts xx. 28; 2 Tim. ii. 24-6.

26. Christopher Potter, A Sermon preached at the Consecration of the right reverend father in God Barnaby Potter, DD and L.Bishop of Carlisle, at Ely house in Holbourne March 15 1628 (1629), p.51.

27. Heal, Of Prelates and Princes, p.38; idem, 'Clerical tax collection under the Tudors: the influence of the Reformation' in Continuity and Change, pp.97-122.

28. Bodl., Bodley MS 124 p.213.

29. These figures are taken from the returns made to Archbishop Whitgift in 1603-4, preserved in BL, Harl.MS 280 fos.158r-69r.

30. A. Fletcher, A County Community in Peace and War: Sussex 1600-1660 (1975), pp.5-7; John Cosin, Correspondence, i. ed. G. Ornsby (Surtees Record Society, lii. 1869), p.36.

31. Canon 122.

32. See, for example, [William Bradshaw], A Myld and Iust Defence of Certeyne Arguments at the last session of Parliament directed to that most honorable High Court, in behalfe of Ministers suspended and deprived...against an intemperat and uniust consideration of them by M.Gabriel Powell (1606), pp.6,8,51,77.

33. S. Thompson, 'The Pastoral Work of the English and Welsh Bishops 1500-1558' (Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1984), pp.16-9,79,94-5,117-8,165-6. Thompson does note, however, the beginnings of a revival of the Pastoral ideal among Edwardine and Marian bishops: ibid., p.171.

Chapter Two: The Episcopate at the Court of James I

> The manner of carrying bishopricks is now com to such a pass yt I am muche ashamed to write. It is better to be silent. I am weary of the court and if I knewe any way hamsomly to be ridd of it, I would gladly be gone.

So wrote George Carleton to his cousin Dudley, disgruntled at having narrowly missed promotion to the see of Carlisle.[1] The image evoked by Carleton and others of a swarm of churchmen, residing at court and hungry for preferment, has received its classic exposition from the pen of Professor Hugh Trevor-Roper. To him, the bishops of King James I were nothing other than secular politicans in clerical attire, the absentee and worldly governors of the Church, who are best judged without reference to their spiritual vocation.[2] Some evaluation of this indictment is a necessary starting-point for an analysis of the pastoral roles of the Jacobean episcopate. It is the contention of this chapter that only a minority of prelates resided in London away from their dioceses. These bishops fulfilled a number of indispensable duties in and around the court, yet were mindful of their diocesan responsibilities and returned home each summer to resume the control of their administration. Indeed, few if any of these bishops match up to the stereotype of the clerical worldling.

\+ + + + +

In an essay published in 1955, Trevor-Roper made a brief study of the Jacobean episcopate and found them to be a bunch of clerical courtiers who neglected their spiritual responsibilities. They were, he concluded, 'indifferent, negligent, secular...' Although over the years a number of scholars have chipped away at corners of his thesis, it has never received the systematic scrutiny that it merits.[3] Trevor-Roper's argument is as succinct as

it is lucid. He identifies the period of 1610 to 1628 as the 'true' Jacobean age, after the passing of the last generation of Elizabethan prelates, and maintains that the episcopate in these years were:[4]

> lay courtiers holding clerical sinecures...those worldly, courtly, talented, place-hunting dilettanti, the ornamental betrayers of the Church, the bishops of King James.

This judgement is grounded upon two propositions. First, their shameless scramble for preferment shows the episcopate to be devoid of any spiritual vocation; and secondly, the bishops resided at court, bidding for office and playing high politics. Neither of these propositions stands up to critical examination.

It is undoubtedly the case that advancement in the reformed Church of England was dependent upon the lobbying of patrons and upon the assiduous wooing of courtiers who possessed access to the King's ear. Few Jacobean clerics rose to the episcopate without the backing of a powerful sponsor,[5] with the probable exceptions of Lancelot Andrewes and James Mountagu, both known to and beloved of King James.[6] Evidence for this inexorable quest for high clerical office is to be found in the public and private, the printed and manuscript collections of the period, the choicest plums of which were picked by Trevor-Roper.[7] Yet the history of the Jacobean episcopate can be written in terms of the gadarene rush for preferment only if ambition and piety are regarded as strange bedfellows. There is abundant evidence, however, to suggest that many prelates could reconcile the search for advancement with a genuine capacity for spiritual leadership. One well-documented example is that of Arthur Lake, Bishop of Bath & Wells between 1616 and 1626. Although his biographer piously attributed his preferment to 'the speciall and...immediate providence of almighty God', Lake's correspondence shows him to be angling for high office from the early years of James I's reign.[8] He adeptly cultivated two influential patrons. The first was Bishop Bilson of Winchester, who appointed Lake to be his domestic chaplain, and collated him

to a brace of episcopal livings and, in 1605, to the archdeaconry of Surrey.[9] The other was his own brother Sir Thomas Lake, Latin Secretary to the King, who secured for him the mastership of St. Cross Hospital in 1603, the deanery of Worcester in 1608, the wardenry of New College, Oxford in 1613 and, in all probability, the bishopric of Bath & Wells itself in 1616.[10] From this evidence one might conclude that Lake had displayed several familiar symptoms of a cleric greedy for preferment. However, as Bishop of Bath & Wells after 1616, Lake threw himself energetically into diocesan administration. He presided over his three triennial visitations, supervised the work of his consistory and was a tireless preacher in his Cathedral church at Wells.[11] Nor is Lake's case exceptional, for the same combination of ambition and diligent pastoral care was exhibited by Tobie Matthew, Archbishop of York after 1606,[12] and by Bishop Carleton of Llandaff and Chichester, to name but two.[13] In short, the method of recruitment to the episcopate and the measure of pastoral care provided by these bishops are two distinct issues. The proper archive for the latter is the records of diocesan administration, not stray letters petitioning for preferment.

Nor can it be shown that the Jacobean bishops hung dronishly around the court, eager to receive honour, patronage and power. Non-residence was hardly compatible with that personal supervision of the flock which the model of the apostolic bishop demanded. As will be argued later, even if delegation did not necessarily imply negligence, nevertheless the responsibilities of preaching, hospitality and leadership could never be satisfactorily left to subordinates. However, there was no single pattern of episcopal residence in the Jacobean Church, in contrast to the period after 1660, when the episcopate spent half the year in London attending Parliamentary sessions and the other six months in their dioceses.[14] Most Jacobean prelates were resident in their dioceses for the majority of each year.[15] It was not simply pastoral considerations that kept these bishops in their sees. In the southern province,

only Canterbury, Ely and London retained houses in the capital after the despoliation of episcopal property between 1530 and 1560, so that most bishops had to find temporary accommodation during their periodic visits to London. This problem was avoided by a minority of fortunate bishops, such as Ravis of Gloucester and Barlow of Lincoln, who still possessed prebendal houses from the chapters of Westminster and St Pauls.[16] Moreover, Dr Heal has noted that Tudor bishops found London life to be expensive and it is unlikely that the experience of their Jacobean successors was very different.[17] Nor was the intrigue and conflict of court life to the taste of all bishops. During a brief visit to London in April 1622, Bishop Carleton found that unknown enemies had maligned him before the King. Once James' favour had been regained, Carleton was eager to return home to Chichester diocese, 'for I had rather be att my charge then att court'.[18]

The contemporary expression 'court bishop' in fact embraced at least four overlapping explanations for residence in the capital. First, there were those prelates holding sees either conterminous or contiguous with the cities of London and Westminster. The bishop of London lived at Fulham House, while the bishop of Rochester were often in and around Whitehall, for his principal seat was at Bromley in Kent, a mere half-day's ride from London.[19] One edge of Winchester diocese ran along the south bank of the Thames and two of the three Jacobean incumbents lived at Winchester House in Southwark.[20] To this group may be added the three Jacobean archbishops of Canterbury, who resided at Lambeth Palace. There were also a number of prominent offices in the royal household staffed by the episcopate, which obliged them to remain at court. Richard Neile as clerk of the closet was responsible for arranging the rota of preachers in the chapel royal, which for an ambitious young cleric might be an important step on the ladder to preferment, provided his deportment and learning pleased the discerning eye

and ear of James I. Thus it was Neile who selected William Laud to preach before the King for the first time in September 1609.[21] The household office of dean of the chapel royal was revived by James I and granted first to James Mountagu and after his death to Lancelot Andrewes. The deans organised the daily celebration of the liturgy in the chapels royal both in London and on the summer progresses, and, as ordinaries of the chapel, they administered a body of some forty gentlemen of the chapel and officers of the vestry. While routine duties fell on the shoulders of the subdean, the deans officiated at services of baptism, confirmation and marriage of the royal family and of prominent courtiers.[22] The royal almonership was filled successively by three bishops between 1603 and 1625 and carried with it the obligation of residence at court.[23] Six Jacobean bishops were also Privy Councillors at one time or another and most attended meetings punctiliously.[24]

Prelates who stayed at court for several months each year while they performed their duties as royal chaplains may be considered a third variety of court bishop. These included William Barlow of Lincoln,[25] and Thomas Morton of Coventry and Lichfield.[26] Finally, there emerged in the second half of the reign a handful of bishops who resided in London although they had no ostensible duties to keep them there. Overall of Coventry & Lichfield and Felton of Ely are two probable examples, although the evidence for their itineraries is far from complete.[27] Another was Valentine Carey, Bishop of Exeter between 1621 and 1626, who lived with his family in London for ten months a year, returning to his diocese every summer between July and September.[28] All three prelates had lived in London prior to their consecration and evidently preferred its society to the more sedate rhythms of provincial life. When Carey invited the Master of St. John's Cambridge to travel down with him to Exeter in 1623, he candidly admitted that he would need 'the company of some good friend there with me'.[29] William Laud, as Bishop of St. Davids and after 1622 confessor to the Duke of Buckingham,

helped swell further the episcopal presence at court, and Charles I may have been aware of this trend when, in July 1629, he ordered the bishops to return to reside at their sees.[30] The court bishops of King James constituted, therefore, a small if significant group. Six of the twenty-six bishops of England and Wales resided in and around London in the first years of the reign, rising to an average of eight after 1614; and all but one or two of these bishops held a position necessitating their presence in the capital. These figures do represent a small increase on the four or five court bishops in the time of Elizabeth,[31] a change which reflects not the worldly character of the Jacobean episcopate so much as the preferences of their sovereign, James I.

The presence of bishops around the monarch is common to most ages of the Church. The distinctive feature of the Jacobean court bishop was the high standing he enjoyed. If six Jacobean bishops were appointed to the Privy Council in contrast to only one by Elizabeth I, it was because the King found their company congenial, with whom he could indulge in theological debate or banter, as the mood took him.[32] Thus the growing eminence of Lancelot Andrewes at court derived primarily from James I's keen appreciation of his rare gifts of eloquence and erudition. The King found himself enthralled with Andrewes's preaching. After one sermon he declared that no man had spoken so well 'since the days of the Apostles' and another delighted him so much that he procured a copy and placed it under his pillow.[33] The presence of bishops and divines at James' court was thus, in part, for the King's own satisfaction, and it may well have been the desire to maintain a sizeable clerical coterie at court that prompted James to revive the posts of dean of the chapel royal and clerk of the closet in 1603.[34]

The King's passion for theological debate ensured that the duties of court bishops were not confined to the routine performance of political or household offices. James I took great pride in his knowledge of theology and did not shrink from parading that learning before a European audience. In his

polemical exchange with the Papacy on the Oath of Allegiance controversy, the King mustered a small army of English and Scottish divines to write in his defence, among them Bishops Barlow and Andrewes.[35] By nature a scholar and not a controversialist, Andrewes was browbeaten into writing two works against the formidable Robert Bellarmine.[36] Organising this literary armada was James Mountagu, a particularly close confidant of the King. Mountagu had attracted the attention of James I within months of his accession and was awarded the deanery of the chapel royal in December 1603.[37] As a mark of special favour, Mountagu was the only English cleric present at a meeting between the King and Scottish presbyterians in September 1606.[38] Three months earlier Mountagu had been given the singular option of accepting the next vacant bishopric of his choice, and in February 1608 he duly chose the see of Bath & Wells.[39] The familiarity between Mountagu and the King is caught well in an anecdote the Bishop relayed to his mother in February 1614 after he had just recovered from a bout of toothache:[40]

> The Kinge tells me that if my head ache I must cutt it off next time, but I tell him I will leave that for him to doe.

Mountagu quickly established himself as James' indispensable secretary and theological factotum as he attended him at the chase as well as in London. The chief monument to this relationship is James I's Works edited by Mountagu and published in 1616,[41] but equally revealing is Mountagu's correspondence on behalf of the King. In the spring and winter of 1611, as James hunted around Royston and Newmarket, Mountagu wrote off a string of letters to the French émigré scholar, Isaac Casaubon, enquiring after the progress of his writings against Bellarmine and Baronius and assuring him on one occasion that 'solet Rex excitare athletas suos'.[42] Mountagu's pervasive influence over the King may have extended to doctrinal niceties. Peter Heylyn noted the more liberal attitude of James I towards critics of the Calvinist theology of grace in the last years of his life and attributed this, in part, to the death of Mountagu, an

orthodox Calvinist, in July 1618.[43]

Under the rule of such a benign monarch, the episcopate could play an influential role in matters temporal and spiritual. The evolution of royal directives on Church discipline and doctrine may have owed something to the advice of individual court prelates, but this episcopal function is more easy to assert than to document. There is little evidence, for example, of the part played by court prelates in framing the Directions on Preaching of August 1622 save for an attribution of its authorship to Laud by his biographer, Peter Heylyn, an implausible suggestion since Laud was only a peripheral figure at court at that time.[44] The regular access several of these bishops possessed to the King might be of decisive importance, as one telling example illustrates. It has been observed that under James I the episcopate enjoyed greater economic security, symbolised by the statute of 1604 which forbade the alienation of episcopal lands to the Crown.[45] Nevertheless the temporalities of bishoprics were still vulnerable to the pressing needs of their monarch. Bilson of Winchester was obliged to lease Farnham Castle to the Crown in 1608, while Nicholas Felton was excluded from Ely House from September 1619, to make room first for Gondomar, the Spanish ambassador, and afterwards for the Duke of Richmond.[46] On this delicate issue, the timely intervention of an important court prelate could be decisive. On one occasion the opportunity arose for the King to appropriate some Cathedral lands, but he was dissuaded by Lancelot Andrewes, a pugnacious defender of the temporalities of his own sees,[47] who convinced James I that he should act as protector rather than engrosser of Church property. As the Bishop pointed out, services were held three times a day in every Cathedral 'and his Majesty publikly prayed for in his greatest necessities.'[48] Similar episodes may have happened on other unrecorded occasions.

The other court prelates must have closed ranks in support of Andrewes's prompt defence of Church property, but for much of the time they were

engaged in bitter factional fighting against each other for the King's favour. After 1611 there grew up at court two hostile groups of churchmen, whose rivalry centred on differing interpretations of the theology of grace. A Calvinist lobby, headed by Archbishop Abbot and Bishop Mountagu, was opposed by an Arminian grouping led by Bishop Neile.[49] Each sought to discredit the other in the eyes of the King by manipulating James' fear of the twin evils of popery and puritanism. The conflict between Abbot and Laud is the most famous example of this factional struggle. Having persecuted Laud at Oxford, Abbot had him denounced to the King as a papist in 1610, and Laud's standing with James was only preserved through the influence of his patron, Richard Neile.[50] As will be argued below,[51] the sermons and churchmanship of these two groups indicate that each was offering the King a very different view of the needs and priorities of the English Church; and if James did not succcumb completely to the proposals of either faction, then the presence of these bishops around their sovereign, guarding against the possible triumph of their opponents, was all the more necessary.

The court bishops also performed a number of less contentious duties in London. It was they who presided over the Ecclesiastical Commission, sitting at Lambeth or St. Paul's, but the almost complete loss of its records for the Jacobean period preclude much analysis.[52] Its relative importance may have been enhanced after 1610, however, when James I promised in Parliament that in future he would not grant letters patent for diocesan ecclesiastical commissions, with the result that all business from the southern province devolved upon the Commission sitting in London.[53] It was at this time, according to John Hacket, that Archbishop Abbot was applying the Commission's disciplinary powers with some severity, in contrast to his predecessors Whitgift and Bancroft.[54] A reconstruction of episcopal attendance on the Commission shows that Abbot sat more regularly than any other bishop,[55] and Hacket's claim is supported by one relatively well-

documented case. Meredith Mady was instituted to the living of Blagdon in the diocese of Bath & Wells in 1607 and soon distingushed himself as a thoroughly capricious and fractious minister. His churchwardens presented eighteen charges against him in the episcopal visitation of 1612, accusing him of neglect of his ministry, the practice of extortion and the vexation of his parishioners with tithe suits. Mady's nonchalant attitude towards the ecclesiastical authorities may be adduced from the claim that he had reported the churchwardens to the consistory for failing to present his own neglect of catechising the young. Moreover, it was alleged that he had christened children without using the sign of the cross:

> and beeinge demaunded by last yeeres churchewardens, whie hee did refuse to signe them with the signe of the crosse hee aunswered that suche as will have them soe signed shall not, and such as will not, shall.

Later that year Mady was defending himself before the Ecclesiastical Commission on these charges, but regrettably the records of proceedings have been lost.[56] In 1614, he was accused by his parishioners of adultery and incest and the case was heard by the Ecclesiastical Commission sitting at Lambeth. There, before his Ordinary, Mountagu, and Andrewes, Neile, Buckeridge, Mady's conduct was investigated and he received a judicial admonition. A week later Archbishop Abbot was present, and upon re-examining the evidence, declared himself dissatisfied with the lenient sentence imposed by his fellow commissioners and ordered Mady to purge for his innocence. On this occasion Mady was acquitted, but three years later it was Abbot who presided over a session of the Ecclesiastical Commission when Mady was deprived of his living for 'nonnulla gravia et enormia crimina', specifically for his characteristic disregard of a sentence temporarily suspending him from the ministry.[57] The incident supports Hacket's contention that Abbot stamped his personality on the dealings of the Commission.

Court bishops were also appointed to hear cases reaching the highest

court of civil law, that of the delegates. It was this court that heard the notorious Essex divorce case of 1613, with six bishops sitting in judgement. However, the earliest extant repertory book only begins in 1619. In it is recorded the names of the parties in dispute, the date of commission, the name of the court from which the appeal was made and the names of the judges. Between 1619 and 1625 fifteen bishops were selected to hear twenty-four of the two hundred and sixty cases before the delegates. Buckeridge of Rochester proved to be an indispensable judge, for he served on sixteen of these commissions.[58] Bishops heard the whole range of cases, including testamentary, matrimonial and disciplinary disputes emanating from the provincial courts of Arches and Audience, but as Dr Duncan observed, they rarely sat in the earlier sessions of a cause.[59] One hardy perennial among these were suits over the dilapidation of episcopal property, and the intimate acquaintance of many bishops with the problem may explain their regular selection as judges.

The most prolonged dilapidation suit in this period was fought between Lancelot Andrewes and the executor of the estate of James Mountagu, Bishop of Winchester, who had died in July 1618. Both Bishops had placed equal importance on protecting the temporalities of their various sees. Andrewes had repaired the bishop's palace at Chichester, and on his translation to Ely in 1609 had sued the estate of his predecessor, Martin Heton. In a case that reached the delegates, he received at least £58 for dilapidations to Ely House in London and the bishop's three principal houses in the diocese.[60] As Bishop of Bath & Wells Mountagu had contributed to the completion of Bath Abbey and had renovated Banwell manor and Wells palace. On his promotion to Winchester in 1616, he had obtained £1000 from the widow of Thomas Bilson for dilapidations and began immediately to repair the episcopal property of the see. Within a year, the reparations to Winchester House were complete.[61] Mountagu died, however, in July 1618, and his successor Andrewes alleged that

the majority of the bishopric's seats were out of repair, especially Farnham, Wolvesley and Bishop's Waltham. Mountagu's executor contested this claim and the matter came before the delegates in July 1619. An expensive and lengthy suit ensued, which was not settled until December 1622, in course of which six different bishops heard evidence. Two of these, Abbot and Williams, rebuked Andrewes for standing too rigidly on his rights, but the Bishop went on to win the case and received £90 from the plaintiff.[62]

Notwithstanding the claims made by Trevor-Roper, these court bishops cannot be characterised merely as time-serving politicans. Certainly, all were general practitioners of the arts and strategems of political life, which were necessary accomplishments for members of the Privy Council and Star Chamber. One exception may have been Lancelot Andrewes, a theologian rather than a politican, who customarily avoided meddling in secular matters as a Privy Councillor.[63] More typical was the flair shown by James Mountagu at furthering the fortunes of his large family, particularly those of his younger brother Sir Sidney, for whom Mountagu sought preferment for many years.[64] In the last months of his life, the Bishop had the satisfaction of helping his brother become Master of Requests.[65] Politicans they may have been, but the respect and obedience shown to the Crown by the court bishops should not be mistaken for abject servility. The subtle bonds of interest and reciprocity that existed between James I and some court prelates may inferred from the relations of the King and Lancelot Andrewes. In his court sermons, the Bishop reiterated the conventional political notions of the day to express his profound respect for the office and person of his sovereign. James I was God's lieutenaunt on earth to whom obedience was owed, supreme governor of the Church by divine right, who had been protected from conspiracy by the hand of providence. At times, Andrewes's remarks were overtly flattering. The King was commended for his wisdom and learning, his union of the two Crowns, and his love of peace; and Andrewes often concluded his sermons with a fervent

personal prayer for the preservation and prosperity of the King in this life and eternal bliss in the next.[65] Outside the pulpit, Andrewes did on occasion yield to royal pressure. In 1608 he was bullied into writing against Rome and in 1613 may have been forced to support the divorce of the Earl of Essex and Lady Frances Howard. Yet the Bishop enjoyed an important influence over the King. He was able to check a royal scheme to appropriate Cathedral lands and played upon James' stated fears of radical puritans in order to discredit John Preston, the leader of the godly in Cambridge, in 1618-9. Indeed, in one revealing episode, Andrewes threw himself on his knees before the King, begging to know the truth of the Gowrie conspiracy, for he protested that he could not preach on the subject while remaining ignorant of whether or not the plot had been fabricated.[66] Andrewes's colleague, Abbot of Canterbury, dissented from royal policy on several occasions. The Archbishop clashed with the King over the Essex divorce of 1613, refused to read the royal Declaration of Sports in 1618, and in 1623 led the opposition in the Privy Council to the Spanish match.[67]

The pursuit of secular power and office among these ecclesiastical statesmen to the exclusion of spiritual duties was a rare occurence. Richard Neile certainly had a dubious reputation as an 'irreverend bishop' and 'one of the abusers of the King's eare in sermon time', but, as is argued below, he also displayed a considerable flair for diocesan administration.[68] Late in life, Bishop Bilson of Winchester discovered in himself strong political ambition, as a result, perhaps, of his role in the Essex divorce suit. In 1615 he made an unsuccessful bid for the vacant position of Lord Privy Seal, and had to be satisfied with a place on the Privy Council. A satirical bill appeared at the New Exchange in London, offering a reward for information on the whereabouts of the bishop, who had 'privilie run out of his dioces'.[69] John Williams alone approximates to Trevor-Roper's archetype. As Lord Keeper (1621-5) Williams never visited his diocese of Lincoln.[70] Only when he fell

from grace in 1625 and arrived in Lincoln to lick his wounds did he become involved in diocesan affairs, as Wolsey had done a century earlier at York.[71] For both, pastoral care played second fiddle to political ambition. Moreover, as Dr Thomas has shown, even after 1625 Williams struggled to return to the centre of national life.[72] Williams's absence from his diocese was in stark contrast to other prelates resident in London, who attempted to combine the roles of court politicans and diocesan governors by establishing channels of communication with their dioceses, which they renewed and strengthened each year when they returned to visit their sees.

* * * * *

The court prelates of James I were conscious of the pastoral responsibilities of their office and performed several episcopal functions during their residence in London. Most personally exercised their authority to grant institutions to livings,[73] a duty conferring privileges as well as liabilities,[74] a fact which is noteworthy because a number of bishops resident at their sees, such as Bridges of Oxford or Smith of Gloucester, frequently left this to their chancellor.[75] Several court prelates, such as Andrewes, Morton and Laud, also held regular services of ordination in various churches and private chapels throughout the capital.[76] The exercise of control over their diocesan administrations was a less straightforward matter. Dr Foster has argued persuasively that Richard Neile recruited a loyal team of civil lawyers, who followed him as he was translated from see to see.[77] Yet this solution was by no means foolproof. While Neile was exacting full subscription from clergy who travelled to London to be instituted at his hands, his diocesan officials in Lincoln were allowing dozens of ministers to escape with a limited form of subscription.[78] Lancelot Andrewes relied on a more clerical clientage. After his translation from Chichester to Ely in 1609, Andrewes

enticed two domestic chaplains, Jerome Beale and Thomas Emerson, to follow him there with an offer of rich episcopal livings in the diocese.[79] He also recruited reliable servants from elsewhere. Five months after moving to Ely, Andrewes granted the episcopal living of Leverington to George Bayley, BD. Bayley served occasionally as a surrogate in the consistory at Cambridge and furthered Andrewes's interests in the Isle of Ely in the protracted disputes over proposals to drain the fens. As Andrewes's translation to Winchester became imminent in the late summer of 1618, Bayley wrote to William Greene, the Bishop's secretary, to request that he might accompany Andrewes to Winchester diocese, while modestly disclaiming that he had performed any useful service at Ely.[80] Yet another loyal servant to Andrewes was Daniel Wigmore, a local cleric, whom Andrewes created Archdeacon of Ely in 1617.[81]

Through such contacts, Andrewes maintained some control over the direction of diocesan affairs, as is evident from the campaign waged by his consistory in Ely diocese against non-resident ministers. Absenteeism was an endemic problem in Ely, where an unusually large number of poor impropriated livings surrounded a university town at which many incumbents were still studying for higher degrees.[82] Shortly after Andrewes's translation to Ely, his consistory began systematically to investigate all cases of non-residence. Between 1610 and 1617 the court deprived at least four and probably seven ministers for non-residence,[83] pressurised another into resigning his living,[84] sequestered the fruits of the livings of a further three[85] and scrupulously examined the licences dispensing other clergy from residing at their cures.[86] This represented a major change from the more relaxed attitude of his predecessor, Martin Heton, who had used the weapons of sequestration and deprivation more sparingly.[87]

Astute patronage of officials and clergy was a valuable device for the court bishop to retain some control over his see, but there was nothing as effective as a personal visit to the diocese. This was recognised by Jacobean

court prelates, most of whom returned to their dioceses annually during the summer months.[88] The example of James Mountagu in Bath & Wells demonstrates clearly the practical limitations upon what a court bishop, however vigilant, might achieve in his diocese.

As Bishop of Bath & Wells between 1608 and 1616, Mountagu spent the months of July to September each year in his diocese. During this brief period, he would become engrossed in diocesan affairs. He rode at the head of his primary visitation in 1609 and was appointed principal commissary for Abbot's metropolitical visitation of the see in 1613. Mountagu launched the visitation at Wells Cathedral on 30th August and preached the customary sermon to the clergy of the local deanery.[89] Each September, on the Sunday following Ember week, the Bishop held an ordination service in the Cathedral.[90] Sitting occasionally in his consistory, but more often in his palace at Wells, Mountagu also heard such disciplinary cases as arose during the summer law vacation. A number concerned influential gentry such as Sir Bartholomew Mitchell, who admitted to the Bishop that he had fathered a child born to one of his maidservants six months previously. Mountagu imposed a sentence of public penance on Mitchell, but allowed him to commute it to a heavy fine of £40 to be spent on pious uses.[91] The Bishop also dealt with more routine matters, such as clandestine marriages and negligent clergy,[92] and he deprived two ministers of their benefices, one for scandalous conduct, the other for non-residence.[93] In addition, Mountagu brought into the diocese a number of notable clergy who became long-serving ministers, among whom Richard Bernard was perhaps the most distinguished.[94] The detection of catholic recusants was a particular priority for the Bishop. To be sure, this was a recurrent preoccupation of the episcopate throughout James I's reign and was the subject of archiepiscopal directives in 1605, 1610 and 1611.[95] Yet Mountagu's interest in the subject manifested itself on occasions quite separate from these. Upon his arrival in Wells in 1608, he sent a list of

notorious recusants to Archbishop Bancroft, requesting that they be arrested, presumably through the authority of the Ecclesiastical Commission. Six years later, when writing to the Dean and Chapter on other business, he returned to this issue with passionate concern:[96]

> You had presented some under your government others under mine that seldom or never com to the comunion. I need not heere name them: looke to your presentments and you may see who they be. Such as belonge to me I will either reforme or put them over to my Lord of Canterbury and I doubt not that you will doe the like for yours. For it is a notable shame to our Church of Wells that our officers and servants wifes should be accounted papists and therfore I pray you lett us sett roundly uppon it to helpe it.

However, this genuine concern for the welfare of his diocese was circumscribed by Mountagu's prolonged absence. Certainly, his consistory functioned smoothly under the experienced hand of his chancellor, Francis James, but there is little evidence that any campaigns were launched through it. Moreover, Mountagu's avowed intention to foster an effective preaching ministry in his diocese[97] was partly frustrated by his ignorance of his clergy, for his distribution of preaching licences seems rather indiscriminate. Recipients included Meredith Mady and William Buckland, both of whom were later deprived for scandalous conduct.[98] His successor Lake was not impressed with the learning of many other ministers licensed to preach by Mountagu, eight of whom he required to return theological exercises to him at visitation time.[99]

Lancelot Andrewes was another court prelate who resided in his diocese for two months each summer. In contrast to Mountagu, Andrewes had no desire to immerse himself in diocesan administration. In twenty-one years as Bishop of three sees, Andrewes never sat in a formal session of his consistory and attended only one visitation, that of Chichester in 1609.[100] Instead he practised the arts of hospitality and liberality, as befitted his position at the very apex of local society. Isaac Casaubon accepted Andrewes's invitation to

spend the summer of 1611 with him in Ely diocese and recorded their itinerary in his diary. Andrewes visited each of the principal centres of the diocese in turn. After a short stay in Cambridge he moved on to Ely. There on August 5th, Andrewes preached in his Cathedral in the service commemorating the failure of the Gowrie conspiracy. On his arrival in Wisbech, the Bishop was met by the mayor, ten burgesses and one hundred and fifty horsemen. Shortly afterwards he attended the assizes in the town and later that month entertained the gentry of the Isle to a feast at Downham.[101] This attention to the common rounds of civility was of especial importance in the Isle, where the bishops of Ely continued to enjoy temporal as well as spiritual jurisdiction.[102]

The contact that Andrewes and Mountagu maintained with their diocese was followed by other court bishops. Bishop Carey, for one, visited Exeter diocese each summer; and prelates such as Overall and Montaigne, whose movements are more elusive, were certainly at their sees to attend their triennial visitations.[103]

* * * * *

In the reformed Church of England, the model of the apostolic bishop supervising his flock in person might appear compromised by the continuing existence of prelates as spiritual counsellors to the King as well as diocesan governors. Yet contemporary practice lessened the latent tension between these two roles. The episcopate as a group provided advice as lords spiritual only during Parliamentary sittings. At all other times the majority resided in their dioceses, and those bishops who remained at court fulfilled a number of specific duties. Their role around the sovereign exactly mirrored the exemplar of the bishop as ecclesiastical statesman that Richard Hooker had proposed in the 1590s.[104] As Hooker himself recommended,[105] many court prelates

developed close ties with their dioceses through careful patronage and returned regularly to their sees to take personal charge of their administrations.

Footnotes to Chapter Two

1. PRO, SP 14/88/136, 24 October 1616.

2. Trevor-Roper, 'King James and his Bishops', pp.571-81.

3. Trevor-Roper, op.cit.; Rogan, 'King James's Bishops', pp.93-9; Kennedy, 'The Jacobean Episcopate', pp.175-81; Collinson, The Religion of Protestants, pp.39-91.

4. Trevor-Roper, op.cit.

5. For example, bishoprics were won for Thomas Morton (Coventry & Lichfield) by Lancelot Andrewes, and for George Carleton (Llandaff) by Prince Charles. Barwick, The Fight, Victory and Triumph of S.Paul, p.84; PRO, SP 14/94/29,38. The selection of Jacobean bishops is discussed below, pp.302-9.

6. Henry Isaacson, The Life and Death of Lancelot Andrewes, D.D., ed. S. Isaacson (1829), p.32; Bodl., Carte MS 74 fo.361. I am grateful to Paul Seaward for alerting me to the Mountagu correspondence in this collection. I have retained the spelling of Mountagu's surname that he himself used.

7. For unsuccessful suits for bishoprics see, for example, BL, Cotton MS Julius C.III fo.156, Thomas Dove to Robert Cotton, 13 April 1608 and fo.371, William Tooker to the same, 29 December 1609.

8. Lake, Sermons, sig. ¶3ir; PRO, SP 15/39/44.

9. HMC, 9 Hatfield House, xv. pp.306-7; HRO, A/1/29 fos.11v,15r,19r.

10. Godfrey Goodman, The Court of King James the First, to which are added, Letters, ed. J.S. Brewer (2 vols., 1839), i. p.14; HMC, 9 Hatfield House, xvi. pp.366-7; PRO, SP 14/31/59; Bodl., MS Top Oxon b.48 fos.11-4; John Chamberlain, Letters, ed. N.E. McClure (2 vols., Philadelphia, 1939), ii. p.12.

11. SRO, D/D/Vc 78, 80, 82; and see below pp.58,116-8,151-2.

12. Collinson, The Religion of Protestants, pp.45-9; see below pp.238-41.

13. PRO, SP 14/77/9, 88/136, 94/38; WSRO, Ep.I/17/19-22, I/18/34-5, analysed below pp.110,119-23,160-2 and appendix XIV.

14. A.O. Whiteman, 'The Episcopate of Dr Seth Ward, Bishop of Exeter (1662-7) and Salisbury (1667-1688/9), with special reference to the Ecclesiastical Problems of his Time' (Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1951), p.38.

15. Namely Still and Lake of Bath & Wells (SRO, D/D/Ca 101,112,134,138 fos.65r,189r,212r,233v, D/D/B Reg.19); Harsnett and Carleton of Chichester (WSRO, Ep.I/17/13,15,17,19-22); Heton of Ely (BL, Harl.MS 7044 fos.113r-122v); Cotton of Exeter (Cassidy, 'The Episcopate of William Cotton, Bishop of Exeter 1598-1621', pp.1-42); Goldsborough, Ravis, Parry and Smith of Gloucester (GDR, 27A pp.239-465, 142A pp.7-10, 98 fos.142r-269v, 103); Chaderton of Lincoln (LAO, Register XXX, passim); Bennett and Godwin of Hereford (HDR, composite Register of Bennett & Godwin, i. pp.27,40-1,49,96,99,140,199); Jegon and Harsnett of Norwich (Anthony Harison, Registrum Vagum, ed. T.F. Barton, Norfolk Record Society, xxxii-iii. 1963-4; NNRO, Reg/15/21 fos.1v-13r, PRE/16, NCB/15 fos.358r,380v,382r,392r,420r); Bridges and Howson of Oxford (OCRO, MS.Oxf.Dioc.Papers c.264 fos.9r-109r); Dove of Peterborough (Allen, 'The State of the Church in the diocese of Peterborough', passim); Cotton, Abbot and Davenant of Salisbury (WRO, Reg.Cotton fos.21v-34v; Reg.Abbot fos.1r-4r; Reg.Davenant fos.14v-20r); Bilson of Winchester, between 1603 and 1615 (see his itinerary in appendix I, below pp.336-8); and Babington, Parry and Thornborough of Worcester (HWRO, b.716.093-BA.2648/10(i) pp.151-233). For obvious reasons, Canterbury and London are omitted. Thompson of Gloucester (1611-2) resided at his deanery in Windsor, Thornborough of Bristol at his deanery of York in 1606-9 (GDR, 27A p.353; The Chapter Acts of the Dean and Canons of Windsor,

1430,1523-1672, ed. S. Bond (Windsor, 1966), pp.75-6; HMC, 9 Hatfield House, xviii. p.138, xix. p.145; PRO, SP 14/47/6). I have unearthed nothing about the itineraries of Overton of Coventry & Lichfield and Felton, Searchfield and Wright of Bristol, except the negative evidence that they did not reside in London.

16. Heal, Of Prelates and Princes, pp.112-4,134-5; GDR, 27A pp.300,321; PRO, SP 14/45/18,77, 54/39.

17. Heal, Of Prelates and Princes, pp.83-4.

18. PRO, SP 14/129/1.

19. Barlow of Rochester also resided in his prebendal house at Westminster, while after 1617 Buckeridge lived in Durham House. See appendix II for Barlow's itinerary; Peter Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus: or, The History of the Life and Death of the most reverend and renowned Prelate William...Lord Archbishop of Canterbury (1668), pp.74-5.

20. Namely Mountagu and Andrewes. PRO, SP 14/93/13; Bodl., Carte MS 74 fo.324; Borth., Precedent Book ii, pp.374-7,392,398,403. I am grateful to Andrew Foster for drawing my attention to Greene's formulary.

21. PRO, LC 13/168 p.91; Laud, Works, iii. p.134; see, for example, William Westerman, Iacobs Well: or a Sermon preached before the Kings most excellent Maiestie at Saint Albans in his summer progresse 1612 (1613), sig. 4iv; Nathaniel Field, Some Short Memorials concerning the Life of that reverend divine Doctor Richard Field, ed. J. Le Neve (1717), pp.74-5. I owe the first reference to Neil Cuddy.

22. The Old Cheque-Book or Book of Remembrance of the Chapel Royal 1561-1744, ed. R.F. Rimbault (Camden Society, 2nd series, iii. 1872), pp.39,107,161-73.

23. Namely Anthony Watson (1596-1605), Lancelot Andrewes (1605-1619) and George Montaigne (1619-1628).

24. Namely Bancroft (1605-10), Abbot (1611-25), Bilson (1615-6), Andrewes (1616-25), Mountagu (1617-8) and Williams (1621-5). An analysis of The Acts of the Privy of England (8 vols., for 1601-25) ed. J.R. Dasant (1908-33) reveals that Abbot, Bilson, Andrewes (for 1616-22) and Williams attended regularly, Mountagu intermittently. The registers are lost for Bancroft's time on the Council. In May 1619 it was rumoured that Bishop King of London would soon join their number: Chamberlain, Letters, ii. p.234.

25. William Barlow, One of the Foure Sermons preached before the Kings Maiestie at Hampton Court in September last. This concerning the Antiquitie and Superioritie of Bishops. Sept.21.1606 (1606), sig.A2r. See appendix II for his itinerary.

26. Barwick, The Fight, Victory and Triumph of S.Paul, p.71; LJRO, B/A/I/16.

27. See appendices V (for Overall) and VII (for Felton) below, pp

28. DRO, Exeter Diocesan Records, Chanter Catalogue 21, fos.116r-23r; The Eagle xvii. (Cambridge, 1893), pp.4-15,142-56,345-50. I owe this last reference to Nicholas Tyacke.

29. The Eagle, xvii. pp.12-3.

30. Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus, pp.85-128; Laud, Works, v. II. p.307.

31. In the late 1590s, for example, the court bishops comprised the Archbishop of Canterbury, the bishops of Chichester and London, and Bilson as Bishop of Worcester. BL, Add.MS 39406B passim; HWRO, b.716.093-BA 2648/10(i) pp.144-9.

32. D.H. Willson, James VI & I (1956), pp.197-8 and the sources cited there.

33. A. Clark, 'Dr Plume's Notebook' Essex Review xv. (Colchester, 1906), p.20; Chamberlain, Letters, i. p.295.

34. The Old Cheque-Book, passim.

35. D.H. Willson, 'James I and his Literary Assistants' Huntington Library Quarterly viii. (1944-5), pp.35-57.

36. PRO, SP 14/37/25; and see below pp.251,272 fn.123.

37. Willson, 'Literary Assistants', pp.41-2; PRO, LS 13/168 p.109.

38. The Progresses, Processions and Magnificent Festivities of King James the First, ed. J. Nichols (4 vols., 1828), ii. p.98. For Mountagu's caustic remarks on this meeting, see Bodl., Carte MS 74 fo.379, James to Sidney Mountagu, 26 September 1606.

39. Bodl., Carte MS 74 fo.361, James to Sidney Mountagu, 6 June 1606; HMC, 9 Hatfield House, xx. pp.86-7.

40. Bodl., Carte MS 74 fo.326.

41. S.T.C. 14344.

42. BL, Burn.MS 365 fos.227,229v,231v,233r,235r. In his absence, Richard Neile acted as Mountagu's surrogate; ibid., fos.250-2.

43. Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus, p.125.

44. Ibid., p.97.

45. I Jas.1 c.3; Hill, Economic Problems of the Church, pp.32-5.

46. Heal, 'Archbishop Laud revisited', p.143. PRO, SO 3/4 (unfoliated: May 1608); PRO, SP 14/110/71, 145/11, 148/79,117; HMC, 4th Report, p.285. A third example occurred in 1606, when Bishop James of Durham was obliged to lease Durham House to the Duke of Lennox. See PRO, SP 14/21/18, Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain, 20 August 1606.

47. See above pp.36-7; Isaacson, Life and Death of Lancelot Andrewes, pp.38,54-6.

48. John Gauden, Ecclesiae Anglicanae Suspiria: the tears, sighs, complaints and prayers of the Church of England (1659), p.604.

49. Tyacke, 'Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter-Revolution', pp.126-

7,130.

50. Laud, Works, iii. pp.133-5; Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus, pp.54,60-1,66-7. This factionalism is fully documented in K. Fincham & P. Lake, 'The Ecclesiastical Policy of James I', Journal of British Studies (forthcoming, 1985).

51. See below pp.227-56,293-4,301-2.

52. See P. Tyler's introduction to Usher, High Commission (Oxford, 1968).

53. Proceedings in Parliament 1610, ed. E.R. Foster (2 vols., 1966), ii. p.263; Lords' Journals, ii. p.650. Local ecclesiastical commissions existed in at least four dioceses for the period 1603-10 (Exeter, Gloucester, Salisbury and Winchester), but there is no evidence that they sat after 1610. See Tyler's 'Additional Bibliography' in Usher, High Commission; GDR, 101; M.J. Ingram, 'Ecclesiastical Justice in Wiltshire 1600-1640, with special reference to Causes concerning Sex and Marriage' (Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1976), p.22 fn.5.

54. John Hacket, Scrinia Reserata: A Memorial offer'd to the great deservings of John Williams (1693), i. p.97; Paule, Life of Whitgift, pp.59-60. David Lloyd suggested that the reason why Abbot was 'so harsh to ministers...brought before him' was because he had never held a parochial cure and therefore knew nothing of the 'careless molestations' and accusations that many clergy faced as a result of tithe disputes with their parishioners. State-Worthies or the States-men and Favourites of England since the Reformation (1670), p.747.

55. See appendix VIII.

56. SRO, D/D/Ca 177 fos.11r-13v, 171 fos.266r-7r,292v,342v,408, 174 fo.134r.

57. PRO, Stac/8/209/26; PRO, SP 14/92/38. Mady claimed in his defence that he had not been formally suspended, and he submitted petitions to Parliaments in 1624, 1626, 1628 and 1641 to have the judgement reversed. HLRO, Main Papers., 2 & 9 May 1626, 27 March 1628 & 30

April 1641. I owe these latter references to Jamie Hart.

58. PRO, DEL 8/70 fos.1r-24v.

59. G.I.O. Duncan, The High Court of Delegates (Cambridge, 1971), pp.183-5.

60. WSRO, Ep.I/75/1; PRO, DEL 4/5 fos.73r,79r,87r,167r,223r,228, C 66/1956/13.

61. DNB, xxxviii. p.251; Borth., Precedent Book ii, p.389; William Camden, 'The Annals of James I' in A Complete History of England, ii. (1706), p.648.

62. PRO, DEL 4/8 fos.28r-195r, 4/9 fo.139r; Bodl., North MS a.12 fo.276, b.12 fos.198-9,202-16r, b.19 fos.154-5; Clark, 'Dr Plume's Notebook', p.20.

63. Andrewes, Works, v. p.300; Lloyd, State-Worthies, p.1024.

64. Bodl., Carte MS 74 fos.324,337,377,379; HMC, 45 Buccleuch, i. pp.240-5,252.

65. Welsby, Lancelot Andrewes, pp.202-8; Andrewes, Works, ii. pp.289-2,289, iv. pp.120,127,261,272, v. pp.186-9.

66. PRO, SP 14/37/25; State Trials, ii. ed. T.B. Howell (1816), p.807; Chamberlain, Letters, i. p.469; Gauden, Ecclesiae Anglicanae Suspiria, p.604; Thomas Ball, The Life of the Renowned Doctor Preston, ed. E.W. Harcourt (Oxford, 1885), pp.42-58; A. Clark, 'Dr Plume's Pocket-Book', Essex Review, xiv. (Colchester, 1905), pp.219-20.

67. Welsby, George Abbot, the Unwanted Archbishop, pp.57-73,84-5,107-

110. Professor Collinson concludes from a study of the Crown's relations with the Elizabethan episcopate that the bishops were not 'an utterly helpless set of men' and had available a number of ways of making their views known: Collinson, The Religion of Protestants, pp.27-38.

68. A Survey of the Booke of Common Prayer (1610), sig.*2v; Court and Times of James the First, ed. T. Birch (2 vols., 1848), ii. p.228; see above p.39 and below p.255.

69. Progresses of King James, iii. p.99 fn.5; Chamberlain, Letters, i. pp.603-4. For Bilson's itinerary 1603-16, see appendix I.

70. Hacket, Scrinia Reserata, i. p.86. Williams's visitation articles for 1622 are identical to those of his predecessor Montaigne for 1618, except for the addition of one question (no.31). George Montaigne, Lincoln (1618), John Williams, Lincoln (1622) sig.B3v.

71. Hacket, op.cit., ii. passim; George Cavendish, The Life and Death of Cardinal Wolsey, ed. R.S. Sylvester (Early English Text Society, ccxliii. 1959), pp.138-50.

72. G.W. Thomas, 'Archbishop John Williams: Politics and Prerogative Law 1621-1642' (Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1974), pp.5,206,222.

73. As did Bishops Watson, Andrewes, Neile and Overall : WSRO, Ep.I/1/8 fos.1-50v; Borth., R IV Be 2; LJRO, B/A/4/17.

74. R. O'Day, The English Clergy: the Emergence and Consolidation of a Profession (Leicester, 1979), pp.75-85.

75. OCRO, MS.Oxf.Dioc.Papers c.264 fos.53r-78r; GDR, 27A pp.354-465.

76. CUL, MS Mm 1.39 pp.146-7; LJRO, B/A/4/18, passim; Laud, Works, iii. pp.141-3,149,157.

77. Foster, 'Archbishop Richard Neile', pp.60-3.

78. Borth., R IV Be 2 fos.22-67v; LAO, Sub.I fos.118r-32v.

79. WSRO, Ep.I/1/8 fos.40,42v,44v; CUL, MS Mm 1.39 pp.133-6; EDC 2/4/1 fo.310r; BL, Add.MS 39533 fo.39r; Borth., Precedent Book ii. pp.293-4.

80. CUL, MS Mm 1.39 p.128; EDR, B/2/34 fos.57r,126v, A/8/19. I owe this last reference to Clive Holmes.

81. CUL, MS Mm 1.39 p.136; EDR, A/8/20,33.

82. M. Spufford, Contrasting Communities: English Villagers in the

Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries (Cambridge, 1974), p.251.

83. EDR, D/2/30 fos.3r,67-8,99v, D/2/31 fos.53r,121v-2r, D/2/33 fos.198,222r, D/2/36 fos.69-70r, G/2/21 fos.52r,193r; CUL, MS Mm 1.39 p.130.

84. EDR, D/2/30 fos.78,100r, D/2/33 fos.137v-8r,150v, D/2/36 fo.75.

85. EDR, G/2/20 fos.263r,275r,283.

86. EDR, D/2/30 fo.97, B/2/32 fo.30v, B/2/36 fos.177r-9v.

87. EDR, D/2/27 fo.30, G/1/9 fo.61r, G/2/20 fos.119,146r.

88. Only Lord Keeper Williams and Archbishops Bancroft and Abbot did not visit their dioceses regularly.

89. SRO, D/D/Vc 21, D/D/Ca 174 fo.305r; LPL, Reg.Abbot i. fo.236v.

90. SRO, D/D/Vc 79, passim. See below p.353.

91. SRO, D/D/Ca 185 fo.235. For a similar case see ibid., fos.229,233r.

92. SRO, D/D/Ca 163 fo.139, 172 fos.150-5v, 184 fos.167r,171v.

93. Thomas Jones and Simon Sturtevant. SRO, D/D/Ca 146 fos.256v-7, 149, 155, 158 fo.324r, 174 fos.36r,144r,309v; Proceedings in Parliament 1610, i. pp.134-5.

94. DNB, iv. pp.386-7; Richard Bernard, A Key to Knowledge for the opening of the Secret Mysteries of St Iohns Mysticall Revelation (1617), sig.A2; SRO, D/D/Vc 79 fo.6r. I have found little evidence to support Usher's assessment of Mountagu as a man of 'small ability'. Usher, Reconstruction, ii. p.48.

95. Concilia, iv. pp.410-2,440-1; LAO, Add.Reg.I fos.225r-6r.

96. LPL, Fairhurst MS 2004 fo.90, 28 August 1608; SRO, D/D/0 ii. (unfoliated: 12 February 1614).

97. PRO, SP 14/35/482, Mountagu to Robert Cecil, 15 August 1608.

98. PRO, SP 14/92/38; SRO, D/D/Ca 201 fos.113r,180r, 204, 209 fo.38v, D/D/B Reg.19 fo.8v, D/D/Vc 76 fos.13r,28v.

99. Namely Edward Ballett, Thomas Close, Richard Coggan, John England,

Thomas Hall, Thomas Smart, John Stansall and George Woolton. SRO, D/D/Vc 78-80,82.

100. WSRO, Ep.II/11/2 fos.21r,23r.

101. Isaac Casaubon, Ephemerides, ed. J. Russell (2 vols., Oxford, 1850), ii. pp.854-77.

102. Victoria County History of Cambridge and Ely, iv. ed. P.G. Pugh (Oxford, 1953), pp.1-27.

103. The Eagle, xvii. pp.4-15,142-56,345-50; LJRO, B/V/I/28, B/A/4/17 (5-17. Sept. 1617); LAO, Add.Reg.3 fo.82v; see also appendices V and VI.

104. Richard Hooker, Works, ed. J. Keble (3 vols., Oxford, 1836), iii. I. pp.335-6.

105. Ibid., pp.379-92.

Chapter Three: The Spiritual Jurisdiction of the Episcopate.

(i) The Visitation

> Be to the flocke of Christ a sheepherd, not a wolfe: feed them, devour them not: hold up the weake, heale the sicke, bind together the broken, bringe againe the outcasts, seeke the lost. Be so mercifull, that you be not too remisse: so minister discipline that you forget not mercie...

Each bishop listened to the balanced cadences of this charge as the archbishop handed him a Bible in the concluding moments of his consecration to the office of episcopacy.[1] The first and principal opportunity for a bishop to realise these ideals in a tangible form was on visitation, which he was canonically obliged to conduct within a year of his consecration to a see, and thereafter to repeat triennially. This chapter explores the form and content of Jacobean episcopal visitations. Since the episcopate placed a high premium on leading their visitations in person, the judicial processes of detection and correction of malefactors were accompanied by a measure of pastoral leadership and supervision. Although visitation records scarely ever allude to this important pastoral dimension, there is sufficient evidence to identify its salient features. It will be argued, therefore, that the significance of the visitation lies, in equal measure, in this dual function. The efficacy of the visitation in reforming discipline and morals is studied in an investigation of the capitular visitation, with particular reference to the well-documented case of Chichester. The chapter ends with a consideration of the role of diocesan synods in this period.

* * * * *

In the early seventeenth century the utility and purpose of the episcopal

visitation were questioned periodically. In the course of compiling presentments against their minister or fellow parishioners, churchwardens sometimes wearily observed that they had returned identical faults at previous visitations, with little or no effect.[2] Others claimed that the visitation was primarily a cynical exercise in raising money through the examination of licences and dispensations and the collection of procurations.[3] Although the charge was not novel[4] it was frequently aired and received its most literary expression from the pen of Anthony Harison, domestic chaplain and secretary to Bishop Jegon of Norwich and something of a poetaster:[5]

> Ffirst sending interdictions of meaner iurisdictions,
> then sending inhibitions and granting inquisitions
> by general comissions,
> of churches dilapidations for want of reparations
> threatning of sequestrations, degradations,deprivations,
> or of later invention, menacing suspentions,
> awarding of citations for lude mens fornications
> and such abominations,
> after excommunications granting absolutions for sinfull polutions,
> granting dispensations and penance comutations.
> after some vacaution yeilding relaxation
> of former interdictions to every jurisdiction.
> So reformation pretended,
> but money intended,
> nothing is amended,
> but God is offended,
> and so ye play is ended.

This ditty was given added pungency by the fact that the bishops of Norwich, in contrast to their colleagues, could only visit their dioceses septenially and consequently charged relatively high fees for the examination of licences and orders.[6] Nor was the accusation entirely without foundation. Procurations were certainly a valuable source of income to many bishops, especially at their primary visitation as they struggled to pay their first-fruits to the Crown.[7] Moreover, rapacious officials might exploit the occasion in the pursuit of profit. In April 1619 John Cosin, secretary to Bishop Overall of Norwich, wrote to his opposite number at Coventry & Lichfield, Richard Baddeley, advising him how to squeeze the maximum financial advantage from the scrutiny of certificates, licences and dispensations during the visitation. Baddeley should

sit with the registrar demanding sixpence from every cleric, whether or not licensed to preach, and keep the fee even if the registrar objected. For unlicensed preachers, 'a good profit may arise in admonishing them', Cosin confided.[8] Yet the regular appearance of bishops on visitation indicates that these financial perquisites were of secondary importance, for they might as easily be collected by the chancellor or surrogates. For the majority of the Jacobean episcopate the visitation was too important a function to be delegated to subordinates. Evidence compiled from thirteen dioceses is presented in Table One overleaf and shows that between 1597 and 1627 bishops presided at forty-eight out of seventy-three visitations, an attendance rate of 66%. Specific reasons may be adduced in many cases to explain the absence of an individual bishop. In 1617 James Mountagu and Richard Neile accompanied James I to Scotland and therefore delegated the supervision of their visitations of Winchester and Lincoln dioceses.[9] Henry Parry drew up the schedule for his primary visitation of Gloucester diocese in 1607 while still Bishop-elect and the visitation began only twelve days after his consecration at Lambeth Palace, which may account for his absence. Three years later he conducted his triennial visitation in person.[10] Archbishop Bancroft was evidently too committed at court to lead his primary visitation of Canterbury diocese in 1607 and so appointed Bishop Barlow of Rochester as his commissary.[11] The punishing travel of the visitation circuit was reported by Bishop Barlow in 1611, who complained of the loss of his 'voice, strength and health' after completing half of his visitation of Lincoln diocese, a consideration which may have deterred certain ageing and valetudinarian bishops, such as Bilson of Winchester, from visiting their dioceses in person.[12]

Only Nicholas Felton and Lancelot Andrewes consistently delegated their visitations to commissaries. While little or nothing can be determined of Felton's view of his office,[13] there is more evidence of that of his patron, Lancelot Andrewes. In a sermon he preached before the southern convocation

Table One: Episcopal attendance at Visitations, 1597-1627

Note: Underlined are the dates when bishops were absent from their visitation. The list is as complete as the evidence allows.

Diocese	Bishop	Dates of Visitation
Bath & Wells[1]	James Mountagu	1609, 1613
	Arthur Lake	1617, 1620, 1623
Bristol[2]	Robert Wright	1623, 1626
Chichester[3]	Anthony Watson	1597, 1600, 1603
	Lancelot Andrewes	1606, 1609
	Samuel Harsnett	1610, 1613, 1616
	George Carleton	1619, 1622, 1625
Canterbury[4]	Richard Bancroft	1607
Coventry & Lichfield[5]	William Overton	1600
	John Overall	1614, 1617
	Thomas Morton	1620
Ely[6]	Martin Heton	1601, 1604, 1607
	Lancelot Andrewes	1610, 1613, 1616
	Nicholas Felton	1619, 1622, 1625
Gloucester[7]	John Bullingham	1597
	Godfrey Goldsborough	1599, 1602
	Thomas Ravis	1605
	Henry Parry	1607, 1610
	Miles Smith	1613, 1616, 1619, 1622
	Godfrey Goodman	1625
Lincoln[8]	William Chaderton	1604
	William Barlow	1611
	Richard Neile	1614, 1617
	George Montaigne	1618
	John Williams	1622, 1625
London[9]	Richard Bancroft	1598
	Richard Vaughan	1605
	Thomas Ravis	1607
	George Abbot	1610
	John King	1612, 1615
Norwich[10]	Samuel Harsnett	1620, 1627
Rochester[11]	William Barlow	1605
Winchester[12]	Thomas Bilson	1606, 1609, 1612
	James Mountagu	1617
	Lancelot Andrewes	1622, 1625
Worcester[13]	Gervase Babington	1598, 1607
	Henry Parry	1611, 1614
	John Thornborough	1617, 1620, 1623, 1626

Footnotes:

1. SRO, D/D/Vc 21, 78, 80, 82, D/D/Ca 174 fo.305r.
2. Robert Lougher, A Sermon preached at Cern in the County of Dorset, the 18 day of September 1623 at the visitation of the right reverend father in God, the Lord Bishop of Bristoll (1624), sig.A2r-Br; BRO, EP/V/2/1. I owe the first reference to Christopher Haigh.
3. WSRO, Ep.II/11/1 fos.73r,87r-9r, II/10/1 fos.1r,11r,34v, II/11/2 fos.18v-23v,33r-65v, II/10/2 fo.38v, I/18/22 fo.28r, I/18/27,29-31, 33-5. Carleton never attended visitations of Lewes archdeaconry.
4. LPL, Reg.Bancroft fos.223v,226r, VG 4/6 fos.1r-23r. Bishop Barlow of Rochester conducted the visitation on Bancroft's behalf.
5. William Overton, Oratio Doctissima et Gravissima (Oxford, 1601); LJRO, B/V/I/28,37, B/A/4/17 (unfoliated: 5 - 22 September 1617).
6. EDR, B/2/9 fo.24r, B/2/18 fo.60r, B/2/23 fos.1r,38r, B/2/31 fos.1r,106r,137r, B/2/32 fos.103v,115r, B/2/37 fo.2r.
7. GDR, 80, 96, 102, 110, 115, 146, 157.
8. LAO, Register XXX fos.238v,310v, Add.Reg.3 fos.2v-3v,22r-3r,81v-2v; Laud, Works, v. II p.333. Montaigne only attended three of twenty sessions in 1618.
9. GL, MSS 9537/9 fos.5vff,151r,157r,170r, 9537/10 fo.120r, 9537/11 fos.1r-93r,170v; Kalu, 'Bishops and Puritans in Early Jacobean England', pp.473,478. Ravis (1607) and King (1615) each attended only one session, in London.
10. BL, Add.MS 24346 fo.6; Extracts from the two earliest Minute Books of the Dean and Chapter of Norwich Cathedral 1566-1649, ed. J.F. Williams & B. Cozens-Hardy (Norfolk Record Society, xxiv. 1953), pp.54-5; NNRO, Reg/16/22 ii. fos.24v-25r; iii. (unfoliated: Norwich Cathedral on 20 April 1627 and King's Lynn on 21 May 1627); LPL, MS 943 p.125.
11. KAO, DRb/Pwr 19 i. fo.446v.
12. HRO, B/1/A/21,24,26,28-30; PRO, Stac 8/212/31.
13. The visitation books for Worcester are lost, and this analysis relates only to visitations of the Cathedral Chapter. HWRO, 716.093- BA 2482 fos.69v,80v.

in February 1593, Andrewes thundered against ignorance and false doctrine in the Church. He urged the bishops sitting before him to use their authority to combat these problems, and advised them to sit in their consistories and attend their visitations, those 'attentiones sedes...attentiones itinera.'[14] As bishop, Andrewes did neither. He presided over a part of the visitation of Chichester diocese in 1609, but he may not have found the experience particularly congenial for he did not repeat it. In Ely diocese, for example, the visitation was a moveable feast to be held at any time between April and October, yet Andrewes allowed three successive visitations to be held between April and June, when he was absent in London.[15] Most prelates acted differently from Andrewes, for they may have recognised that the visitation offered important opportunities to be a good pastor as well as an efficient administrator.

Visitations were held every three years in most dioceses, although in Winchester they were held annually, in York quadrennially and in Norwich septennially.[16] The judicial proceedings of the visitation have been outlined many times.[17] Rectors, vicars, curates, chaplains, preachers, lay readers, sequestrators, schoolmasters and doctors were summoned by the apparitor to appear before the bishop or his commissary at a specified time and place, usually at a spacious church in their deanery. There, after a short service of morning prayer, the clergy exhibited documentation of their ordination, institution, dispensations and licences which were endorsed by the registrar,[18] while the churchwardens and inquisitors received the articles of visitation, swore the oath accompanying these articles, which required them to make a complete and accurate presentment of offences, and were also informed of the date these bills were to be returned to the consistory. Absent churchwardens were pronounced contumacious and absent clergy were suspended from the ministry.[19] Some weeks later the court went on circuit around the diocese to process the presentments arising from the visitation.[20] Many historians have

implied that there was little more to the episcopal visitation than the due observance of these administrative processes, a view which naturally arises from the perfunctory record of proceedings made by the registrar in the liber cleri.[21] Yet the visitation presented a unique opportunity for the bishop to escape from the judicial atmosphere of the consistory, which was the principal link with his flock in routine administration, and travel through his diocese, meeting the clergy in relatively informal settings. Indeed, it provided the most suitable occasion for the bishop to exercise those qualities of teaching and personal leadership that St. Paul had recommended in his pastoral epistles.[22]

One prime feature of this pastoral element in the visitation was the personal, intimate contact between the bishop and his flock. The visitation was a rare occasion for the bishop to travel the length and breadth of his diocese and to become better acquainted with his clergy and laity. Normally his itinerary was confined to journeys between his manor houses and the cathedral city, which might all be in one corner of the diocese. In Chichester diocese, the episcopal residences lay in or around the city itself in the extreme west of the diocese,[23] and then, as now, the direct route to London via Horsham also ran through the western archdeaconry. The triennial visitation enabled the bishop to see something of East Sussex, as he moved from Lewes to Hastings and from there to Rye, nearly one hundred miles east of the cathedral city. Moreover, since sessions were held for only one or two deaneries at a time, the visitation tour might span several weeks in the larger dioceses.[24] As he travelled through his diocese, the bishop and his entourage would be entertained by prominent laity and clergy, as can be illustrated by Bishop Henry Parry's itinerary on his visitation of Gloucester diocese in 1610. Parry divided his visitation into three stages. In early August he rode south from Gloucester for fifteen miles to join his chancellor and registrar at Wotton Under Edge, lodging that night with Sir Thomas Escourt in Shipton-

Moyne. The following day Parry began the visitation of Hawkesbury deanery at Old Sodbury church, staying overnight with a local gentleman, Richard Cotherington of Dodington. Three weeks later the Bishop visited the eastern part of his diocese. He stayed first at Long Marston parsonage with Samuel Burton, archdeacon of Gloucester, and after three successive sessions rested for a day with Thomas Whiltington, rector of Great Rissington. On 31st August Parry preached the sermon ad clerum at Cirencester deanery and then rode three miles west to Sapperton to be entertained by Sir Henry Poole, a former sheriff and knight of the shire. Parry returned to Gloucester the next day. He completed the visitation circuit a few days later by touring the west of the diocese, staying with Nathaniel Dod, rector of Newent.[25] His predecessor Thomas Ravis had followed a similar itinerary on his primary visitation in 1605. On 31st August Ravis had preached to the clergy of Cirencester and Fairford and later dined with William Masters, rector of Coates. There was no visitation session the next day, a Sunday, but Ravis preached again - presumably in Coates parish church - before riding north to stay with John Carter at his manor house at Aston-Blank. It must have been on these occasions that Ravis and Parry each established bonds of friendship and respect in the county, which expressed 'great grief' at their translations to other sees.[26]

At each visitation session, hospitality and goodwill were also sustained by the practice in many dioceses of adjourning for dinner midway through proceedings.[27] This might be held in an inn or at the parsonage attached to the church. On a visitation to rural Cambridgeshire in September 1607, Martin Heton of Ely was feasted in the houses of local ministers, accompanied by his chancellor, 'suis familiaribus' and many local clergy, and in return for providing this hospitality the hosts were excused the payment of procurations to the Bishop.[28] Theological debates probably dominated the discussion at these meals, to judge from the table-talk at Richard Neile's primary visitation

of Lincoln diocese in 1614.[29] The relative informality of conversation and debate between the bishop and his clergy may well have fostered a sense of collegiality and common purpose.

The sermon preached ad clerum might also have engendered a heightened sense of ministerial vocation, and therefore had a wider significance than merely forcing the clergy to listen to a sermon by someone other than themselves, as one historian drily suggested.[30] The points raised in the visitation sermon may have been the subject for debate at the visitation dinner,[31] although in Norwich diocese, once the sermon was concluded, the bishop led a discussion of its content with his clergy, a custom not dissimilar to the disputations of the prophesying movement.[32]

Visitation sermons tended to be exhortatory or expositional in theme. Preaching before Bishop William Cotton at Barnstaple in September 1616, Richard Carpenter recited a muster-roll of sins and failings which flourished in Exeter diocese, as a result, he claimed, of clerical ignorance and the indolence of churchwardens who drew up partial and incomplete presentments. Turning to the Bishop, Carpenter publicly urged him to 'strike at the very roote of those enormities' by vigorous enforcement of the canons of the Church. More irenic in tone was the sermon that Samuel Crooke delivered at a visitation in Bath & Wells in July 1612, which dwelt on ministerial duties. Occasionally the pulpit would be used for an unadorned theological disquisition. On Bishop Howson's instructions, his chaplain preached a visitation sermon in Oxford diocese in September 1619 on the office of confirmation establishing its apostolic origin and defending its retention in the reformed Chuch of England.[33] Nor were bishops themselves strangers to the pulpit. Lists of visitation preachers disclose that the bishop, if present, had usually placed himself on the roster. Thus Heton of Ely preached at each of his three visitations, while Barlow of Lincoln preached twice on visitation in 1611. One exception was Miles Smith of Gloucester, who preferred to listen rather than

to instruct.[34] Only two of these episcopal sermons have survived, both preached by Bishop Lake on visitations at Bath between 1617 and 1623, and they afford some insight into the manner in which a bishop might reprove or encourage his clergy.[35] On one occasion, taking as his text 'By the grace of God I am what I am'[36] Lake outlined what he called 'an exact patterne of a good pastor and christian' and requested his audience to listen carefully. The Bishop centred his discussion on the ministerial function and its neglect by some clergy, and warming to his theme, delivered an encomium on the evangelical fervour of St. Paul as a model for all to heed, if they could not imitate. In his concluding remarks Lake returned to the present occasion and, having given an explanation of its purpose, urged his audience to compile accurate presentments to the visitation articles that he had circulated:

> The world hath many Saules, blasphemers, oppressors, wicked livers, but you use to present all as Pauls, you say all is well, when every man may see that much is amisse. Remember that this is a iudicium ante iudicium, a medicinall iudgement before a mortall, the iudgement of man to prevent the iudgement of God, doe not by cruell indulgence exempt any from the iust censure of the Church, to expose your selves and them to the intolerable vengeance of God. Rather let us all joyne, of Saules to make Paules, that so wee may repaire the decayes of the Church, and heare a comfortable doome when we all come before the tribunall seat of Christ.

In short, Lake's sermon deftly combined a description of the exemplar of the good pastor with an appeal for a thorough presentment of offenders against the ordinances of the Church.[37]

The condemnation of negligent and unsatisfactory ministers reiterated in these sermons was no empty rhetorical device for it served as a timely prologue to the customary examination of scandalous clergy, who might already be known to the bishop or be denounced to him by their churchwardens. Although this practice is rarely recorded in the visitation books, it took place intermittently in at least six dioceses.[38] The reformation of the clergy was one theme of Bishop Barlow's visitation of Lincoln diocese in

1611. The Bishop castigated a number of unlearned clergy who failed to study regularly, in contravention of canon 75, even neglecting to read those theological works available in English. Then he examined several wayward ministers and warned them to appear before him at his manor of Buckden at a later date.[39] Elsewhere, the inadequate learning of the clergy might come to light when they were examined to see if they merited licences to preach or to serve cures.[40] If the bishop considered the general level of clerical learning to be unsatisfactory, he might devise schemes of educational training, which drew on Elizabethan precedents and involved either the provision of monthly instruction to poorly educated ministers by senior neighbouring clergy or the return of exercises on a specified text or theological topic; these will be discussed elsewhere,[41] but they constituted an important if occasional element in the pastoral supervision of the clergy on visitation.

* * * * *

The judicial administration of discipline is a second and more familiar aspect of the visitation. Presentments were drawn up in response to articles of visitation, which were printed and distributed to the churchwardens and inquisitors of every parish. These episcopal articles were derived from the canons of 1604 and, although they appear to be less idiosyncratic than their Elizabethan precursors, their lack of uniformity was censured by canon 9 of 1640. A study of fifty extant articles of visitation[42] furnishes valuable evidence of the views and vigilance of the episcopate. Bishops who had little interest in diocesan administration often reissued the set of articles composed by their predecessors with only minor modifications, as did Watson at Chichester in 1600 or Williams at Lincoln in 1622.[43] Prelates might retain a set of articles as they were translated from one see to another, as exemplified by Lancelot Andrewes on his move from Ely to Winchester in 1619.[44] The fact

that Andrewes's articles at Chichester for 1609 were annotated in the hand of his chancellor John Drury indicates that the task of concocting and altering articles was occasionally delegated.[45] Some clear and methodical sets of articles were imitated widely. Andrewes's set for Ely in 1610 was the model for Montaigne's at Lincoln in 1618 and for Neile's at Durham in 1624.[46] The more original articles provide valuable evidence of the views and objectives of a particular bishop. Those devised by John Overall for his primary visitation of the godly diocese of Norwich contained a thorough scrutiny of nonconformist practices. Did the minister, for example, wear the surplice during divine service 'alwaies and at every time both morning and evening...and doth he never omit to wear the same?' In contrast, Andrewes of Chichester merely asked whether the surplice was worn at service time, while George Abbot of Canterbury and his brother Robert of Salisbury enquired perfunctorily if the surplice was worn as prescribed by authority.[47] Bishop Overall then went on to recommend auricular confession as a valuable preparation for Holy Communion, a question without precedent in Jacobean articles of visitation.[48] After 1624 this clause was adopted in visitation articles issued by Bishops Neile, Andrewes and Harsnett, which reflects the Arminian sympathies that they shared with Overall.[49]

New questions in visitation articles could affect the composition of churchwardens' presentments, but the less practical the enquiry, the more chance there was that it would be ignored. In 1605 Andrewes asked some unusually detailed questions on the number of children who remained unconfirmed, which did not elicit a positive response.[50] The same fate befell certain enquiries in Overall's articles. The Bishop's primary visitation was cancelled on his death in May 1619, yet when his articles were reissued by Samuel Harsnett in 1627, the clause mentioning the desirability of confession was passed over by all one thousand one hundred parishes in the diocese.[51] With some justice did William Ames cite the absurdity of asking

churchwardens if their minister expounded the scripture 'according to the interpretation of the ancient fathers or no', a direct reference to a question in Overall's visitation enquiries of 1619, repeated in those of Harsnett for 1620; and it was to prevent such 'impertinent, inconvenient and illegal enquiries' that canon 9 of 1640 ordered the use of a uniform set of articles throughout the southern province.[52] However, churchwardens and inquisitors did respond to novel questions on the possessions and furnishings of the church for which they were responsible. Bancroft's metropolitical visitation of Chichester and Bath & Wells in 1605 focussed, in part, upon checking whether every church had the correct liturgical furnishings, as specified in the canons promulgated the previous year, and over a hundred churchwardens were presented on this matter in each diocese. Likewise, in John Still's visitation of Bath & Wells in 1606, eighty-four pairs of churchwardens were found to lack the order of prayers for the service commemorating the failure of Gowrie's conspiracy, in response, it seems, to Still's enquiry.[53]

The delivery of an episcopal charge to churchwardens and inquisitors on one or more specific issues was perhaps the most effective way that a bishop could influence the content of presentments. Just as the purposes of the visitation dinner matched those of the sheriff's table at the Lancashire assizes, so the visitation charge is analogous to the judge's speech to the grand-jury.[54] Although the peroration is associated more with episcopal visitations in the eighteenth century,[55] the practice certainly existed in the Jacobean Church, even if references to it are infrequent.[56] There is no mention of an episcopal charge in the liber cleri for Samuel Harsnett's visitation of Norwich diocese in 1627, but another source records that the Bishop 'bitterly' rebuked the churchwardens of King's Lynn deanery for omitting to present scandalous ministers.[57] The episcopal charge could touch on a variety of topics. In a visitation of the peculiar of Wells city in the summer of 1624, Bishop Lake told the churchwardens and inquisitors that he had heard rumours of irregularities

by parish officials of St. Cuthbert's, including the peculation of legacies, which he ordered to be investigated.[58] While on visitation in Gloucester in 1610, Henry Parry received a circular from Archbishop Bancroft on a number of contentious issues. Two points concerned the churchwardens, who were accordingly instructed to organise a new collection for Arthuret church in Cumberland and to buy a copy of Jewel's works 'within this moneth to be had in Gloucester'.[59]

Contemporaries acknowledged that the presentment of offenders rested ultimately on the integrity of churchwardens and inquisitors who, assisted by their minister, were responsible for compiling a complete and impartial bill in answer to the articles of enquiry.[60] A number of conventional devices were available to strengthen this system of detection. Articles of visitation sometimes enquired if the churchwardens had concealed any crime since the last visitation.[61] After a bill was submitted, churchwardens might be summoned to explain any cryptic allusions that it contained,[62] or to return fuller answers. In June 1624, for example, Bishop Lake ordered the churchwardens of Wells to present the names of more recusants within the week.[63] Churchwardens might also face prosecution for failure to submit a full bill. Twenty churchwardens of Bath & Wells diocese were presented on this account in the months following Lake's visitation of 1623, and a further thirty-seven were cited in the wake of Abbot's metropolitical visitation of the diocese three years later.[64] In Norwich, bills of presentment were returned at the preliminary session to a proctor, 'and all others to be prohibited to meddle in ye examination', a precaution which may have been taken elsewhere.[65] However, only the most vigorous of diocesan administrations attempted any refinement of this system, and two isolated examples stand out from a study of seven dioceses - at Gloucester in 1605 and at Chichester a year later.[66]

Thomas Ravis was consecrated Bishop of Gloucester in March 1605 and

arrived in the diocese that August to conduct his primary visitation. He distinguished himself at once as an administrator of formidable energy. At the final assembly of the visitation, held in the Cathedral for Gloucester deanery, Ravis delivered an episcopal charge after dinner 'upon private conference' with his clergy. First, he urged them to choose only the most able men to be churchwardens and sidesmen, who would not be permitted to serve by deputies. The clergy were also encouraged to inform the Bishop of any matter with which they felt he should be acquainted 'in due regard of well doing' and such information would be treated in confidence. Ravis may have been mindful not merely of the vagaries of the machinery of detection but also of the taint of corruption attached to the diocesan administration.[67] In view of the nature of the charge, little can be learnt from the court books of its success.

An ambitious programme of administrative reform was unveiled at the primary visitation of Lancelot Andrewes at Chichester in 1606. A document entitled 'Orders to be observed' was read out and circulated among the clergy, the main thrust of which was to secure a more diligent ministry serving a better educated and more dutiful laity.[68] Ministers were asked to supply the consistory with the names of every communicant and catechumen in their parish and then, at three monthly intervals, to return the names of those parishioners who had received communion or were attending catechising classes. The registrar had merely to compare the two lists and proceed against offenders. Negligence in preaching was the target behind a further request for clergy to submit lists of sermons preached and homilies read in their churches. The principal achievement of the scheme seems to have been a rise in the volume of presentments of recusants, but the scheme lapsed at Andrewes's second visitation, in 1609.[69]

It would be misleading to deduce from this evidence that Bishops Ravis and Andrewes were particularly vigilant and imaginative visitors, for these initiatives owed something in Gloucester and almost everything in Chichester

to extraneous circumstances, which made a thorough visitation imperative. The untimely death of Bishop Goldsborough of Gloucester in May 1604 created a vacuum at the centre of diocesan government, so that for the next fifteen months, while the canons of 1604 were imposed elsewhere and nonconformist clergy were removed from their benefices, the Gloucester consistory marked time.[70] This explains in part the considerable energy that Ravis expended on his visitation in the autumn of 1605, when he examined in person lay and clerical offenders, and shortly before his departure for London to attend Parliament, deprived three recalcitrant ministers for nonconformity.[71] The 'Orders' in Chichester diocese were the culmination of a series of administrative and pastoral experiments that the diocesan authorities had undertaken, in the face of vociferous puritan criticism, in the months before the Hampton Court conference in January 1604. They seem to have been the brainchild of chancellor John Drury rather than of Lancelot Andrewes, who was absent from the visitation and knew little or nothing of the administrative procedures which underpinned the entire scheme.[72]

Although bishops were careful to preside at their visitations, they often delegated to their commissaries the task of processing the returns made by churchwardens.[73] Thomas Ravis displayed exemplary diligence when he administered discipline in the cases arising from his primary visitation of Gloucester in 1605. Personally scrutinising every facet of church order and organisation, which affected clergy and laity alike, the Bishop deferred nearly fifty cases for his further consideration at the Vineyard, the episcopal house outside the city. When Rowland Searchfield, DD, Rector of Eastleach Martin and later Bishop of Bristol, failed to answer a charge of prolonged absence from his cure, the registrar noted laconically 'my Lord to speake with Dr Serchefield.'[74] More characteristic was the practice of Bishops Lake and Heton of being available to hear particularly difficult or infamous cases.[75]

The volume and composition of presentments for four dioceses - Bath &

Wells, Chichester, Ely and Winchester - reveal that bishops initiated detection campaigns on specific issues only periodically. The absence of presentments for nonconformity, for example, such as occurred in Chichester diocese between 1605 and 1628, may imply the connivance or indolence of churchwardens as much as conformist practice.[76] Conversely, a sudden, large rise in returns across the diocese for an offence is less ambiguous, for it implies a response to an episcopal lead or directive. Routine presentments fill the visitation books for Ely and Bath & Wells throughout James I's reign. One exception occurred in Bath & Wells at Lake's final visitation of 1623, when he enforced the Directions on Preaching issued the previous year. Ministers displayed a copy of the Directions at the visitation sessions and were warned to be guided in their sermons by the book of Homilies, which churchwardens were obliged to purchase. As a result a relatively large number were presented for not having a copy of the Homilies.[77] Samuel Harsnett conducted a survey of church fabric in the archdeaconry of Chichester at his primary visitation in 1610, and over a hundred churches were found to be in disrepair.[78] A minor campaign to improve the furnishings of parochial communion tables was begun at Andrewes's primary visitation of Winchester diocese in 1619, and lasted at least until the spring of 1624.[79] The subject was of particular interest to Andrewes, who lamented the general neglect of the Eucharist in many of his sermons.[80] At other visitations, attention was directed to the perennial problems of the condition of church fabric, clerical dereliction and misconduct of the laity. Discipline in the visitation court was administered in a broadly similar fashion to the consistory, and will be considered in the next chapter.

A visitation supervised by the bishop contained, therefore, opportunities for pastoral contact with clergy and laity as well as the administration of discipline. When the conduct of the visitation was delegated to commissaries, who were usually civil lawyers, judicial functions tended to triumph over

pastoral ones. In Ely diocese between 1601 and 1607, Martin Heton led his own visitation of Cambridgeshire, preaching to the clergy and accepting their hospitality. Following sixteenth century precedents,[81] on each occasion the Bishop held these preliminary sessions at different rural churches, which allowed him to familiarise himself with the clergy and topography of the diocese. His successor Andrewes left the visitations to his chancellor William Gager, who reduced the visitation sessions to two and invariably held them in St Mary-the-Great in Cambridge. Since Gager lived in Cambridge, the chief criterion for selecting a venue became administrative convenience.[82]

* * * * *

The bishop was also the visitor of his cathedral church and the exempt jurisdiction that the dean and chapter enjoyed was suspended for the duration of the visitation. The compact size of the cathedral community, the continuity in personnel over a number of years and its immunity to the bishop's supervision outside visitation-time make capitular visitations an appropriate case-study for assessing the impact of episcopal visits upon discipline and conduct. The records of capitular visitations are cursory and uninformative for Ely and Gloucester dioceses and do not exist for Winchester and Bath & Wells.[83] However, there survives at Chichester a splendid run of visitation records for the period 1603 to 1625. An analysis of these documents suggests strongly that even a reforming bishop was confronted by a series of taxing problems, which proved to be almost intractable.

The chapter of Chichester Cathedral was a large body, consisting of dean, twenty-nine prebendaries and four wiccamical prebendaries, although a statute of 1574 limited the number of canons-residentiary to four, besides the dean.[84] Serving in the quire were four vicars choral[85] and eight lay clerks as well as a number of choristers. In the later sixteenth century there had been

some friction between the chapter and Bishops Curteys and Bickley,[86] but under the insouciant eye of their successors, Bishops Watson and Andrewes, relations were more harmonious. The capitular visitations of Lancelot Andrewes in 1606 and 1609 were unremarkable affairs, save for an attempt in 1606 to enforce the preaching rota in response to reports that sermons had not been given regularly.[87] It was only with the arrival of Samuel Harsnett at Chichester that a bishop addressed himself to the problems of lax discipline and widespread neglect of the statutes of the Cathedral church.

In three visitations between 1610 and 1619, Harsnett made determined efforts through strict adherence to the cathedral constitutions to fashion a society of learned and diligent prebendaries who led the daily celebration of divine worship with devotion and decorum, akin to Bishop Scambler's vision of a Cathedral chapter as 'the oracle of the whole dioces and a light unto the places being near it.'[88]

Bishop Robert Sherburne had founded in about 1521-3 four prebendal stalls to be held by New College men, who were to reside in St.Richard's walk in the Cathedral close for not less than ten months a year, and daily attend prayers in the Cathedral. One of the four, the Bursal prebendary, was to preach regularly in the Cathedral and to inform the bishop or dean twice yearly how often he had done so.[89] These statutes had been widely ignored since the mid-sixteenth century and by 1610 all four prebendaries resided at their benefices outside the city. Indeed, Ambrose Sacheverell, prebendary of Bursal since 1605, lived outside the diocese at Radcliffe in Buckinghamshire. At his first visitation, Harsnett threatened three of the four wiccamical prebendaries with deprivation and, in the statutes he drew up for the chapter at the conclusion of the visitation, all four were ordered to reside in the Cathedral; if, after three admonitions, they remained non-resident, the dean and chapter should proceed with their deprivation 'having the bishop's assistance thereto.'[90] Harsnett took especial exception to the absence of

Sacheverell, the Bursal prebendary, who was statutorily required not merely to preach in the Cathedral but also to act as senior member of the community of vicars choral, in return for which he received the principal of the lands given to the vicars by Bishop Sherburne, to the annual value of £4. In the mid-sixteenth century the Bursal prebendary had compounded with the vicars choral that in exchange for his absence, he would take only 13s 4d per annum. Sacheverell, however, had persuaded Lancelot Andrewes to grant him the full sum of £4 while remaining resident elsewhere, despite the protests of the vicars choral.[91] For these reasons Sacheverell found himself under attack from Harsnett in the episcopal visitation of 1616, and he responded with a mandate from the court of Audience, which inhibited the Bishop's proceedings against him. Sachaverell won his case and remained non-resident.[92] Similiarly, Harsnett investigated the absence of Jerome Beale, who in 1609 had been collated to the prebendal stall of Wightring or West Wittering, which carried with it the duty of delivering lectures in theology in the Cathedral. After being peremptorily cited to attend the visitation of 1616, Beale appeared under protest, claiming that he held the rectory of Wivelingham in Ely diocese and resided there in accordance with statute law; moreover, he had received a dispensation to be absent from the dean and chapter and he stated that others were performing his duties. Like Sacheverell, Beale responded to further episcopal pressure by appealing to a provincial court, this time the Arches.[93]

The reformation of the Cathedral community of vicars choral and lay clerks was another aim of Harsnett's visitations. The four vicars choral were paid only a modest stipend, which was reduced further by the composition with Sacheverell in 1606, so they augmented their incomes by serving cures in and around Chichester, a practice recognised in the statutes of 1574.[94] Numbering so few, they were, as a result, frequently absent from the daily services in the Cathedral. As a canon-residentiary, John Cradocke, later recalled :[95]

> one Saturdaye night the seconde of November 1622 for

> want of a vicar Mr Deane was compelled to reade divine service and that for wante of a competente number of vicars and singingmen, prayers in the Cathedrall church ar often reade as in a parochiall church.

Having examined their statutes in the course of his primary visitation, Harsnett ordered the vicars choral to reside in the Cathedral close and revived the ancient decree empowering the dean and chapter to deprive a vicar if he remained absent without leave after three admonitions.[96] At his second visitation Harsnett removed John Meade from his place as a vicar choral since he was continually absent as rector of Racton and sequestrator of St. Andrews in Chichester, which he held without dispensation. Meade immediately appealed to the court of Audience and evidently won his case, for he remained a vicar choral until 1634.[97] The problem persisted, however. During the metropolitical visitation of 1615, the absence of the vicars choral was reported and the commissaries ordered the dean and chapter to punish such negligence severely. In 1622 Bishop George Carleton's solution to the problem was to enforce the statute which cut off the supply of commons to absentee vicars.[98]

Moral discipline was also slack in the Cathedral precinct. In 1613 Harsnett investigated unspecified charges against two lay vicars, Thomas Weelkes and Thomas Leame, and ordered each to purge for his innocence. In 1616 he deprived both for drunkenness.[99] At the same time five other lay vicars were forbidden to serve as curates in the diocese, a practice they had adopted to supplement their slender emoluments, without which 'theyre wage will scarse fynde them drinke.' In view of their poverty, it is not surprising that this prohibition was ignored by at least one lay vicar.[100]

Harsnett's energy was everywhere apparent. In 1611 he ordered the canons-residentiary to comply with canon 44 by returning to their benefices once their period of residence was over.[101] At the conclusion of the visitations of 1610-1 and 1613-4 he issued sets of injunctions on Cathedral government, of which only the first survives. In addition to the matters

outlined above, its twelve clauses touched on the decorum to be observed in the quire and provided for a survey of fabric in the Cathedral close.[102] Harsnett's successor, George Carleton, displayed less vigour in his capitular visitations. Nothing has survived of his first visitation of 1619, but in 1622 he did proceed against absentee vicars choral, and in his last visitation of 1625, supervised repairs to the vicars close.[103]

Notwithstanding this row of thorough visitations, the Cathedral community remained remarkably impervious to reform. This is very evident from the answers submitted to Carleton in his visitation of 1622, which recited the same problems that had confronted Samuel Harsnett twelve years before. The vicars choral remained absent from the quire for long periods. Moreover, one spent his time as a fortune-teller, another kept a housekeeper to whom he publicly referred as 'his whore'. The statutes enjoining community life on the vicars choral were ignored, their hall and houses were dilapidated and their profits embezzled by a cabal among them. Preaching in the Cathedral was neglected by the prebendaries and the mulcts laid down by statute were not imposed.[104] Why was this so?

However diligent a bishop might be, he was empowered to visit the Cathedral only once every three years and if his vigilance were not matched by that of the dean, discipline would remain lax. The Dean of Chichester between 1601 and 1629 was William Thorne, sometime Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford, and by habit a sluggish disciplinarian, who could be goaded into action only intermittently. Initially he cherished ambitions of a move from Chichester to the episcopate, and for this purpose drew up his own testimonial letter in about 1606 and procured the signatures of fifteen prelates.[105] It was perhaps significant that in a eulogistic dedication of a volume of sermons to Thorne from his subdean, John Meredyth, he was praised for his piety, charity and zeal in 'preserving the possessions, immunities and priviledges' of the Cathedral church, but nothing was said about his judicial

government.[106] Meredyth was a protege of dubious character. Thorne had allowed him to be instituted to the subdeanery church in July 1616 after Samuel Harsnett had "reject'd" him - presumably as a candidate for institution to a living within his jurisdiction - because of his levity and preaching, which Harsnett described as 'vain, indecent and impure'. In January 1617 Harsnett inhibited him from preaching any more, but Meredyth continued to lecture in the Cathedral, relicensed by Thorne once the visitation was over.[107] It is clear from the chapter act book that Thorne was no spirited reformer. In twenty-eight years he drew up only two sets of regulations for conduct and discipline in the Cathedral close, and it may not be a coincidence that each was promulgated shortly before a visitation by Samuel Harsnett was about to begin.[108] Despite issuing occasional warnings to the vicars choral, and especially to Godfrey Blaxton and John Meade, Thorne never persisted in these moves.[109] In contrast, his successor Francis Dee acted firmly against this pair and forced both to resign their places.[110] Thorne's inept government may also be adduced from the articles returned to visitation enquiries. The subchauntler, William Lawes, was responsible for noting the absence of vicars from the quire, and he complained in 1619 that contrary to custom the dean and chapter had granted leave to vicars without consulting him first to see if they could be spared. Service in the quire suffered accordingly. Richard Buckenham, a canon-residentiary, admitted in 1622 that the decree for expelling absentee vicars was not used effectively. Harsnett himself was conscious of Thorne's lax administration, for in 1616 he enquired caustically if 'any one thing hath been amended or any person proceeded against' who had been prosecuted at his first visitation in 1610.[111] Even though the prebendal stalls were in the bishop's gift, it might take years for his protégés to become an influential group in the government of the chapter. Only by his third visitation of 1616 did Harsnett have two allies - his cousin Richard Buckenham and John Cradocke - among the four canon-residentaries who ruled the

Cathedral close with the dean.[112]

Yet the problems went deeper than the failings of one man. It was the inadequate stipends that had reduced the numbers of vicars choral from twelve in 1534 to four by the end of the century and which prompted them to serve cures in and around Chichester. With so few vicars, absenteeism was the predictable result. On an annual income of 40 marks, there was some validity in Blaxton's claim that:[113]

> the service of the quier is rather a servitude, we beinge but foure nowe, the least number of any Cathedrall in this kingdome, and the wages and maynteynance but small...

Poverty and negligence went hand in hand, and Harsnett's moves against the vicars choral tackled the symptoms rather than the cause of the problem. The Bishop's attempt to enforce the statutory duties of residence and lecturing on the Bursal and West Wittering prebendaries precipitated a clash between local and parliamentary statutes. The Bursal prebendary was allowed to hold benefices elsewhere but, once instituted to a living, he was required by statute to reside there.[114] The evidence suggests that both provincial courts of Arches and Audience frustrated Harsnett's attempt to assert local over national statute.

Hence, after three draconian visitations of the chapter, Harsnett's achievements were to prove ephemeral. He had temporarily enforced a more strict moral discipline in the close, but the solution to the thornier problem of residence had eluded him. If the Chichester visitation records suggest that Harsnett was a more effective disciplinarian and administrator than Thorne, it is worth recalling that at precisely this time the Bishop was under attack from the Fellows of Pembroke, Cambridge, who accused their Master of non-residence, embezzlement of funds and violation of the college statutes.[115] Harsnett may have been an energetic visitor, but on this occasion he showed no more respect for the foundation statutes at Pembroke than did Thorne at Chichester.

In short, the problems posed by capitular visitations in Chichester derived principally from the exempt jurisdiction which the chapter enjoyed out of visitation time. Other communities in the diocese could never remain so impervious to reform, since the biannual presentments of churchwardens ensured that the faults unearthed at the visitation would not always persist unchecked in the months following its conclusion.

* * * * *

In at least eleven dioceses the bishop and his clergy also congregated at the synod,[116] certain features of which were analogous to the visitation. These were half-yearly or annual meetings of the clergy to pay their synodals to the bishop and among the dioceses under investigation, they were held at Ely, Chichester and Norwich. Synods were convened at Whitsun in Ely diocese,[117] at Michaelmas in Chichester[118] and at Easter and Michaelmas in Norwich.[119] Synods were especially useful for the bishops of Norwich since they visited their diocese only once every seven years. At the Michaelmas session in 1622, Harsnett distributed copies of the royal Directions on Preaching to the diocesan clergy, who were reminded to certify at the next meeting that these orders were being heeded.[120] Proceedings at the synod may be described with most confidence for Chichester diocese. Synods took place in both archdeaconries each autumn. Characteristically, even when he was in the diocese, Lancelot Andrewes did not attend the synod, although his successors Samuel Harsnett and George Carleton presided fairly regularly.[121] Attendance at these synods was consistently lower by some ten percent than at visitation time which, in view of the paucity of evidence surrounding the synod's function in the rich diocesan archive, may have been a symptom as much as a cause of its peripheral importance in diocesan administration.[122]

Yet synods may have had a significance akin to the social and pastoral aspects of the episcopal visitation. Time was put aside, as at visitation, to hear a sermon.[123] This was another opportunity for a bishop to instruct or reprove his flock, as is illustrated by Archbishop Matthew's selection of the text and theme of the sermon at the Southwell synod in 1613, the intention being, as the preacher explained to his audience, 'to urge my brethren of the ministery, publikely assembled, to the duty of catechising.'[124] The valuable function that synods could fulfill was outlined by Samuel Gibson in a synodal sermon at St. Michael's Coventry in 1615:[125]

> Good use (no questio) there is of such meetings of ministers, as that those may grow to knowledge and acquaintance one with another, that bee under the same iurisdiction, and to maintaine love and amitie amongst us, so specially to end such controversies as arise by any stirring heads, or contentious persons. If this bee put in practice, no doubt wee shall see good come of synods.

These sentiments are equally applicable to the assembly of the bishop and his clergy on visitation.

* * * * *

In 1635 John Williams of Lincoln conducted his visitation in person for the first time, which he discovered to be a rewarding experience. 'He finds so much good thereby', Archbishop Laud reported,[126]

> beyond that which chancellors use to do when they go the visitation, that he is sorry he hath not done it heretofore, in so many years as he hath been bishop.

Williams was surely alluding to the pastoral element of the episcopal visitation which, it has been argued, was as important as the judicial detection and correction of offenders. Williams's belated appreciation of this point was not typical of the whole bench of bishops. Their regular attendance at visitations implies that they recognised the unique opportunities of the occasion for

pastoral contact with their flock, which, unlike the routine administration of discipline, could not be safely delegated to commissaries.

Footnotes to Chapter Three

1. The Forme and Maner of making and consecrating Bishops, Priests and Deacons (1607), sig.Biii iiiv.

2. SRO, D/D/Ca 173 (unfoliated: Michaelchurch), 235 (unfoliated: Halse); WSRO, Ep.II/9/11 fo.223r; Usher, Reconstruction, ii. p.118.

3. Hooker, Works, iii .I. p.386; Paul Baynes, The Diocesans Tryall, wherein all the Sinnewes of Doctor Downhams Defence are brought into three Heads and orderly dissolved (1621) sig.Br; [William Prynne], A Looking-Glasse for all Lordly Prelates [1636] p.76.

4. Heal, Of Prelates and Princes, p.303.

5. NNRO, Har/3 fos.383-4.

6. In comparison to Ely or Chichester. CUL, MS Dd 12.43 p.236; EDR, B/2/31a; WSRO, Ep.I/19/6 fo.24r.

7. See, for example, Bishop Robert Abbot's will, PRO, Prob.11/131/48.

8. Cosin, Correspondence, i. p.8.

9. Progresses of King James, iii. pp.245,257,389-90; HRO, B/I/A/26; LAO, Add.Reg.3 fo.48.

10. GDR, 102 pp.1-3, 110; A.P. Perceval, An Apology for the Doctrine of Apostolical Succession (1839), p.181.

11. LPL, Reg.Bancroft fos.223v,226r, VG 4/6, passim.

12. LPL, Tenison MS 663 fo.74r; LAO, Add.Reg.3 fos.2r-3v; HMC, 9 Hatfield House, xvii. pp.5-6,141-2, xx. p.59.

13. EDR, B/2/37, B/2/9 fo.24r, B/2/32 fos.96r,103v,115r. Felton's personality remains elusive. He published no writings and his correspondence, episcopal register and articles of visitation are lost. See below pp.237-8 and appendix VII.

14. Andrewes, Works, ix. pp.29-51.

15. WSRO, Ep.II/11/2 fos.21r,23r; EDR, B/2/31 fos.1r,106r,137r.

16. R.A. Houlbrooke, Church Courts and the People during the English Reformation 1520-1570 (Oxford, 1979), p.29; R.A. Marchant, The Church under the Law: Justice, Administration and Discipline in the diocese of York 1560-1640 (Cambridge, 1969), p.114.

17. For example, by Marchant, op.cit., pp.114-35.

18. As required by canon 137. Occasionally these endorsed documents survive: WSRO, Ep.I/69/8.

19. WSRO, Ep.I/18/27 fo.15; EDR, B/2/29 fo.5v. In Gloucester absentee clergy were merely declared contumacious: GDR, 88 pp.3-4.

20. There were minor differences in procedure between dioceses. At Norwich, churchwardens were sent the articles of enquiry in advance and made their presentments immediately after taking the oath. The visitation court went on tour only in the larger dioceses, such as Bath & Wells or Norwich.

21. Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation, ed. W.H. Frere i. (Alcuin Club Collections, xiv. 1910), pp.27-9,117-29; H.G. Owen, 'The Episcopal Visitation: its Limits and Limitations in Elizabethan London' Journal of Ecclesiastical History xi. (1960), pp.179-85; Marchant, The Church under the Law, pp.114-46,185-8; D.M. Owen, The Records of the Established Church in England (British Records Association: Archives and the User, i. 1970), pp.30-5; Houlbrooke, Church Courts and the People, pp.29-30 & passim. The argument I am developing here is adumbrated in Collinson, The Religion of Protestants, pp.66-7.

22. I Tim. iii. 2, iv. 16; 2 Tim. ii. 24-5, iv. 2,5.

23. Namely the palace in Chichester, and at Aldingbourne and Cakeham manors. Harsnett also resided at Stedham. WSRO, Cap.I/27/2

fos.59,166v, Ep.I/18/31 fos.6r,7v, I/17/19 fos.74v,192r, I/15/3/16 fo.35.

24. On average, 14 sessions were held for London diocese, 13 in Bath & Wells and 12 in Gloucester over a period of three weeks or so.

25. GDR, 110 p.9; Robert Atkyns, The Ancient and Present State of Glostershire, ed. B.S. Smith (2 vols., 1974), pp.646-7,397,627.

26. GDR, 96 (unfoliated); Atkyns, Glostershire, ii. pp.227-8; Browne Willis, A Survey of the Cathedrals (3 vols., 1742), ii. p.723.

27. Collinson, The Religion of Protestants, pp.123-4. Fragmentary evidence for these dinners are in the visitation books for the dioceses of Ely, Gloucester, Lincoln and Norwich. It is probable they were also held at Chichester, where stewards ('seneschalli') were appointed 'to provide for the ministers of their deanyres'. See WSRO, Ep.I/20/7 fo.39v.

28. EDR, B/2/23 fos.39v,43v,48r, C/5/9/5a (unfoliated). Procurations, of course, were payments of money in lieu of hospitality.

29. 'The Primary Visitation of the diocese of Lincoln by Bishop Neile, A.D. 1614', ed. E. Venables, AASRP, xvi. (1881), pp.31-54, discussed in Collinson, The Religion of Protestants, pp.123-4.

30. Marchant, The Church under the Law, p.135 fn.1.

31. This point is disputable. In Neile's visitation of 1614, only once did the table-talk relate to the sermon. 'The Primary Visitation of...Bishop Neile', p.48.

32. NNRO, Har/3 fo.384.

33. Richard Carpenter, A Pastoral Charge: faithfully given and discharged, at the trienniall visitation of the Lord Bishop of Exon: holden in Barnstaple the seventh of September 1616 (1616); Samuel Crooke, Three Sermons (1615), pp.73-129; Edward Boughen, A Sermon of Confirmation preached in Oxford, at the visitation of the right reverend father in God, Iohn Lord Bishop of Oxford. September 27

1619 (1620).

34. EDR, B/2/18 fo.60r, B/2/23 fos.1r,38r; LAO, Add.Reg.3 fo.3; GDR, 115 pp.159,315,463. See below pp.147-51.

35. Lake, Sermons, iii. pp.249-72. Bishop Overton's sermon to his clergy, on visitation in 1600, also survives. Taking a favourite text (Acts xx. 28), he urged them to reside on their cures and there preach, provide hospitality and lead by example: Overton, Oratio, passim.

36. I Cor. xv. 10.

37. Lake, Sermons, iii. pp.262-72.

38. Namely, those of Bath & Wells, Chichester, Gloucester, Lincoln, London and Norwich. Lake, Sermons, sig.+; WSRO, Ep.II/11/1 fos.126v, 141v,146r,152r, I/20/7 fo.40; GDR, 110 pp.95-6, 107 (unfoliated: William Bush, rector of Avening), 115 p.62; GLRO, DL/C/306 pp.50,57-8; NNRO, Har/3 fo.384, Vis/3. For Lincoln, see fn.39. Such examinations regularly occurred in Ely diocese in the 1590s: EDR, B/2/16 (unfoliated: 11 October 1596), B/2/17 fo.35v.

39. Charles Richardson, A Workeman that Needeth not to be Ashamed: or the Faithfull Steward of Gods House (1616), p.29; LAO, LC/III fos.2v,67r,68v,83v. Barlow's articles of visitation for Lincoln are not extant, but those of Rochester in 1605 enquire whether or not the clergy studied regularly 'which we hold to be 7 houres in the day'. William Barlow, Rochester (1605), sig.A3v.

40. See, for example, GDR, 80 p.191.

41. See below pp.180-92.

42. For the English dioceses in Canterbury province 1603-25 there survive some 66 different episcopal articles of visitation, scattered in many repositories. This analysis is based upon 50 of the most accessible of these.

43. Thomas Bickley, Chichester [1586]; Anthony Watson, Chichester (1600),

sig.Aiiv; Montaigne, Lincoln (1618); Williams, Lincoln (1622) sig.Bv. For the government of Watson and Williams, see below pp.182-3,258-9.

44. Lancelot Andrewes, Ely (Cambridge, 1610 & 1613); idem, Winchester (1619).

45. Andrewes, Chichester (1606), sig.A2r,A3ir,Br,Bir,B3v.

46. A common derivation is possible, of course. Another example is the very evident influence of the articles of Gervase Babington for Worcester (1607) upon those of John King for London (1612).

47. John Overall, Norwich (Cambridge, 1619), p.6; Andrewes, Chichester (1606), sig.A3iiv; George Abbot, Gloucester [1612], sig.A2v; Robert Abbot, Salisbury (1616), sig.A2r.

48. Overall, Norwich (1619), p.8.

49. Richard Neile, Durham (1624), sig.A2i; Lancelot Andrewes, Winchester (1625), sig.A3ir; Samuel Harsnett, Norwich (1627), sig.B2r; Tyacke, 'Arminianism in England', p.125; idem, 'Arminianism and English Culture', pp.96,98,101. However, the first to reproduce the clause was Robert Tounson, Salisbury (1620), p.7.

50. Andrewes, Chichester (1606), sig.A3iv,B2r; WSRO, Ep.I/17/12, II/9/11.

51. Harsnett, Norwich (1627), sig.B2r; NNRO, Vis/5.

52. [William Ames], A Reply to Dr Mortons Particular Defence of Three Nocent Ceremonies, viz the Surplice, Crosse in Baptisme and Kneeling at the receiving of the Sacramentall Elements of Bread and Wine (1623), pp.21-2; Overall, Norwich (1619), p.6; Harsnett, Norwich (1620), sig.A2iv; Concilia, iv. pp.550-1. See also Tounson, Salisbury (1620), p.5.

53. WSRO, Ep.I/17/11 fos.143v-216v. II/9/10 fos.2v-24r; SRO, D/D/Ca 140, 142, 149, 151-2. These examples could be multiplied by similar illustrations from other dioceses.

54. Proceedings of the Lancashire Justices of the Peace at the Sheriff's Table during Assize Week, 1578-1694, ed. B.W. Quintrell (The Record

Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, cxxi. Bristol, 1981), passim; J.S. Cockburn, A History of English Assizes 1558-1714 (Cambridge, 1972), pp.67-9. I have benefited from discussing this point with Clive Holmes.

55. N. Sykes, Church and State in England in the XVIIIth Century (Cambridge, 1934), p.138. Among the earliest printed was Henry Leslie's charge at his visitation of 1638: A Speech delivered at the Visitation of Downe and Conner, held in Lisnegarvy the 26th of September 1638 (1639).

56. Episcopal charges to the dean and chapter of Ely were habitually recorded. EDR, B/2/23 fos.34v,61v, B/2/31 fo.160 B/2/37 fo.21. For Bath & Wells, see D/D/Ca 237 fo.55r.

57. NNRO, Reg/16/22 ii.fos.24v-5, iii. (unfoliated: 21 May 1627); LPL, MS 943 p.125.

58. SRO, D/D/Ca 243a fos.1v-2r.

59. Concilia, iv. pp.440-2; GDR, 110 pp.17,80.

60. Carpenter, A Pastoral Charge, p.27; PRO, SP 16/345/85, Richard Neile to William Laud, January 1637. For the most perceptive modern discussion, see Ingram, 'Ecclesiastical Justice in Wiltshire', pp.317-24.

61. For example, Watson, Chichester (1600), sig.Biiv-Bii iv; William Chaderton, Lincoln (Cambridge, 1604), p.11; John Bridges, Oxford (Oxford, 1604), sig.Br; Thomas Dove, Peterborough (Cambridge, 1605) p.6 and Peterborough (1617), sig.A2iir; John Howson, Oxford (Oxford, 1619), sig.Br. See also Francis Goodwin, To the Parson, Vicar or Curate of...and to everie of them [Oxford, 1603], (S.T.C. 11948), p.4.

62. WSRO, Ep.I/17/15 fos.20r,70r,95v.

63. SRO, D/D/Ca 244 fos.3v,12v-13r.

64. SRO, D/D/Ca 232 fos.121v-139v,148,155v,169, 237 fos.20r,55v,131r,164v, 247 fos.321r-2r, 248 fos.163r,173v-4r,264v, 249 fos.73r,78r, 252 fos.156,178,179v, 253, passim. These figures are analysed by T.H.

Peake, 'The Somerset Clergy and the Church Courts in the diocese of Bath & Wells 1625-1642' (Bristol M.Litt. thesis, 1978), pp.87-97.

65. NNRO, Har/3 fo.384.

66. Namely those of Bath & Wells, Chichester, Ely, Gloucester, London, Norwich and Winchester.

67. GDR, 96 p.lll. William Blackleech, the corrupt chancellor of the diocese for many years, had finally been dismissed in 1600 but allegations of malpractice persisted. F.D. Price, 'Bishop Bullingham and Chancellor Blackleech: a diocese divided' TBGAS, xci. (1972), pp.194-8; GDR, 93 fo.93r.

68. WSRO, Ep.I/20/7 fo.40, I/18/27 fos.15r,24v, Par.460/1/1/1 fo.26v.

69 For a more detailed discussion of the 'Orders' see K.C. Fincham, 'Ramifications of the Hampton Court Conference in the dioceses, 1603-1609' Journal of Ecclesiastical History (forthcoming, 1985), and also appendix IX.

70. Babbage, Puritanism and Richard Bancroft, pp.103-245. Chancellor Seman attempted to enforce subscription, but could only suspend and not deprive ministers. GDR, 93 fos.197v-262v.

71. GDR, 97 fos.lr,27v,82v,87r,91v,118r,222r.

72. Fincham, 'Ramifications of the Hampton Court Conference', passim; and see below pp.182-3,211 fn.94.

73. Exceptions were John Still at Bath & Wells in 1594 and 1603, Samuel Harsnett and George Carleton at Chichester in 1613, 1616 and 1625 and Godfrey Goldsborough, Thomas Ravis and Miles Smith at Gloucester in 1599, 1605 and 1613. SRO, D/D/Ca 102, 104, 133-4; WSRO, Ep.I/17/15-6, 21; GDR, 87, 97, 120.

74. GDR, 97 fo.163v and passim.

75. EDR, D/2/33 fos.132r,159r,165r; SRO, D/D/Ca 204 (unfoliated: William Shepphard of Pitcombe, Thomas Andrewes of Winscombe, Joan Huff of

Somerton and William Buckland of East Coker).

76. In Lewes archdeaconry, for example, seven ministers were presented for nonconformity in Bancroft's metropolitical visitation of 1605. Between 1606 and 1626 only three were detected for these offences: WSRO, Ep.II/9/9 fos.272v,277r, II/9/10 fos.11v,12v,14v,30r,35v, II/9/11 fo.106r, II/9/16 fo.1v, II/9/18 fo.58r.

77. Concilia, iv. pp.465-7; SRO, D/D/0 ii. (unfoliated: Lake to the Dean and Chapter of Wells, 30 September 1622), D/D/Vc 82, D/D/Ca 235-6, 237 fo.55r.

78. WSRO, Ep.I/17/13 fos.85v-113v.

79. HRO, C 69 fo.48v, C 75 fos.13v,34v,49v, C 92, 94 (both unfoliated), C 96 fos.18,19r,20r,21v,53v,82v,83v,102r,110r.

80. Andrewes, Works, i. pp.62,232, iv. p.380, v. pp.68-9,191. In his biographical sketch Bishop Buckeridge states that Andrewes celebrated communion monthly in his private chapel, despite taking the Eucharist at court, and the churchwardens' accounts for St. Giles Cripplegate record that expenditure on bread and wine roughly doubled after Andrewes was instituted to the living in 1589. Andrewes, Works, v. p.303; BL, Add.MS 12222, passim.

81. EDR, B/2/8 pp.1,84,140.

82. EDR, B/2/18 fo.60r, B/2/23 fos.1r,38r,39r,43v,48r, B/2/31 fos.1r, 106r,137r.

83. EDR, B/2/18, 23, 29, 31, 33, 37; GDR, 88, 120 passim, 125 pp.125-6.

84. The Acts of the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral Church of Chichester 1545-1642, ed. W.D. Peckham (Sussex Record Society, lviii. Cambridge, 1959), p.93.

85. See W.D. Peckham, 'The Vicars Choral of Chichester Cathedral' Sussex Archaeological Collections, lxxviii. (Oxford, 1937), pp.126-59.

86. R.B. Manning, Religion and Society in Elizabethan Sussex (Leicester,

1969), pp.73-6,108-9,204-5.

87. WSRO, Ep.I/18/27 fos.6v-7r, I/18/29 fos.1r-10r.

88. BL, Lansdowne MS 38 fo.178, quoted in R.B. Manning, 'The Crisis of Episcopal Authority during the Reign of Elizabeth I' Journal of British Studies, xi. (1971), p.20.

89. Statutes and Constitutions of the Cathedral Church of Chichester, ed. F.G. Bennett, R.H. Codrington & C. Deedes (Chichester, 1904), pp.54-76.

90. WSRO, Ep.I/18/30 fo.15; Acts of the Dean and Chapter of...Chichester, p. 190. The dean was empowered to dispense them from residence, provided 'nostre ordinationis intentionem consideret'. Statutes and Constitutions, pp.58,67,71,75.

91. WSRO, Ep.I/20/10 fo.37, Cap.I/4/8/3; Acts of the Dean and Chapter of...Chichester, p.190.

92. WSRO, Cap.I/1/2 fo.27v, I/4/9/32, Ep.I/18/33 fo.21r.

93. The History and Constitution of a Cathedral of the Old Foundation: illustrated from Documents (hitherto almost entirely unpublished) in the Registry and Muniment Room of the Cathedral of Chichester, ed. C.A. Swainson (1880), pp.38-40; WSRO, Cap.I/1/2 fo.27v, Ep.I/18/33 fos.17v-19v.

94. The Acts of the Dean and Chapter of...Chichester, p.93; WSRO, Cap.I/4/8/3.

95. WSRO, Ep.I/20/10 fo.35.

96. WSRO, Ep.I/18/30 fo.15ir.

97. WSRO, Ep.I/18/31 fo.6; BL, Add.MS. 27950 fo.94r. Internal evidence proves this latter document to be a fee-book for the court of Audience and not, as catalogued, the court of Arches.

98. HLRO, Main Papers (24 May 1614 - 26 September 1615) fos.219r-226r; WSRO, Ep.I/18/32 fos.17v-18v,20v, I/18/35 fos.6r-7r,9,12r, I/20/10 fo.31.

99. WSRO, Ep.I/18/31 fos.7v-8r, I/18/33 16r-17r,19v-20v. See also K. Fincham, 'Contemporary Opinions of Thomas Weelkes', Music and Letters, lxii. (1981), pp.352-3.

100. WSRO, Ep.I/18/33 fo.16r, I/17/16 fo.3v, I/20/10 fo.37, III/6 Box 407 fos.9,56.

101. WSRO, Ep.I/18/30 fo.11v.

102. WSRO, Ep.I/18/31 fo.9v; Acts of the Dean and Chapter of...Chichester, pp.190-1.

103. WSRO, Ep.I/18/35 fos.6r-7r,9,12r,36r, I/20/10 fo.31.

104. WSRO, Ep.I/20/10 fos.33-7.

105. PRO, SP 14/24/46.

106. John Meredyth, The Sinne of Blasphemie against the Holy Ghost scholastically examined; the reasons of the absolute irremissibility thereof displayed; an Admonition to all revolting Apostates (1622), sig.A2r.

107. WSRO, Ep.III/4/9 fos.45,121v,130r, Cap.I/1/2 fo.27v, Ep.I/17/16 fo.3r, Par.44/6/3 passim.

108. Acts of the Dean and Chapter of...Chichester, pp.183,206-9.

109. Ibid., pp.162-3,175,204,212,214,219-21,229. This may be compared with the stricter discipline of his predecessor between 1596 and 1601: ibid., pp.141-153.

110. Ibid., pp.241-5,249,251-2; WSRO, Cap.I/4/10/9.

111. WSRO, Ep.I/20/9 (unfoliated), I/20/10 fo.33, Cap.I/1/2 fo.27v.

112. Acts of the Dean and Chapter of...Chichester, p.197; WSRO, Ep.I/1/8 fos.58,63r,64v; PRO, Prob.11/160/78, 11/154/82.

113. WSRO, Ep.I/20/10 fo.37.

114. 21 Henry VIII c.13.

115. BL, Harl.MS 7048 pp.144-7.

116. For archival evidence of synods in Ely, Chichester and Norwich, see

below. Evidence for six other dioceses comes from printed synodal sermons: Samuel Gibson, The Only Rule to Walke By: a Sermon preached at a Synod, or meeting of Ministers in S.Michaels Church in Coventry the second of October 1615 (1616); James Hyatt, The Preachers President or the Master and Scholler. In a Sermon preached at a Synode, holden by the right reverend father in God Iohn, Lord Bishop of Chester at Wigan in Lancashire, the 21 of Aprill 1625 (1625); Robert Mandevill, Timothies Taske, or a Christian sea-card guiding through the coastes of a peaceable Conscience to a Peace constant and a Crowne immortall...in two Synodall assemblies at Carliell (Oxford, 1619); Robert Matthew, Peters Net Let Downe or the Fisher and the Fish both prepared towards a blessed Haven. Delivered at a Synod at Chipping-Norton in Oxford-shire (1634); Thomas Oxley, The Shepheard, or a Sermon preached at a Synode in Durisme Minster upon Tuesday, being the fift of April 1608 (1609); Jerome Phillips, The Fisher-Man: a Sermon preached at a Synode held at Southwell in Nottinghamshire (1623). Synods also took place in Peterborough diocese, to judge from the title-page of Bishop Dove's visitation articles between 1605 and 1623. See, for example, Articles to be inquired of within the diocesse of Peterborough in the visitation of the reverend father in God, Thomas...this present yeare 1605...and for that purpose lawfully appointed in visitations, synods or els where (Cambridge, 1605). Bangor diocese also held regular synods: PRO, SP 16/164/23.

117. EDR, B/2/19, K/16/4, B/2/31a fo.4r. For better documented periods, see D.M. Owen, 'Synods in the diocese of Ely in the later Middle Ages and the Sixteenth Century' Studies in Church History, iii. ed. C.J. Cuming (Leiden, 1966), pp.217-222.

118. WSRO, Ep.I/18/28.

119. Houlbrooke, Church Courts and the People, p.30.

120. NNRO, ANW/21/1 fos.8r-9v.

121. WSRO, Ep.I/15/3/16 fo.35, I/18/28 fos.15r,19r,35r,41v, I/51/3 fo.23v.

122. See appendix X. Rural deans were elected in synods in Chichester archdeaconry and there may have been a synodal dinner, since stewards ('obsonatores vel seneschalli') were often appointed: WSRO, Ep.I/18/28 passim.

123. EDR, B/2/31a fo.4r; NNRO, Act/45b (unfoliated: 11 October 1614, John Eaton of Wickham Market); John Vicars, The Sword Bearer: or the Byshop of Chichester's Armes emblazoned in a Sermon preached at a Synod (1627).

124. Richard Bernard, Two Twinnes: or Two Parts of one Portion of Scripture (1613), pp.2,14.

125. Gibson, The Only Rule to Walke by, p.28.

126. Laud, Works, v. II. p.333.

Chapter Four: The Spiritual Jurisdiction of the Episcopate.

(ii) The Consistory

> You are now to be made a Bishop, an overseer of the Lord's flocke, make good your name, looke over your whole diocesse, observe not only the sheepe but the pastors, not only those that are lyable to your authority and jurisdiction, but those also who execute it under you. Have an eye to your eyes and hold a strict hand over your hands, I mean your officials, collectors, receivers; and if your eye cause you to offend, plucke it out, and if your hand, cut it off.

These words of advice were offered to Robert Wright at his consecration as Bishop of Bristol on 23 March 1623 in the sermon preached by Daniel Featley, chaplain to Archbishop Abbot.[1] Featley was alluding not to the visitation that Wright would conduct in person later that year,[2] but to the administration of his consistory court and temporalities by a team of officials that the Bishop would inherit on arrival in Bristol. This chapter examines the control that prelates exercised over the administration of ecclesiastical justice in six dioceses in the southern province: those of Bath & Wells, Chichester, Ely, Gloucester, Norwich and Winchester.[3] It is suggested that most resident bishops took an active interest in the operation of their consistories, and either presided in person or carefully selected a group of officials and surrogates to serve in their place. Some new bishops clashed with entrenched interest groups in their diocesan administration, as Featley's remark seems to imply. On these occasions they could rely for assistance on their household of lawyers and clergy, whom they appointed to such key diocesan posts as fell vacant. Several prelates also made a distinct impression on disciplinary policy in their consistories, although not upon the instance and record business coming before them.

* * * * *

It is ironical that the class of diocesan records which survives in greatest number - the proceedings of the consistory court - is the one in which the bishop's influence was assumed to be most circumscribed. The procedures of the courts Christian had evolved to function smoothly in the absence of the bishop. The canons of 1604 reserved for the bishop only the formal act of the deprivation of a minister from his benefice and allowed all other judicial duties to be delegated.[4] This principle was entirely consonant with the varied roles that a prelate was expected to perform, as an important figure in local society, dispensing and receiving hospitality, as a member of the commission of the peace, as a large landowner entrusted with the supervision of extensive estates and as a lord spiritual advising the King in Parliament. It is all the more interesting, therefore, that a majority of resident bishops assumed more than nominal responsibility for their consistories, as will be demonstrated below.

The ecclesiastical justice administered by the diocesan courts was derived from a corpus of canon, civil and ecclesiastical common law, and fell into three broad areas of competence. The courts dealt with office business arising from denunciation by churchwardens, from accusation which might lead to a promoted cause and from inquisition where the judge proceeded ex officio mero, from his own motion. Summary procedure was normally used for cases arising from denunciation by churchwardens in their biannual presentments.[5] A defendant or his proxies would listen to the charge against him and then either confess or deny its truth. Confession was followed by an immediate sentence, while a denial obliged the defendant to purge for his innocence, and the sentence rested on whether or not this was successful. In contrast, office cases by accusation and by inquisition, where the defendant denied the allegations made against him, involved plenary procedure. The consistory also heard disputes between parties ad instanciam of the plaintiff, which were also determined by plenary form. Record jurisdiction was the third area of

cognisance of the diocesan courts, under which heading may be included the granting of marriage licences, probates and administrations.[6]

In all sees, courts exercising exempt or concurrent jurisdiction existed alongside the bishop's consistory. The number and size of exempt jurisdictions differed from diocese to diocese. Deans of cathedrals of the Old Foundation possessed jurisdiction over the cathedral church and neighbouring parishes, and peculiars might also be attached to prebendal stalls, as occurred in Bath & Wells, Lincoln and Salisbury.[7] The primatial see of Canterbury also held peculiars in several dioceses; in Chichester, for example, the archbishop appointed a dean to administer the peculiars of Pagham, Tarring and South Malling, which together numbered some thirty parishes and chapelries.[8] Nor was there any single pattern of archidiaconal authority. Some, such as the four archdeacons of Norwich diocese, held concurrent jurisdiction with the bishop, while others were limited to handling office and certain testamentary causes, as was the case with the archdeacons of Winchester and Bath.[9] Similarly the archdeacon of Ely exercised limited jurisdiction in Cambridgeshire and in Wilburton and Haddenham in the Isle.[10] Sometimes, indeed, archdeacons possessed no independent jurisdiction at all. Since the early sixteenth century, the archdeacons of Chichester and Lewes had had the status of commissaries to the bishop, so that the presentments arising from their annual visitations each spring were processed in the episcopal courts sitting at Chichester and Lewes.[11] Both decanal and archidiaconal authority could be suspended by the bishop only once every three years for the duration of his visitation.

One obvious consequence of these differing administrative structures was that the bishop's consistory was more powerful in some dioceses than in others. In 1638 Richard Mountagu was translated from Chichester diocese, where archidiaconal jurisdiction had long since been emasculated, to Norwich

diocese, where he discovered that his authority was 'engrossed by the claimed or usurped jurisdiction of a vicar generall, 4 archdeacons, 4 comissaryes, diverse registers, a rabble of proctors and apparitors'. Mountagu took comfort from his power to erect a court of audience, with original as well as appellate jurisdiction, which had been occasionally convened by his Jacobean predecessors.[12] Similar courts of audience existed in many dioceses, although their proceedings have rarely survived.[13] Although disputes between those possessing concurrent jurisdiction are an endemic feature of English diocesan history, the problem remained largely dormant in the six dioceses under analysis in this period.[14] The authority of all consistories was weakest in those hinterlands where rival jurisdictions met. Culprits could easily escape detection by moving from one jurisdiction to another, as regularly happened in and around the city of Chichester where bishop, dean and archbishop all held spiritual authority. There the problem persisted even after 1611, when Bishop Harsnett was created Dean of Pagham and Tarring. It was reported in 1615, for example, that Joan Ludgate had for five years evaded a sentence of penance by shifting between the two jurisdictions that Harsnett possessed.[15]

In some dioceses a third level of government existed in the office of rural dean. In origin the rural deans were agents of the bishop, and in the early seventeenth century it was episcopal officers who supervised their selection on visitation, at the synod or through the consistory in the three dioceses of Bath & Wells, Gloucester and Chichester.[16] Their functions remain elusive. In Bath & Wells, rural deans were chosen in rotation, and the court appeared primarily interested in exacting the customary fee of eight shillings and eight pence that accompanied appointment to the office. In October 1612 Richard Mountagu, the absentee Rector of Wootton Courtenay, was summoned to take his oath as the new rural dean for Dunster deanery. When his curate appeared and explained that Mountagu was resident at Windsor, the consistory administered the oath to him on Mountagu's behalf and

received their fee in return.[17] Six years earlier in the midst of a campaign against nonconformist practices, the court had admonished William Sclater, the precisionist Vicar of Pitminster, for omitting to wear the surplice during divine worship in defiance of an earlier warning, and ordered him to answer a series of articles. Later that session Sclater was sworn in as rural dean for Taunton deanery.[18] Neither of these cases suggest that the rural dean fulfilled any onerous or delicate responsibilities, a supposition which is endorsed by the silence of the court books. In Gloucester, rural deans were chosen on visitation by the bishop, and then, like their Somerset neighbours, they disappear from view.[19] Only in Chichester diocese were the rural deans assigned any major role in diocesan administration, albeit momentarily. It was the custom for clergy to elect a pair of rural deans for each deanery during the annual synod or at the triennial visitation and their choice naturally fell on senior ministers, who included several domestic chaplains of the bishop.[20] In an attempt to counter puritan criticism of clerical insufficiency in Chichester diocese, Bishop Anthony Watson, during his visitation of September 1603, devised a scheme of clerical education in Lewes archdeaconry, and it was to the rural deans that he turned for assistance, requiring them to examine the life and learning of their weaker brethren and to provide instruction where necessary.[21] Three years later at the primary visitation of Lancelot Andrewes, a series of orders was promulgated to strengthen the hand of the administration. Each quarter, ministers were to return lists of communicants and catechumens to their rural deans who would pass them on to the consistory. The deans also recommended which clergy might benefit from theological tuition, and sometimes they provided it themselves.[22] These orders were not reissued at Andrewes's second visitation in 1609, and in subsequent years the office of rural dean is mentioned only in connection with its election at the annual synod.

* * * * *

Apologists for the discipline dispensed by the consistory courts sometimes deflected puritan criticism from the person of the bishop by alluding to the shortcomings of his officials, a distinction which many prelates must have endorsed.[23] New bishops inherited a corps of diocesan administrators led by the chancellor and registrar, who by this period generally enjoyed tenure for life,[24] a position which led the episcopate to complain at the Hampton Court conference in 1604 that they were enslaved by the patents granted by their predecessors.[25] Naturally these officials might be as concerned with the social prestige and financial profit attached to the post as with the responsibilities it entailed, so that the appearance of a reforming bishop would be seen as an unwelcome intrusion. A resort to subterfuge was one answer. Early in the episcopate of John Still of Bath & Wells a minor court officer, James Cappes, was angling for the reversion of the registrarship from his father-in-law William Lancaster, and he admitted quite candidly that the safest strategy was to conceal the matter from the Bishop 'if it may be'. A very similar plot was hatched in Lincoln diocese in 1613. Tobias Heyrick was promised the immediate reversion of Leicester archdeaconry by the incumbent, provided he secure the consent of Bishop Neile. Heyrick wrote to his uncle lobbying for support, adding that the archdeacon's complicity 'must in noe wise be spoken to the bishop'. Both bids eventually failed, though there is no indication that either Still or Neile discovered the scheming.[26]

Since some measure of delegation was a necessary element of diocesan government, most resident bishops acknowledged the prime importance of assembling a team of administrators who shared their perceptions and were responsive to their wishes. On occasions, of course, new prelates were satisfied with their predecessors' appointments. On his translation to Ely in 1609, Lancelot Andrewes seems to have established a good working relationship with the chancellor, William Gager, who launched a drive against non-residence within months of the Bishop's arrival, resulting in the deprivation of

seven ministers.[27] Arthur Lake of Bath & Wells lent heavily on Arthur Duck, his predecessor's choice as chancellor, to steer him through the murky waters of diocesan administration; so that under Duck's supervision, an experienced group of surrogates continued to serve in Wells consistory. By nature a pastor rather than an administrator, Lake found kindred spirits in Samuel Ward and Timothy Rivett, two archdeacons chosen by his predecessor Mountagu, as well as in Ralph Barlow, a Crown appointee as Dean of Wells.[28]

Other new bishops clashed with their diocesan officials. In three of the six dioceses under investigation, quarrels quickly erupted between the new incumbent and his chancellor, and each case illustrates the different forms this problem might take. At Norwich, Bishop John Jegon had to teach an independent-minded chancellor that he remained in overall control of diocesan affairs. Within months of Jegon's consecration in February 1603, the English Church was embroiled in a debate over the reform of its discipline prompted by the announcement of a conference to be held later that year at Hampton Court.[29] In July the Ecclesiastical Commission in London instructed the bench of bishops to examine the conduct of their subordinates in order to eradicate certain specified abuses, and in contrast to many colleagues[30] Jegon seized the opportunity to investigate the calibre of his diocesan officials. One positive result of the survey was the reduction in the numbers of apparitors from thirteen to eight. Yet behind this exercise lay an undercurrent of tension between Jegon and his chancellor Robert Redmayne, manifested sometime that year when the chancellor, without Jegon's knowledge, returned to Archbishop Whitgift a list of eight nonconformist laity and clergy, an act which 'bred great variance' between them.[31] Another clash two years later taught Redmayne to proceed more warily, since the Bishop's residence at Ludham did not mean that he had renounced a supervisory role over his consistory at Norwich.[32]

A more violent dispute occurred at Chichester between a group of

diocesan officials and Bishop George Carleton, following his translation there in September 1619. Carleton found his consistory staffed by three clerical protégés of his predecessor, Samuel Harsnett, who were acting as surrogates to the absentee chancellor, Clement Corbett, Master of Trinity Hall, Cambridge. In September 1620, on only his second appearance in the consistory, Carleton pronounced Corbett to be contumacious and suspended him from office, presumably for failing to answer an episcopal citation. Sitting in his consistory over the next month, Carleton scrutinised the qualifications of Corbett's most active surrogates - Richard Buckenham DD, Owen Stockton MA and John Hullwood MA - all of whom were also suspended, since none held a degree in civil law nor had legal experience in any court besides that of Chichester. The surrogates, in turn, immediately appealed to the provincial court of Audience on the grounds that they were sufficiently qualified by canon 128 of 1604.[33] Carleton's objection to these surrogates may have been personal, in part, for each was a close intimate of his predecessor Samuel Harsnett, who had brought them with him into the diocese: one was his cousin, another his nephew, a third his domestic chaplain.[34] More tangibly, none of them was a trained civil lawyer. John Cradocke, a doctor of civil law, had supervised the court in Harsnett's latter years at Chichester, but upon the Bishop's translation to Norwich in 1619, Cradocke had been appointed Dean of the archiepiscopal peculiars of Pagham, Tarring and South Malling and had ceased to sit in the episcopal consistory.[35] Clement Corbett arrived in Chichester in late November to forestall further legal moves against him. Carleton ordered him to attend both consistories in Chichester and Lewes, and, in a fit of legal pique, also required him to subscribe to the three articles of 1583 as his commissary for Lewes archdeaconry.[36] Shortly afterwards Bishop and Chancellor struck a bargain. In exchange for proceedings being dropped against him, Corbett appointed a surrogate of suitable calibre, a young bachelor of civil law from his own college named Francis Ringstead,

who arrived in Chichester the following April. The selection of Ringstead proved to be an adroit move, for he established a remarkably successful partnership with Carleton over the next six years as they sat together in Chichester consistory.[37] Meanwhile Buckenham, Stockton and Hullwood found themselves excluded from any prominent role in the administration so that the animus created by the incident was not forgotten immediately. Richard Buckenham, archdeacon of Chichester, chose to be absent without leave from Carleton's synods held in the autumn of 1620 and 1621, so that the Bishop instituted an ex officio mero case against him, and peace between them was not restored until June 1622.[38]

Unlike Carleton or Jegon, Goldsborough of Gloucester was not prepared to compromise with his chancellor, William Blackleech, whom he dismissed for corrupt practices in 1600. Blackleech had already withstood an attempt in 1590-2 by Bishop Bullingham, Goldsborough's predecessor, to have him removed for similar offences. After his arrival in Gloucester in 1598-9, Goldsborough sat regularly in consistory to monitor Blackleech's conduct, and his decisive eviction of the chancellor in 1600 proved him to be a more effective opponent than Bullingham.[39] While personality as much as policy may account for the differences between the new bishop and his officials in Chichester and Norwich dioceses, the pervasive corruption of Gloucester consistory is enough to explain the antagonism between successive bishops and chancellor Blackleech.

There resided in the episcopal household a pool of legal and clerical talent on which the bishop could draw if he wished to exercise greater control over his diocesan administration. To one contemporary, William Prynne, the sheer size of the bishop's personal entourage was one sign of a degenerate episcopate:[40]

> if any time after they are made bishops they leave their former habitations and repaire to their diocesse or bee translated from one see to another, they commonly

> take with them...archdeacons, chauncellors, registers, appariters, howshold chaplaines, secretaries and private informers...

The episcopal household was indeed a flourishing institution in the early seventeenth century, even if Prynne's description of it was characteristically coloured. It consisted of legal secretaries, lawyers and a heterogeneous collection of clergy who associated their careers with the fortunes of the bishop, although they may not have been in continuous residence with him.

The rise of the legal secretary in this period gave the bishop a measure of independence from his diocesan registrar.[41] John Cosin, Richard Baddeley and William Easdell, secretaries to Bishops Overall, Morton and Neile, are familiar examples, but legal secretaries were employed by at least eleven other bishops.[42] The most famous of these was Anthony Harison, chaplain to Jegon of Norwich, who drew a pleasing cameo of episcopal secretaries meeting together in London during Parliamentary sessions to exchange procedural precedents.[43] These secretaries travelled with the bishop from see to see, as exemplified by William Greene, who accompanied Lancelot Andrewes from Chichester to Ely and from there to Winchester.[44] Secretaries were appointed primarily for administrative convenience, especially by prelates who lived away from their dioceses, but on occasions they may also have been valued as servants whose loyalty was untouched by the web of local vested interests which existed in most diocesan administrations. Their functions varied widely. The absentee Bishops Watson and Andrewes retained control over the institution of clergy to diocesan livings, so their secretaries issued certificates of the institution or deprivation of clergy, filed declarations of resignation, returned the annual list of institutions to the First Fruits office in the Exchequer and maintained the episcopal register.[45] However when the bishop established cordial relationships with his registrar, as was the case with Chaderton of Lincoln and Lake of Bath & Wells, his secretary would be no more than an amanuensis who handled episcopal correspondence.[46] Similarly,

George Carleton quarrelled not with his registrar but with his surrogates, and he saw no need to employ a personal secretary.[47] Other bishops permitted or, indeed, encouraged their secretaries to appropriate certain duties from the diocesan registrar. Samuel Harsnett at Chichester and Norwich kept a strict eye on his consistory and employed a secretary to administer episcopal institutions, who also displaced the Chichester registrar at the ordination of ministers.[48] For the first eighteen months of his episcopate, Jegon of Norwich allowed his chancellor to institute clergy to benefices, and then took over the responsibility himself, an action probably not unconnected with their quarrel in 1603-4, and perhaps done at the prompting of Harison, who was no friend to Redmayne.[49] On occasion the episcopal secretary might be created registrar when the office fell vacant, as occurred at Ely under Lancelot Andrewes. However the motive in this case was profit rather than the extension of episcopal control over the administration, since the new registrar, William Greene, was continually absent and delegated duties to the deputy registrars whom he had inherited.[50] In short, the rise of the legal secretary owed much to simple convenience, but it enabled some bishops, if they wished, to retain direct control over certain responsibilities.

The extensive patronage possessed by bishops could be used to refashion their diocesan administration, for the chancellorship, archdeaconries and registrary lay in their gift. In practice this opportunity remained largely fortuitous since these posts were held for life. Not a single major diocesan office fell vacant during Arthur Lake's ten years at Bath & Wells, so that the excellent relations he established with his officials proved to be invaluable. Most prelates did no more, therefore, than gradually introduce a small number of protégés into their administration. George Carleton had to wait seven years for the resignation of his absentee chancellor, Clement Corbett, before he could select a chancellor who would reside in the diocese and preside in consistory. His choice fell on his step-son William Nevill, who had recently

received a B.C.L. at Oxford, and Carleton's complete confidence in him may be adduced from the fact that he left the running of the consistory entirely in Nevill's hands and never sat in his consistory again.[51] John Still of Bath & Wells was more fortunate, for the chancellorship fell vacant midway through his episcopate. Still appointed Francis James to the post, and the pair co-operated closely in Wells consistory, as is illustrated by James' choice of regular surrogates - Anthony Egglesfield, Anthony Methwin and Henry Peek, all domestic chaplains to Still.[52]

Similarly, Samuel Harsnett was able to remodel his diocesan administration at Chichester between 1609 and 1619. On his arrival in 1609, Chichester diocese was under the care of John Drury, chancellor since 1607, who was an official with a wealth of diocesan experience stretching back to the 1580s.[53] Until Drury's death in June 1614, Harsnett sat in his consistory regularly, though as observer rather than as president, and on those occasions when he could not attend, he often sent along his secretary Richard Evans in his place.[54] The only recorded clash between Harsnett and Drury occurred after one court session in December 1611 when the Bishop publicly rebuked the chancellor for not wearing his canonical dress, and demanded to see his letters of ordination to satisfy himself that Drury was indeed in holy orders.[55] Harsnett took full control of his consistory on Drury's death and appointed a relative, Clement Corbett, to be the new chancellor, inserting in his letters patent a clause expressly permitting the Bishop to intervene in any matter of ecclesiastical cognizance that interested him.[56] Corbett's absence[57] clearly suited Harsnett, for the chancellor appointed as his surrogates members of the Bishop's household - his cousin and chaplain Richard Buckenham, whom Harsnett had created archdeacon of Lewes in 1614, his chaplains Owen Stockton and John Hullwood and a fourth protégé, John Cradocke, the very officials with whom Bishop Carleton would later cross swords, as noted above.[58] With this cosy coterie running his consistory, Harsnett took a less

prominent role in the administration, appearing periodically in court to hear cases of special interest.[59] On his translation to Norwich in 1619, Harsnett began to construct his team afresh. Taking with him secretary Richard Evans, Harsnett was quickly able to fill two archdeaconries with protégés whom he had once patronised at Chichester.[60] Clement Corbett became registrar of Harsnett's consistory and audience courts in 1625, and within a week of the death of chancellor Redmayne that August, Corbett was acting as the episcopal commissary in consistory, and shortly afterwards he was granted the diocesan chancellorship.[61] Most bishops, however, had less opportunity than Harsnett to alter the composition of their administration, and, in view of the weight of silent evidence, had less occasion to do so. The episcopates of Bilson and Andrewes of Winchester or Heton and Felton of Ely were not characterised by conflict with their officials.

In his study of civil lawyers in the early seventeenth century, Dr Levack has suggested that several bishops appointed unqualified friends and relatives as chancellors of their dioceses and he cites as evidence the examples of Godwin of Llandaff and Hereford, and Cotton of Exeter.[62] None of the six dioceses under purview contain comparable episodes. The men selected as chancellors were all qualified civil lawyers, and, even on those occasions when a bishop such as Harsnett or Still had his chaplains appointed as surrogates, they presided in court under the supervisory eye of a senior surrogate, who was invariably a civil lawyer.

* * * * *

The fact that some new bishops did quarrel with their diocesan officials, while others were careful to remodel their administration, strongly suggests that the operation of the consistory was a major interest of many resident prelates. This supposition is confirmed by a study of the personal participation

of bishops in the administration of ecclesiastical justice. Table Two overleaf draws together evidence from six dioceses to demonstrate that most resident bishops took an active role in their consistories. This finding reflects, in part, the broad administrative and judicial experience that many prelates acquired prior to their consecration.

Dr Houlbrooke has argued that most Elizabethan bishops lacked experience of diocesan administration, which is patently not the case for their Jacobean successors.[63] Twenty-seven of the forty-two divines elevated to the episcopal bench between 1603 and 1625 had previously exercised some spiritual jurisdiction, as archdeacons, as deans of cathedral churches of the Old Foundation or as vice-chancellors of the two universities.[64] Since the administrative responsibilities attached to these offices were sometimes delegated, one should not invest too much significance in these bare statistics; John King, for example, was for many years Archdeacon of Nottingham while residing in Oxford as Dean of Christ Church and vice-Chancellor of the University. Nevertheless, there is much documentary evidence to demonstrate that some future bishops familiarised themselves with aspects of diocesan administration.

Samuel Harsnett is one interesting example. As chaplain to Richard Bancroft of London, Harsnett had assisted in his primary visitation of 1598 and had acted as agent for the Ecclesiastical Commission in their prosecution of the exorcist John Darrell, who later railed against 'our two English inquisiters, Samuel Harsnet and his master'.[65] In 1603 Harsnett was rewarded with the archdeaconry of Essex, with its own extensive jurisdiction, and each Easter he presided at the archidiaconal visitation. Harsnett also conducted the metropolitical visitation of Ely diocese on Bancroft's behalf in September 1608. Sitting in St. Mary the Great in Cambridge, Harsnett inaugurated a visitation later notorious in godly lore for the suspension of two eminent nonconformists, Paul Baynes and Thomas Taylor, on charges of unlicensed

Table Two: The role of resident bishops in the administration of ecclesiastical justice 1593-1629.

Diocese	Name	Pattern of Participation
Bath & Wells[1]	Still (1593-1608)	Presided regularly in the Diocesan High Commission, 1597-1598, sat fairly regularly in consistory and heard cases in his palace.
	Lake (1616-1626)	Sat occasionally in consistory and frequently heard cases in his palace. See appendix XII.
Chichester[2]	Harsnett (1609-1619)	Sat regularly in consistory 1611-1614. See appendix XIII.
	Carleton (1619-1628)	Sat regularly in consistory 1622 and 1624-1626. See appendix XIV.
Ely[3]	Heton (1600-1609)	Never sat in consistory, but heard cases occasionally referred to him.
Gloucester[4]	Goldsborough (1598-1604)	Sat regularly in consistory 1599-1600, very occasionally thereafter.
	Ravis (1605-1607)	Sat regularly in consistory, June 1606-January 1607, and at almost every session of the Diocesan High Commission, 1606-1607.
	Parry (1607-1610)	Sat regularly in consistory, August 1608-January 1610.
	Smith (1612-1624)	Sat occasionally in consistory, 1613-1615. Very occasionally heard cases, 1615-1624.
Norwich[5]	Jegon (1603-1618)	Never sat in consistory, held a court of audience.
	Harsnett (1619-1629)	Rarely sat in consistory, held a court of audience.
Winchester[6]	Bilson (1597-1616)	Never sat in consistory. Presided over every session of the Diocesan High Commission, 1606-1608. See appendix I.

Footnotes:

1. SRO, D/D/Ca 100, 112, 138 fos.65r,189r,212r,233v, 141, 146 fo.94r, 201 fo.237v, 204, 209 fos.16v,20r,38v,101r,140r, 220, 223 fos.41v-238r, 232 fos.4r,22v,23r,78r,99v,115r, 241 pp.8-377, 244 fos.1r-25r, 249 p.333. Many of the courtbooks for Still's episcopate are too damaged to be examined.
2. WSRO, Ep.I/17/13 fos.155v-243v, I/17/15 fos.44v-57v,94r-157v, I/17/19 fos.290r-324r, I/10/34 fos.211r-20r,300v, I/10/35 fos.39v-171r, I/17/20 fos.1r-18v, I/17/21, I/10/36 fos.85v-242r, I/17/22 fos.10r,17v.
3. EDR,D/2/23 fos.132r,159r,165r, D/2/25 fos.37v,38r.
4. GDR,86-7, 90 fo.335, 93 fo.161v, 98 fos.76r-8r,142r-268v, 101, 103 fo.239ff, 108, 117 fos.143r-302r, 125 p.337, 142 fos.61v,86r.
5. Marchant, Church under the Law, pp.35 fn.4, 37; NNRO, Vis/5 (unfoliated: 1 June 1620), Act/58b (unfoliated: 21 October 1628), Reg/15/21 ii. fos.1v-2r; Bodl., Tanner MS 138 fo.137. There is no evidence of Overall's role in the consistory during his brief tenure of the see, 1618-9.
6. HRO, C 70-83.

preaching.[66] Another episcopal chaplain, Arthur Lake, combined the offices of Dean of Worcester and Archdeacon of Surrey from 1608, and gained an insight into the administration of church courts through his regular attendance at the Winchester Ecclesiastical Commission, which met at Bishop's Waltham under the presidency of his patron, Bishop Thomas Bilson.[67] The administration of a diocese during a sede vacante often fell to a future bishop who could profit from the valuable judicial experience it afforded. Lancelot Andrewes was appointed vicar-general for London diocese during the vacancy of 1594, and John Overall as Dean of St. Paul's performed the same role in 1607 and 1609.[68] Andrewes also served on the Ecclesiastical Commission in London and was a member of the enquiry, established by Archbishop Whitgift in 1594, to investigate the alleged malpractices of the London consistory court.[69] These cases suggest that many Jacobean prelates had received some schooling in the forms and procedures of ecclesiastical law prior to their consecration, which may explain the personal role that bishops such as Harsnett or Lake took in their consistories from the early years of their episcopate.

The evidence presented in Table Two above proves that most resident bishops took a direct part in the running of their consistories. Different patterns of participation can be identified within this general finding. First, there are those bishops who regularly presided in their consistory or audience courts, among whom are Lake, Carleton, Ravis, Parry and, in all probability, Still.[70] Carleton, indeed, not merely presided in Chichester consistory, but also strengthened his control over the relatively autonomous consistory in Lewes archdeaconry by sending his commissary there every month or so to monitor the conduct of the local surrogates.[71] Other bishops sat in consistory until such time as they had reshaped their teams of officials, as was the practice of Harsnett at Chichester and Goldsborough at Gloucester.[72] Bilson of Winchester delegated the supervision of the consistory to subordinates.

However the chance survival of one courtbook for the local Ecclesiastical Commission, which sat in Winchester diocese between about 1605 and 1610, shows him to be presiding at every session to hear serious sexual offences, and cases of recusancy and nonconformity.[73] A precise assessment of the personal role taken by Bishops Jegon and Harsnett of Norwich in their spiritual jurisdiction is hampered by the loss of the court of audience records and many of the consistory office books. Nevertheless, some broad conclusions may be drawn from the fragmentary evidence that survives. As noted above, Jegon quarrelled with chancellor Redmayne after his arrival in Norwich and taught the chancellor to consult him on any major issues that arose in diocesan affairs. This is well illustrated by Redmayne's prosecution of William Sayer, a schismatic layman who was accused of maintaining a mixture of barrowist and anabaptist doctrines. Following Sayer's arrest in Bury St. Edmunds in July 1612, Redmayne wrote to Jegon at Aylsham, promising to follow 'the course by your honor formerly prescribed' and to keep him informed of developments. By October, Redmayne had been defeated by Sayer's trenchant defence of his views, so he asked Jegon for further instructions. Jegon turned to Archbishop Abbot for guidance and followed his advice by handing over Sayer to Sir Edward Coke at the next assizes.[74]

It may appear paradoxical that although Samuel Harsnett personally supervised his consistory in Chichester, he virtually never attended his court at Norwich. The explanation for this lies in the contrasting size and administrative structure of each diocese. Chichester was a modest-sized diocese of about two hundred and fifty parishes over which a diligent bishop could maintain a watching brief, but in Norwich delegation was the hallmark of any episcopal administration, for the see contained over one thousand one hundred parishes. In the heart of Norwich diocese lay England's second city, so that Harsnett's obligations as leader of county society and justice of the peace were correspondingly more onerous in Norwich than in Chichester.[75] The

Bishop kept a tight control on episcopal rights of institution in both dioceses, and this absorbed a much higher proportion of his time at Norwich than at Chichester, as he accepted resignations from livings, informed patrons of benefices falling vacant, established the ius patronatus of disputed livings and examined candidates for institution to livings.[76] The number of clergy who were admitted to benefices is one crude index of the increased amount of time that Harsnett devoted to these duties in Norwich diocese. In Chichester he instituted on average eighteen ministers each year, in Norwich fifty-five.[77] The fact that Harsnett's consistory was less powerful in Norwich than at Chichester may account in part for his policy of delegation, but other sources attest to his active interest in the conformity of corporation lecturers in the diocese, the more recalcitrant of whom he suspended, probably through his audience court.[78]

Two resident bishops from the sample of six dioceses took only a very minor part in the routine exercise of spiritual justice. The first was Martin Heton of Ely. Although he never sat in consistory, Heton did handle a number of thorny problems in the privacy of his manor house at Downham. This is very evident during the subscription campaign of the winter of 1604-5 when month by month Heton examined a number of nonconformist ministers and succeeded in reconciling their precisionist scruples with the requirements of the canons, with the result that no minister was removed from his benefice.[79] Miles Smith of Gloucester also took little part in consistory business, after an initial burst of enthusiasm in the first years of his episcopate. To judge from the marginalia in the courtbooks, Smith may have found the work of the consistory to be uncongenial. Smith presided in consistory for the first in September 1613 but departed abruptly, halfway through proceedings, to the evident surprise of his registrar.[80]

Although the episcopal consistory administered office, instance and record jurisdiction, all these prelates concentrated their finite time on hearing

office cases. Even bishops such as Carleton of Chichester, who presided regularly in court, displayed little consistent interest in the routine exercise of record administration, which was entered as 'negotium' in the act books and covered the grant of probates and administrations, of marriage licences and faculties to alter church fabric and furnishings. The same is broadly true of the enormous volume of instance business handled by the consistory. This may have been the result, in part, of unfamiliarity with the complexities of the plenary procedure used in instance jurisdiction, which might involve the issue of libels and counter-allegations, the administration of interrogatories to witnesses, the insertion of additional libels, exceptions or exhibits, and the declaration of interlocutory and final sentences. These causes were heard over many weeks, so that for bishops such as Harsnett at Chichester who presided periodically, there was less opportunity for decisive intervention than in office jurisdiction, where cases were processed summarily. Although bishops might be drawn into certain causes,[81] there was no attempt to resolve suits by arbitration, a policy used successfully by Robert Sherburne, the Henrician bishop of Chichester.[82] This is not altogether surprising since it would fly in the face of the vested interests of the registrar, proctors, and surrogates of the consistory, who derived their principal profit from instance rather than office business.

* * * * *

While it was common for prelates to judge office business in person, few made an impression on the disciplinary policy of their consistories. However, as the source for this analysis, the records of office jurisdiction contain certain important limitations. Either through scribal indolence or error, the accusations against defendants are sometimes not recorded, and on occasions cases inexplicably disappear from the act books, although such omissions do

not occur frequently.[83] Nor are the court books a complete record of office business, but rather of that transacted in the consistory and in some informal sessions between sittings, a lacuna of some significance when bishops were as active outside the court as within it. Both Lake and Harsnett are cases in point. At Bath & Wells, the act books often record clergy and laity being summoned to appear before the Bishop in Wells palace on unspecified charges, while at Chichester Samuel Harsnett dispensed justice at his various manors outside Chichester city, with the result that many defendants appeared in court only to report that the Bishop had already judged their case.[84] The consistory had available the disciplinary weapons of admonition, penance and excommunication against lay malefactors, and the content of the first presents some problems. From the terse entries in the court acta, it is difficult to ascertain how sternly or perfunctorily the 'pia monicione' was administered by the bishop or his officials. In the 1560s John Jewel of Salisbury had advised Parkhurst of Norwich that when he sat in consistory he should encourage his chancellor to be severe, so that the Bishop could then be seen to display a degree of mercy.[85] If this recommendation were heeded in Jacobean consistories, it is not evident from the crabbed jottings of the registrar who recorded the proceedings before him. Moreover, the fact that very different punishments were meted out to defendants answering similar charges suggests that the judge looked to the criminal as much as to the crime, although the reasoning is rarely apparent.[86]

Only a small number of bishops had a discernible influence on the routine administration of office business through the consistory. For the six dioceses under discussion, four prelates - Heton of Ely, Harsnett and Carleton of Chichester and Lake of Bath & Wells - tried to re-invigorate the disciplinary tools of the consistory. Critics of the diocesan courts claimed that the censures of the consistory were often vitiated either by the pronouncement of excommunication for trifling offences or by the commutation of penance into

a fine.[87] These four bishops addressed this criticism. In the midst of the controversy over ecclesiastical discipline in the summer of 1604, the consistory at Ely systematically re-examined all office cases since 1601 which had ended in sentences of excommunication being pronounced against defendants, generally for repeated failure to answer the presentments made against them. Fresh citations were served through the apparitors, and excommunication was only re-imposed the following March for the intransigent absence of some defendants. Although it is unclear whether or not this policy was devised by Bishop Heton, it may well have been intended as a timely rejoinder to puritan allegations that sentences of excommunication were often decreed on the most trivial of pretexts.[88]

The practice of commutation contained two major abuses. Its indiscriminate use allowed notorious culprits to escape the punishment of public penance and it also presented a tempting opportunity for officials to peculate the money. The synodal articles of 1575 regulated procedure by stating that commutations should be granted only with the approval of the bishop, and the provincial articles of 1584 added that these grants should be infrequent.[89] Although no specific reference was made to commutation in the canons of 1604, several Jacobean articles of visitation alluded to these Elizabethan injunctions when they enquired about the number of penances which had been commuted and the use to which the mulct had been put.[90] George Carleton showed his awareness of the problem within a month of arriving in Chichester, when he instructed his diocesan officials to grant commutations only with his prior consent, an order which seems to have been observed, not least because Carleton himself sat regularly in his consistory.[91] Although the act books for the preceding years record few penances being commuted, Carleton was acting on information from John Cradocke, a civil lawyer who had run the consistory in Harsnett's latter years as bishop, and who evidently felt the practice should be improved.

Izaak Walton stated that Arthur Lake went further than this and 'very rarely or never' permitted penances to be commuted.[92] This claim cannot be substantiated from the consistory records, which show that commutations were granted fairly regularly under Lake, even if the number was markedly smaller than under his predecessor.[93] This reduction may have been the fruit of deliberate policy, but because the occasions are not recorded when petitions for commutations were refused, this remains unproven.[94] Probably no significance should be attached to the fact that Lake never personally granted any commutations, since the Bishop did not sit regularly in his consistory and preferred to hear particular cases in his palace; moreover, the close watch that he kept over his consistory makes it inconceivable that so many petitions for commutations were accepted in defiance of his wishes.[95]

Lake's distinctive contribution to spiritual jurisdiction lay in his habit of preaching sermons of mortification in the Cathedral at the public penance of infamous offenders, a practice without parallel among the Jacobean episcopate. Lake may have taken the idea from the medieval ordinal of Wells Cathedral, which made provision for a penitential sermon,[96] but it is equally plausible that he devised the custom himself in the belief that his powerful preaching, much admired by contemporaries,[97] would lead the malefactor to repentance and make the occasion something other than an empty ritual. Once the sermon was over and the confession read out, Lake himself pronounced the absolution and then entertained the penitent to dinner in Wells palace, where he would reiterate more privately the importance of genuine contrition.[98] Ten of these sermons survive, five delivered to penitents guilty of incest, one to a blasphemer, another to a bigamist and three to schismatics, and they represent the culmination of judicial proceedings supervised by the Bishop himself.[99] Lake was notified by his chancellor when such cases were presented in his consistory and he handled them himself. Thus he intervened in only four presentments arising from his primary visitation of 1617, three

concerning incest and the fourth sexual promiscuity.[100] Those who were found guilty faced the full sanctions of ecclesiastical law, undergoing public penance in their parish and decanal churches and in the Cathedral of St. Andrew in Wells. Public penance in the cathedral church was an occasional requirement in a number of dioceses, including Bath & Wells, but Lake imposed it with greater regularity than his predecessors.[101] In March 1618 William Sheppard of Pitcombe was convicted of fathering his sister's child and was ordered to perform public penance on three successive Sundays, ending with his appearance at Wells Cathedral on Palm Sunday. At the last moment he was instructed to do penance at Wells after Easter, since Lake had unexpectedly been called to London on royal business and would not return until then.[102] Lake sometimes added his own personal touches to penance in the Cathedral. In November 1625 he ordered Anthony Sage to stand barefoot before the episcopal throne in the Cathedral, in addition to wearing the traditional placard on his back, inscribed with the words 'Ffor incest with his wives sister'.[103] Lake's preoccupation with incestuous crime, which he described as 'bestial' and worse than adultery, is noteworthy since it runs counter to the claims of some historians that incest was not regarded with peculiar abhorrence in the early seventeenth century.[104] The content of these sermons provides the only clues to their efficacy. Particularly striking is Lake's ability to resist an abstruse theological exposition and instead to apply his text directly to the crime of the penitent standing before him, drawing from it a series of relevant moral precepts.[105] Lake's intention in preaching on these occasions is best expressed in the words of a prayer he composed at the conclusion of one sermon:[106]

> I pray God that by that which we have heard, we may all be perswaded to keepe our vessels in honor and not in the lusts of concupiscence, as doe the Gentiles which know not God; and for you that are the penitents, I pray that you may duly consider what iudgements you now feele and may further feare, for your sinnes; that you may have grace to make use of the Churches censures

and be humbled as you ought by them; that so timely preventing by religiously trembling at the judgements of God that hang over you, and may make a fearefull desolation of you, you may returne to God in grace and He may returne to you in mercie, He may be reconciled unto you and you may have peace with him for ever. To this prayer made for ourselves, made for these penitents, let us all, penitents and spectators, let all the people say, Amen.

The exacting penances imposed by Lake for certain crimes were matched by those devised by Samuel Harsnett against Sabbath-breakers in Chichester diocese. It is unclear what position Harsnett adopted towards the doctrine of the morally-binding Sabbath, yet he proved to be a vigorous opponent of Sabbath-breakers on several occasions during his ten years at Chichester. Punishments for profaning the Sabbath varied from diocese to diocese. Offenders in Bath & Wells were usually required to perform a semi-private penance in the chancel after divine service in the presence of the minister, churchwardens and one or two parishioners, while Ely consistory merely warned offenders before dismissing them.[107] Chichester consistory was less predictable. Offenders might be required to perform penances in the chancel or before the congregation, and on occasions the judge also added that the penitent should procure a sermon on the theme of respect for the Sabbath.[108] Although he had sat periodically in consistory from 1611, Harsnett's interest in the problem only surfaced in the winter of 1613. On his specific orders, a number of laity were summoned to answer charges that they had cut and reaped barley on Sunday afternoons during the previous August. Five were found guilty and were ordered to stand at Chichester market-cross for an hour, dressed in white with scythes beside them, and to confess the crime in their parish church the following Sunday.[109] Such public penances were normally reserved for serious sexual crimes, including bastardy,[110] and there was no precedent for Harsnett's severe sentences for this offence. Between 1616 and 1618 several Sabbath-breakers received identical punishments, and others were ordered by the Bishop to confess their fault, dressed in white, before the whole

congregation.[111] It would be misleading to describe these sentences as part of a policy, for Harsnett displayed only intermittent interest in the topic, and his surrogates regularly allowed Sabbath-breakers to confess their fault not in the body of the church, but in the semi-privacy of the chancel.[112] Indeed, no drive against the offence was ever instigated in Lewes archdeaconry.[113] It seems, therefore, that Harsnett occasionally felt compelled to make an example of Sabbath-breakers as a deterrent to others, but he did not pursue this matter with any consistency.

Harsnett also enforced the canons governing excommunication. Canon 65 of 1604 stipulated that excommunicate persons were to be denounced every six months in their cathedral and parish churches during divine worship. In December 1612 Harsnett reminded all ministers of the provisions of this canon, presumably because it was being neglected, and shortly afterwards the consistory act books began to record the occasions when these excommunicates were denounced in the Cathedral.[114] The diocesan archive throws no light on the success of this injunction, but Harsnett's concern with the subject is evident elsewhere. Although Harsnett's articles of visitation for Chichester are not extant, those for his primary visitation of Norwich specifically enquire if this canon is observed by the parish clergy, in contrast to the set compiled by his predecessor Overall.[115]

Under George Carleton, Harsnett's successor at Chichester, there was a sharp rise in the number of cases initiated by the judge ex officio mero. Traditionally the Chichester consistory rarely proceeded by the judge's mere motion, there being, for example, only two cases prosecuted in this manner between May 1613 and September 1615.[116] Table Three overleaf sets out the twenty-three ex officio mero cases begun in consistory during the last eighteen months of George Carleton's episcopate, between November 1626 and his death in May 1628, a period in which the diocesan records are almost complete. The procedure of ex officio mero cases ran as follows. The

Table Three: Ex Officio Mero cases instigated in Chichester consistory, November 1626 - May 1628.

Name and parish of defendants	Offence
Thomas Champion & Andrew Gates, churchwardens of Broadwater:	? Negligence in compiling presentments.
Thomas Smith of Binderton:	Defamation of the consistory.
Thomas Humphrey als.Adams of Chiltington:	Absence from church, Sabbath-breaking with his servants.
Edward Picknoll,William Cowper & Alice Cooke of Henfield:	Not specified.
Thomas Greene of Amberley	Incest.
John Middleton,churchwarden of Arundel:	Opening shop on Sabbath & holy days.
Edward Greenfield of Chiltington:	Sexual intercourse with Mary Baylie.
William Greenfield of Chiltington:	Absence from church & causing others to be absent.
Mary Baylie of Chiltington:	Sexual intercourse with Edward Greenfield & Richard Searle.
Richard Searle of Chiltington:	Sexual intercourse with Mary Baylie.
Francis Greenfield of Chiltington:	Sabbath-breaking.
Reginald Denn of Chiltington:	Causing others to profane the Sabbath.
William Collinson, vicar of Bury:	Negligence and alehouse drinking.
Thomas Court, churchwarden of Westhampnett:	Sabbath-breaking, absence from church, neglecting to present.
Francis & Susan Mercie als.Massey of Tillington:	Pre-nuptial sexual intercourse, absence from and violence in church.
Mr Packe, churchwarden of Rogate:	Not specified.
William Keyes of Tillington:	Drinking during divine service.
Edward Sturt of Tillington:	Ibid.
Stephen Haulen of Tillington:	Ibid.
John Sprinkes, churchwarden of Woolavington:	Sabbath-breaking, absence from church.
Philip Crapley of Petworth:	Sabbath-breaking, absence from church on holy days.
William Bartholomew, churchwarden of Donnington:	Sabbath-breaking, negligence.
John & Thomas Upperton of Rustington:	Hunting during divine service.

Sources: WSRO, Ep.I/17/22 fos.1r-184v, I/10/37 fo.195v, I/15/1 Boxes 139, 172 fo. 12, I/15/3/25-6.

defendant would be summoned to answer allegations which had been bought to the attention of the judge, who would appoint a proctor to be the 'necessary' promoter of the suit if he remained sceptical of the innocence of the accused. Articles would be administered to the defendant, depositions might be taken from witnesses, and the case would be concluded several weeks later with the declaration of a formal sentence. If guilty, the defendant would perform public penance and pay substantial expenses. Thomas Greene of Amberley, for example, was cited to appear in Chichester consistory on 28 September 1627 on a charge of incest with his stepdaughter, and a proctor was selected to pursue the suit on behalf of the judge. The following session Greene received a set of articles to answer, but he failed to reappear in court and was excommunicated in early November. Later that same month Greene did admit his culpability, underwent public penance in his parish church and paid fees of 39s 10d.[117] The growth in ex officio mero cases was of obvious financial benefit to the judge, proctors and registrar; and court discipline bit more deeply than when it had relied exclusively on summary procedure. The time, energy and high costs involved in attending the consistory over a number of weeks were as effective a punishment as the public penance that miscreants had to perform. It is not clear how these cases reached the ear of Carleton and his surrogates, for the biannual presentment bills continued to be processed summarily.[118] Sometimes the Bishop acted on personal knowledge and issued his own citations against offenders;[119] on other occasions the charges arose from information disclosed during an instance suit between parties.[120] Canons 113 and 116 allowed ministers, churchwardens and sidesmen to present at any time of year, which may be one explanation of this growth in cases, yet, because many bills of cost list 12d to be paid 'for detection', it seems more likely that apparitors were responding to official encouragement to submit presentments themselves.[121]

Table Three also indicates the type of cases proceeded against ex officio

mero. William Collinson was the only clergyman in this eighteen-month period to be prosecuted by this method. He was charged with drunkenness and negligence, and, although he promised to amend his conduct, he was deprived of his living within two months of his dismissal by the court.[122] The rest of the cases concerned the laity, who often faced a string of charges. It is significant that over a quarter of these involved negligent churchwardens, those parish officers upon whom the consistory depended for full and accurate presentments. The heavy expenses incurred by these suits were surely intended to remind other churchwardens to observe their oaths. This is very apparent from the penance schedule that John Leece, churchwarden of Eartham, was ordered to read out before ten parishioners, his minister, and fellow churchwarden in November 1626:[123]

> Whereas I being one of the churchwardens of this parrishe and also sworne to make true presentment of all such faults and offences as were comitted within this parrish contrary to the articles given in charge and being also by vertue of my office authorized and appoynted to provide bread and wyne for the comunicants, I have notwithstanding contrary to the duty of my office neglected to provide sufficient wyne...uppon the eighth day of October last...and have also my self bin divers tymes absent from my said parrishe church at divine service uppon holy dayes contrary to the lawes in the behalf provided. And have neglected to present my self therefore I am hartily sorry that I have offended desiring you here present to accept of this my penitent submission and I promise never to [do] agayne in [the] same kinde.

Who was responsible for this decision to proceed ex officio mero? The growth of these cases dates from the summer of 1621, shortly after the arrival of Francis Ringstead, a civil lawyer from Cambridge, who immediately took full control of the consistory.[124] Bishop Carleton's own role cannot be completely discounted, however. His dissatisfaction with the surrogates whom he had inherited from Harsnett sprang primarily from their lack of legal training, and behind his insistence on being served by a properly qualified lawyer there may have been the desire to modify the disciplinary policy of the consistory.

Indeed Carleton's constant attendance in his court implies that he saw the exercise of spiritual discipline as a prime function of his office. It seems reasonable, therefore, to attribute the growth of ex officio mero cases to both Carleton and Ringstead.

It is probable that the bishops who sat regularly in their consistories were also diligent members of the commission of the peace. Successive Parliamentary statutes authorised justices to complement the work of the consistory courts, and prosecute, among others, recusants and Sabbath-breakers.[125] The manner in which secular and spiritual authorities could work hand-in-glove is illustrated neatly by the punishment of Henry West, a Somerset weaver who had blasphemously baptised a cup of beer in an alehouse in the winter of 1620. In his capacity as a justice, Bishop Lake ordered him to be whipped before four witnesses while the archdeacon of Wells enjoined public penance upon him.[126] Preliminary research indicates that Bishops Lake, Harsnett and Carleton all attended the quarter sessions in their cathedral cities, as other resident prelates from these six dioceses may also have done.[127]

* * * * *

The control of the consistory by court prelates who resided outside their dioceses has been outlined in brief elsewhere. It was suggested that both Bishops Andrewes and Neile recruited a corps of clerical and legal servants, who followed them from see to see and fed them with information on local affairs.[128] One testimony to Andrewes's knowledge of diocesan matters is the campaigns which he initiated through the courts against non-residence in Ely and against poorly-furnished parochial communion tables at Winchester.[129] At other times, however, his consistory processed office business in routine fashion, apparently undisturbed by further episcopal directives.[130] A picture

of tranquil administration also emerges from an analysis of the courtbooks for Felton's time at Ely and Mountagu's rule at Bath & Wells, although the latter did occasionally preside in consistory during his annual visit to the diocese.[131] In short, several court prelates did not ignore their spiritual jurisdiction, though delegation was, predictably, the main feature of their government.

* * * * *

The zealous bishop who exercised both the rod of discipline and the staff of the gospel was a familar image in early seventeenth century sermons.[132] One argument, developed in the last two chapters, has been that this exemplar was translated into practice through the regular attendance of many Jacobean bishops on visitation and in consistory. In view of the many roles that these prelates performed at national as well as county level, the fact that few bishops modified the disciplinary policy of their courts is less revealing than their regular presence in audience or consistory.

Footnotes to Chapter Four

1. Featley, Clavis Mystica, p.131.

2. Lougher, A sermon preached at Cern, sig.A2r-Br.

3. Each of these six dioceses has a respectable run of consistory court material.

4. Canon 122.

5. In cases of particular notoriety, the judge might take up the case ex officio mero, appoint a proctor as a necessary promoter and proceed plenarily. See, for example, the cases v. Richard Barwicke and Thomas Bide: WSRO, Ep.I/15/3/20, bound file of depositions v. Barwicke, fo.17, I/17/17 fos.114r,118r,137v,138v, I/22/1 fo.72, I/17/20 fos.185v-233v, I/15/3/22 fos.125-6.

6. This section rests heavily on Ingram, 'Ecclesiastical Justice in Wiltshire', pp.6-8,23-34 and the sources there cited.

7. H.E. Reynolds, Wells Cathedral: its Foundation, Constitutional History and Statutes (Leeds, 1881), pp.cxl-clxix; J.S.W. Gibson, Wills and where to find them (1974), pp.82-3,116-7,144-5.

8. F.W. Steer & I.M. Kirby, Diocese of Chichester: a Catalogue of the Records of the Bishop, Archdeacons and former Exempt Jurisdictions (Chichester, 1966), pp.xxii-iii.

9. Houlbrooke, Church Courts and the People, pp.31-4; Stieg, Laud's Laboratory, p.168.

10. D.M. Owen, Ely Records. A Handlist of the Records of the Bishop and Archdeacons of Ely (Cambridge, 1971), p.71.

11. S. Lander, 'Church Courts and the Reformation in the diocese of Chichester, 1500-58' in Continuity and Change, pp.215-21.

12. LPL, MS 943 p.619; Marchant, Church under the Law, pp.35 fn.4, 37.

13. One notable exception is the Audience courtbook for Chaderton of

Lincoln, LAO, Cj/11-4,16(I), analysed by Hajzyk, 'The Church in Lincolnshire', pp.35-8. More typical are the records for Ely diocese, where a court of audience is mentioned in the patent apppointing William Gager to be Vicar-General and Official Principal in 1606, but no trace of its actions now survive: EDC, 2/6/1 fos.185r-6r. There also exists a precedent book (EDR, F/5/40) of forms used in the provincial court of Audience in the 1610s, which may imply that court officials needed to familiarise themselves with the procedure of an audience court. I owe this point to Mrs D.M. Owen.

14. A minor jurisdictional dispute arose in Bath & Wells in 1623, which Bishop Lake smoothed over. Bodl., Tanner MS 73 fo.376, Arthur Lake to Samuel Ward, ?November 1623. Disputes did occur in Lincoln and Exeter dioceses, however. Hajzyk, 'The Church in Lincolnshire', pp.14-21; J.A. Vage, 'Ecclesiastical discipline in the early seventeenth century: some findings and some problems from the archdeaconry of Cornwall', Journal of the Society of Archivists, vii. (1982), pp.100-1.

15. LPL, Reg.Abbot i. fo.158v; WSRO, Ep.IV/4/1 fo.121.

16. W. Dansey, Horae Decanicae Rurales, being an attempt to illustrate... the names and title of Rural Deans (2 vols, 1835), i. pp.85,109. Although rural deans were appointed in Ely, Norwich and Winchester dioceses in the sixteenth century, I have found no record of their Jacobean successors: Collinson, The Religion of Protestants, pp.127-8; Houlbrooke, Church Courts and the People, p.34.

17. SRO, D/D/Ca 174 fo.108v.

18. SRO, D/D/Ca 148 (unfoliated: 20 November 1606), 151 (unfoliated: 30 October 1606). See also R.W. Dunning, 'Rural deans in the Fifteenth Century', BIHR, xl. (1967), pp.207-11.

19. GDR, 96 p.111, 110 pp.81,185. The episcopal register does record an occasion when the rural dean was instructed to induct a new

incumbent: GDR, 27A p.323.

20. WSRO, Ep.I/18/27 fos.12v,14v,19r,24v, I/18/28 fos.11r-41v, II/11/1 fo.126v. The episcopal chaplains were Thomas Emerson and Humphrey Booth (1606), William Wady (1611) and Godfrey Moore (1617). BL, Add.MSS 39533 fos.59r,80r,102r, 39534 fo.4v.

21. WSRO, Ep.II/11/1 fo.126v. For the background to this decision, see above pp.69-70 and below pp.182-3.

22. WSRO, Ep.I/18/27 fos.15r,24v, I/20/7 fos.40,46,48.

23. George Downame, Two Sermons, the one commending the Ministerie in generall: the other defending the Office of Bishops in particular (1608), sig.A3ir.

24. Borth., Precedent Book ii. pp.105-7,225-8,232-4,253-5,268-70; OCRO, MS Oxf.Dioc.Papers c.264 fos.4r,81r-3r; NNRO, Reg/15/21 ii. fos.31r-2r; WRO, Reg.Cotton fo.36v; WSRO, Cap.I/27/2 fo.128. Dr Houlbrooke has found for the mid-sixteenth century that these patents were generally revocable. Houlbrooke, Church Courts and the People, p.24.

25. Usher, Reconstruction, ii. p.343.

26. SRO, D/D/0 i. (unfoliated & undated correspondence,c.1596); Abstracts of Somersetshire Wills, ed. F. Brown (6 vols., 1887-90), iii. p.49; HMC, 12 Wells Cathedral MSS, ii. pp.336-7; Hembry, The Bishops of Bath & Wells 1540-1640, pp.136-8; Bodl., MS Eng.hist. c.475 fo.138.

27. See above p.40.

28. Lake appointed Duck and Rivett overseers of his will, gave bequests to each, stood as godfather to one of Rivett's sons and officiated at Duck's marriage. His correspondence with Ward testifies to their friendship. Barlow and Lake were contemporaries at New College and were both Archdeacons under Bishop Bilson. In his will, Barlow reproduced verbatim the preamble to Lake's will and asked to be buried near the Bishop's tomb. Like Lake, Barlow was an indefatigable

preacher and therefore may be included in the Wells-Winchester connection described by Professor Collinson. Lake, Sermons, sig.S2iiv,+2; PRO, Prob.11/149/99, 160/123; Somersetshire Wills, ii. p.112; Samuel Clarke, A Collection of the Lives of Ten Eminent Divines (1662), p.489; Bodl., Tanner MS 74 fos.13,20,24,63,174,190; HRO, D/1/D pp.14,70; Collinson, The Religion of Protestants, pp.85-6. In his thesis on the Somerset clergy, Mr Timothy Peake has argued that 'lax enforcement and the non-detection of non-conformity' characterised the last years of Lake's administration. Appendix XI assesses his argument in detail. (Peake, 'The Somerset Clergy and the Church Courts', pp.86-95,135-50).

29. Babbage, Puritanism & Richard Bancroft, pp.43-64. The conference was originally scheduled for 1st November, but was deferred to January 1604 due to plague.

30. These instructions made no discernible impression upon the diocesan administrations of Bath & Wells, Chichester, Ely and Winchester. However, they did elicit a response in Lincoln: Hajzyk, 'The Church in Lincolnshire', p.26.

31. Harison, Registrum Vagum, i. pp.24-34,40-50; Marchant, Church under the Law, p.35; NNRO, Har/2 fo.298r.

32. Marchant, op.cit., pp.35 fn.4, 37. Redmayne's tone to Jegon was thereafter cautious and conciliatory: Harison, Registrum Vagum, i. p.190.

33. WSRO, Ep.I/17/19 fos.74r,82,84r,88v.

34. WSRO, Ep.I/1/8 fos.58r,61v,63r,65r,66v-7v; PRO, Prob.11/160/78, 154/82, SP 16/210/36; BL, Add.MS 39534 fo.42r.

35. WSRO, Ep.I/1/8 fo.58v, I/17/17-8, IV/2/12 fo.57r; LPL, Reg.Abbot ii. fos.180v-1r. See B.P. Levack, The Civil Lawyers in England 1603-1641 (Oxford, 1973), pp.221-2.

36. WSRO, Ep.I/17/19 fos.90v,95r, I/10/34 fos.117v,121v, II/9/16 fo.45v, II/1/1 fo.21r.

37. WSRO, Ep.I/17/19 fo.139r ff, I/17/20-22 fo.17v.

38. WSRO, Ep.I/18/28 fos.35v,38v, I/17/19 fos.265r,267r,275r,290r,323r. After Ringstead's arrival, Buckenham's role as surrogate was largely confined to granting absolutions from excommunication: ibid., fos.188r, 225r,283v.

39. Price, 'Bishop Bullingham and Chancellor Blackleech', pp.179-98.

40. [Prynne], A Looking-Glasse, p.9.

41. R. O'Day, 'The Role of the Registrar in Diocesan Administration' in Continuity & Change, pp.89-90.

42. Namely William Baker (Abbot), William Greene (Andrewes), Simon Biby (Barlow), Mr Howell (Buckeridge), Owen Hodges (Chaderton), Richard Evans (Harsnett), Anthony Harison (Jegon), William Woodhouse (Lake), Thomas Gleeston (Mountagu), Anthony Alcock (Watson) and William Boswell (Williams). PRO, Prob.11/149/99, 164/85; WSRO, Ep.I/1/8 fos.1r,33v, I/9 fos.328,375, I/70 fo.21, I/15/3/19 fo.35; NNRO, Pre/16; SRO, D/D/Ca 171 fo.267r; Hajzyk, 'The Church in Lincolnshire', pp.32,71; English Orders for Consecrating Churches in the Seventeenth Century, ed. J. Wickham Legg (Henry Bradshaw Society, xli. 1911), p.337; Hacket, Scrinia Reserata, i. p.86.

43. Bodl., Tanner MS 228 fo.96v.

44. Borth., Precedent Book ii. passim, which is Greene's formulary.

45. WSRO, Ep.I/1/8 fos.1r-56r; PRO, E 331 Chichester/3 and Ely/7, which are written in the hands of Alcock and Greene.

46. Hajzyk, 'The Church in Lincolnshire', pp.28-33. In Bath & Wells, the register and returns to the Exchequer are in the hand of the registrar, Edward Huish. SRO, D/D/B Reg.19; PRO, E 331 Bath & Wells/2. For the role of Woodhouse, Lake's secretary, see D/D/Ca 223 fo.227,

D/D/Cd 55 (unfoliated: Harvy v. Smart).

47. There is no hint in the very copious diocesan papers that Carleton had a secretary: WSRO, Ep.I/15 Boxes 131-140.

48. WSRO, Ep/I/1/8 fos.58r-73v, I/70 fos.16-23, I/9 fos.328,363,375, I/51/3 fo.206r; NNRO, Reg/16/22 i. fos.81r-4r, ii. fos.1r-33r.

49. NNRO, Reg/15/21 fos.1r-45r, Reg/16/22 i. fos.1r-73v; Harison, Registrum Vagum, i. p.104. Profit may have been another motive for this action: see below pp.243-4. For Harison's influential role in the distribution of episcopal livings, see CUL, MS Mm 6.58 fos.212v-3r.

50. EDC, 2/6/1 fo.201r.

51. Acts of the Dean & Chapter of...Chichester, p.233; WSRO, Ep.I/17/22 fos.20r-184r. See appendix XIV.

52. HMC, 12 Wells Cathedral MSS, ii. p.332; Thomas Otterbourne, Duo Rerum Anglicarum Scriptores Veteres (2 vols., Oxford, 1732), ii. p.715; SRO, D/D/Ca 142 p.83, 138, 141, 146, 152.

53. Borth., Precedent Book ii. pp.103-7; WSRO, Ep.I/17/8 fos.40r,347r; BL, Add.MS 33410 fos.22,76.

54. WSRO, Ep.I/17/13 fos.155v-243v, I/10/30 fos.3r,5v,7r,10v, I/17/15 fos. 45r,49v,57v,94r,102v,122v,126; NNRO, ANW/30/23, passim. See also appendix XIII.

55. WSRO, Ep.I/17/13 fo.202v.

56. WSRO, Cap.I/27/2 fo.128; W.G. Benham, 'Pedigree of Archbishop Samuel Harsnett', Essex Review, xl. (Colchester, 1931), pp.108-9.

57. Corbett did appear in Chichester to conduct Abbot's metropolitical visitation of 1615: WSRO, Ep.I/17/17 fos.1r,7r.

58. WSRO, Ep.I/9 fo.313; and see above, footnotes 34-5.

59. WSRO, Ep.I/17/17 fos.78v,84v,105v. See appendix XIII.

60. Thomas Muriell and Theophilus Kent. WSRO, Ep.I/1/8 fos.64v,65r, 68r,72v; BL, Add.MS 39533 fo.119v; Minute Books of the Dean &

Chapter of Norwich Cathedral, p.57.

61. Ibid., pp.60,62; NNRO, Act/56, sixth gathering, fo.24.

62. Levack, Civil Lawyers, pp.63-5; Cassidy, 'The Episcopate of Willliam Cotton', pp.118-20.

63. R. Houlbrooke, 'The Protestant Episcopate 1547-1603: the Pastoral Contribution' in Church and Society in England: Henry VIII to James I, ed. F. Heal & R. O'Day (1977), pp.81-2.

64. Eleven bishops never held deaneries, archdeaconries or vice-chancellorships (Robert Abbot, Bridgeman, Carleton, Davenant, Felton, Field, Hanmer, Searchfield, Smith, Snowden and Wright); four more (Barlow, Laud, Henry Parry and Senhouse) were deans of cathedrals of the New Foundation and possessed no spiritual jurisdiction outside the close.

65. GL, MS 9537/9; John Darrell, A Detection of that sinnfull shamful lying and ridiculous Discours of Samuel Harshnet entituled: a Discoverie of the fradulent Practises of Iohn Darrell (1600), sig.Ar. During the period 1598-1609 Harsnett also occasionally assisted at the ordination of ministers: GL, MS 9535/2 fos.87r,134v.

66. Kalu, 'The Jacobean Church and Essex Puritans', p.128; EDR, B/2/29 fos.5v,14v, D/2/29 fos.1r,7r-8r; Baynes, The Diocesans Tryall, sig.A2v; Thomas Taylor, Works (1653), sig.b2v.

67. HRO, C 73 fos.1r-9r,19r,27r,31v-43v,50r-1v.

68. GLRO, Lib.VG Stanhope ii. fo.186v; GL, MS 14279; LPL, Reg. Bancroft, fos.236r-7r,257v-8r.

69. Samuel Harsnett, A Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures, to withdraw the harts of her Maiesties Subiects from their Allegeance, and from the Truth of Christian Religion professed in England, under the pretence of casting out devils... (1603), pp.173,203; John Strype, The Life and Acts of the most reverend father in God John Whitgift

(1718), p.418.

70. The personal role of Lake and Carleton in consistory business is set out in appendices XII & XIV.

71. WSRO, Ep.II/9/16 fos.65v,67v,73r,78r,85r,86v,90r, II/9/17 fos.4r,16v, 36v, II/9/18 (irregular foliation) fos.168v,174r,8v,9r,58r,60v. Lewes consistory was run by William Inians and John Chauntrell, rectors of St John sub-Castro and All Saints Lewes. The difference between the two courts is not easy to exaggerate: they sat on different days, at different intervals, and even the scribal phraseology is markedly dissimilar.

72. For Harsnett's participation in Chichester consistory, see above pp.105-6 and appendix XIII below. Once Goldsborough had replaced Blackleech as chancellor, he left the administration of the consistory in the hands of his new chancellor, John Seman: GDR, 86 fos.193r,241r, 87 - 90 fo.173r.

73. PRO, SP 14/13/73; HRO, C 73; and see below appendix I.

74. CUL, MS Mm 6.58 ss7, fos.1r-14r.

75. CSPD 1619-1623, pp.260,268,290,292,297,310-1,338,548; CSPD 1623-1625, p.293. Harsnett was thanked by the mayoral court in June 1623 for his 'great paines' on behalf of the city during the previous term: NNRO, NCB/15 fo.481v.

76. See O'Day, The English Clergy, pp.75-85.

77. WSRO, Ep.I/1/8 fos.58r-73v; NNRO, Reg/16/22 ii. fos.1r-33r.

78. K.W. Shipps, 'Lay Patronage of East Anglican Puritan Clerics in pre-Revolutionary England' (Yale Ph.D. thesis, 1971), pp.77,216-42,271-2,305-7.

79. EDR, D/2/23 fos.132r,159r, D/2/25 fos.2r,37v, D/2/26 fos.2v,72r.

80. GDR, 120 (unfoliated: 29 September 1613).

81. See Carleton's prominent role in one case: WSRO, Ep.I/49/33, I/10/35

fos.55r-121r.

82. S. Lander, 'The diocese of Chichester 1508-58' (Cambridge Ph.D. thesis, 1974), pp.84-5.

83. See, for example, WSRO, Ep.I/17/13 fos.141v,196v, I/17/15 fos.100r,117r; SRO, D/D/Ca 232 fo.5v.

84. SRO, D/D/Ca 209 fos.8r,93v, 241 pp.67,73,120; WSRO, Ep.I/17/15 fos. 20v, 57v,125v,152v, I/17/17 fos.72v,89r, I/17/18 fos.11v,14v,131v.

85. Jewel, Workes, p.26.

86. See, for example, WSRO, Ep.I/17/19 fo.10r.

87. Babbage, Puritanism & Richard Bancroft, pp.45,53,65,246-7,255; PRO, SP 14/1/68; Francis Bacon, The Letters and the Life, ed. J. Spedding (7 vols., 1861-74), iii. p.122.

88. Usher, Reconstruction, ii. pp.34-40; EDR, B/2/20-1; and see above, fn.87.

89. Concilia, iv. pp.284,308.

90. See, for example, King, London (1612), sig.Bv, Overall, Norwich (1619), p.10; Harsnett, Norwich (1620), sig.B3iv. The problem persisted, for canon 16 of 1640 reiterated that commutations should be granted only with the express approval of the bishop.

91. WSRO, Ep.I/17/18 fo.253r; see appendix XIV. Parry of Gloucester issued a similar order within two months of sitting in consistory for the first time: GDR, 103 fo.289r.

92. Izaak Walton, Life of Dr Robert Sanderson, late Bishop of Lincoln (1678), sig.b4iv-iir.

93. Under Mountagu, 25 commutations were granted between March and September 1614 in comparison to 21 under Lake between July 1622 and December 1624, and these figures appear to be representative: SRO, D/D/Ca 185 fos.124v-235v, 232.

94. The office books for Salisbury diocese, in contrast, do record petitions

being refused: Ingram, 'Ecclesiastical Justice in Wiltshire', pp.305-6.

95. See appendix XII for Lake's role in consistory business.

96. Reynolds, Wells Cathedral, pp.cxxxii,104.

97. John Ley, Sunday a Sabbath: or, a preparative discourse for discussion of Sabbatary Doubts, being the first part of a greater Worke (1641), p.103; Anthony Wood, Athenae Oxonienses...to which are added the Fasti, or Annals of the said University, ed. P. Bliss (5 vols, 1813-20), ii. p.399.

98. Walton, op.cit., ibid; Lake, Sermons, sig.S2iiv.

99. Lake, Sermons, i. pp.75-95, iv. pp.1-105.

100. SRO, D/D/Ca 204 (unfoliated: office v. William Shepphard of Pitcomb, Thomas Smith of Dunkerton, Thomas Andrewes of Winscombe and Joan Huff of Somerton).

101. SRO, D/D/Ca 141 (unfoliated: office v. John Pennye of Charlton Canfield), 138 fo.214r, 185 fos.133v-4r,139v,140r,243r; WSRO, Ep.I/17/13 fo.213v, I/17/15 fo.146v; GDR, 90 fos.219v,222,229v.

102. SRO, D/D/Ca 204, 209 fos.20r,21r,23r,24v.

103. SRO, D/D/Ca 241 pp.377-8.

104. Lake, Sermons, iv. pp.3-4,12,36; F.G. Emmison, Elizabethan Life: Morals and the Church Courts (Chelmsford, 1973), pp.36-7; Ingram, 'Ecclesiastical Justice in Wiltshire', p.161.

105. Lake, Sermons, iv. pp.3,4,8-9,23-9,33,39-41,45,48.

106. Lake, Sermons, iv. p.52.

107. SRO, D/D/Ca 232 fos.83r,89r,95v,122r,127v; EDR, B/2/35 fos.3v,5r, 21v,27v,32r,43,44v,51r-2r,54r.

108. WSRO, Ep.I/17/13 fos.16r-199r.

109. WSRO, Ep.I/17/15 fos.55v-62v.

110. WSRO, Ep.I/17/15 fos.65v,146v, I/17/17 fo.48v.

111. WSRO, Ep.I/17/15 fos.138r,145v,148r,154v,160v, I/17/17 fo.85r, I/17/18

fos.33v,96r. See also ibid., fo.79r, IV/2/9 fos.68v,69r,78v,IV/2/10 fo.1v.

112. WSRO, Ep.I/17/18 fos.30v,75v,111r,118v,127v.

113. WSRO, Ep.II/9/12-15.

114. WSRO, Ep.I/15/1 Box 130, 1612 folder, fo.136, I/17/15 fos.21r,143v, I/17/17 fo.72v, I/17/18 fos.4v,118v.

115. Harsnett, Norwich (1620), sig.Aii; Overall, Norwich (1619), p.11.

116. WSRO, Ep.I/17/15 fos.137v,171v.

117. WSRO, Ep.I/17/22 fos.101r,103v,112v,121v, I/15/3/26 fos.168,177,192.

118. WSRO, Ep.I/17/19-22; Churchwardens Presentments: Archdeaconry of Chichester ed. H. Johnstone (Sussex Record Society xlix. 1947-8), pp.1-127.

119. For example, office v. Champion & Gates of Broadwater and Picknoll & Cowper of Henfield: WSRO, Ep.I/15/1 Box 137, 1626 folder i, fo.30, I/15/3/26 fo.86, I/17/22 fos.9r,99v,111r.

120. For example, office v. Smith of Angmering: WSRO, Ep.I/10/34 fo.299v, I/15/3/21 fo.65, I/17/20 fos.151v-208v, I/15/1 Box 134,folder 1623-5 v, fos.10,107.

121. WSRO, Ep.I/15/3/26 fos.149,168-9.

122. WSRO, Ep.I/17/22 fos.120v,126r,136v, I/7/1 fo.2v.

123. WSRO, Ep.I/15/1 Box 137, folder 1626 ii, fo.22. The case may be followed in Ep.I/17/21 fos.221r-3r, I/15/3/25 fo.23.

124. WSRO, Ep.I/17/19 fo.139r ff.

125. Marchant, Church under the Law, pp.223-6.

126. SRO, D/D/Cd 56 (unfoliated: Allen v. Ray).

127. Quarter Sessions Records for the county of Somerset i. James I 1607-1625, ed. E.H. Bates (Somerset Record Society, xxiii. 1907), pp.220, 244,264,323,339,353; Fletcher, Sussex 1600-1660, p.235; NNRO, NCB/15 fos.358r,380v, 382r,392r,420r.

128. See above pp.39-40.

129. See above pp.40,71.

130. A comparison of the Ely courtbooks in the time of Andrewes (1609-19) with those of his predecessor Heton (1600-1609) reveals no significant shifts in the volume and type of presentments coming before the courts. This is demonstrated below in appendix XV, where presentments from the ten parishes of Wisbech deanery for four years under Heton (1600-4) are compared with those for four years (1614-8) under Andrewes.

131. See above p.41.

132. See, for example, Featley, Clavis Mystica, p.136.

Chapter Five: The Provision of Pastoral Care by the Episcopate

(i) To the Laity

Central to the episcopal office were a variety of functions which were far removed from the judicial formality of the consistory. The dispensation of hospitality, of spiritual counsel and leadership, the ministration of the Word and the observance of the rites of confirmation and ordination may be numbered among the pastoral or non-judicial roles fulfilled by the bishops of Jacobean England towards the clergy and laity alike. These activities are poorly documented, especially in comparison to the proceedings of the consistory, but for all that they remain essential components of the model of the apostolic bishop and therefore are explored in the next two chapters. Episcopal supervision of the recruitment and performance of the diocesan clergy is treated in Chapter Six, while a select number of themes in the relationship between the bishop and his lay flock are pursued in this chapter. Often the pastoral activities of the episcopate can only be glimpsed from anecdotal evidence, such as the revealing remark in the correspondence of the Wynns of Gwydir that Bishop Parry of St. Asaph taught the children of the local school 'once or twice a week'.[1] Jacobean prelates are invariably praised by pious biographers for observing St. Paul's rule to be hospitable, claims which are difficult to assess since very few household accounts have survived.[2] Sufficient literary and archival evidence does exist, however, to permit a study of confirmation and episcopal preaching in the southern province, which therefore constitutes the subject-matter of this chapter. For different reasons, both topics deserve careful assessment. There is no systematic analysis of the confirmation rite in the dioceses after the Reformation as a result, perhaps, of fragmentary sources; patterns of episcopal preaching also need to be reconstructed, since the dissemination of the Gospel was viewed as

central to the episcopal office in this period. An examination of these two duties suggests that the confirmation office was generally observed in the Jacobean Church and there is considerable evidence that a number of bishops preached with impressive regularity.

* * * * *

The performance of the confirmation rite held a special place among the sacerdotal functions of the episcopate, since it was the only formal occasion that a bishop intruded upon the spiritual life of the laity, for the welfare of whom he was ultimately responsible. Their rites of passage were discharged by the parish clergy and discipline was administered by the personnel of the local consistory, periodically in the company of the bishop. The sheer size of many English sees before the diocesan reorganisation in the mid-nineteenth century, together with the multifarious duties undertaken by the episcopate, produced a physical and personal distance between the bishop and his lay flock, a distance sometimes bridged only by the confirmation ceremony, which therefore received the contemporary sobriquet of 'bishopping'.[3]

Two pertinent questions need to be addressed on the confirmation rite: how often was it performed by the Jacobean episcopate and how much importance did they attach to it? It would be misleading to propose that satisfactory answers can be provided to either of these questions for there is no natural archive for a study of confirmation in the early seventeenth century. Since the confirmation rite was accompanied neither by the observance of legal niceties nor by the levying of fees, there was no obligation for the registrar to keep any official record of proceedings and therefore references must be garnered from miscellaneous material, from memoirs and from letters.[4]

Canons 60 and 61 of 1604 set out the ordinances of the Church of England

on confirmation. They stated that the bishop should confirm at his triennial visitation such children as were able to give an account of their faith according to the catechism in the Book of Common Prayer. It was the responsibility of the minister to ensure that these candidates duly appeared before the bishop. The contiguous canon required parochial clergy to catechise the young and ignorant weekly, which emphasised the importance of careful catechetical preparation for confirmation.

Professor Collinson has argued that the 1590s saw the beginnings of a revival of the confirmation office, prompted by an archiepiscopal circular of 1591 that urged the episcopate to observe the rite, and he cites the examples of Matthew of Durham and Babington of Exeter.[5] Evidence from other dioceses supports his case. In the course of Bishop Redman's visitation of Norwich diocese in 1597, seven ministers were admonished for admitting unconfirmed parishioners to the communion, and another instructed to send his candidates to be confirmed by the Bishop. The following year at his primary visitation Bancroft of London ordered a dozen ministers to bring their confirmation candidates to him or his assistant, the suffragan bishop of Colchester.[6] Some of the episcopate were less responsive. In 1597 Richard Hooker conceded that confirmation was not regularly observed, a view repeated in 1603 in a source hostile to the ceremony:[7]

> Confirmation...is nowe almost cleane worne owt of use. Ffor except some very fewe bishopps, hardly can yt be sayde that any bishopp hath put this ceremony in use, and those fewe possibly but once in all their tyme, which owght to be done both often by them and by all the rest if they did indeede beleeve that spirituall grace...were gyven by yt.

Further official impetus came in 1604 with the canonical requirement that bishops perform confirmation at visitation-time.

Bishop Joseph Hall's recollection in 1649 that the confirmation office was usually observed by Jacobean prelates, even though their care was not matched by that of the clergy and laity,[8] is partially substantiated by evidence

from at least seven dioceses in the southern province. In Norwich diocese in about 1604 Anthony Harison recorded that Bishop Jegon customarily confirmed children after the visitation dinner had ended, a practice mirrored in the instructions that Bishop Barlow received from Archbishop Bancroft in 1607 to visit Canterbury diocese and also hold services of confirmation and ordination there. Presiding in Canterbury Cathedral that September, Barlow ordered at least one clergyman to return the following day with his candidates for confirmation, and the registrar noted that when the children appeared, they were duly confirmed by the Bishop. In Bath & Wells, Bishop Lake confirmed the young in his visitation of Wells city in 1622, as did Bishop Walter Curll in his primary visitation at Taunton in July 1630; and similar references survive from Bangor, Chichester, Lincoln and Bristol dioceses.[9] The close association of confirmation with the triennial visitation sprang from the assumption that the bishop would visit his diocese in person, and is symbolised by the fact that the two Jacobean sermons that treat the office at any length were each preached ad clerum on visitation.[10] There is no indication that bishops held confirmation tours distinct from the visitation, which was customary by the early eighteenth century, although the diary of Archbishop Tobie Matthew reveals that many of the twenty-three services of confirmation that he conducted between 1607 and 1619 were outside visitation time.[11]

The articles of enquiry issued on visitation are one source from which to judge the importance that bishops placed on the confirmation rite. All faithfully reproduced the letter of canon 59, inquiring about the performance of the weekly catechising class, but a mere fifth explicitly linked this to preparation for confirmation.[12] Only Bishops Andrewes of Chichester, Abbot of Salisbury and Howson of Oxford added a clause which underlined the minister's duty to present the children to them for confirmation.[13] As evidence of indifference to the office, the silence of most episcopal visitation articles is not entirely persuasive. Although successive articles for Lincoln

diocese, for example, made no enquiry about confirmation,[14] there is independent proof that two of the four Jacobean bishops of Lincoln expressed some interest in the rite. In 1614 Bishop Neile learnt that the Lincolnshire clergy were not enthusiastic to have their parishioners confirmed, but the problem might be solved by a direct order from the chancellor. In 1623 Neile's successor but one, John Williams, toyed with the proposal that the episcopate should hold confirmation services at their manor-houses every six months, and although the scheme was not pursued, there is evidence that, after his arrival in Lincoln diocese in 1625, the Bishop did regularly confirm children.[15]

At least three other prelates devoted some thought and energy to the duty of confirming the young. The rubric of the Prayer Book specified that children were fit to be confirmed once they had mastered the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Decalogue and the shorter catechism, and canon 60 placed the responsibility with the minister to provide adequate preparation and to ensure that they duly appeared before the bishop.[16] Critics of the rite argued that most prelates assumed that confirmation candidates had received the appropriate schooling and did not enquire further. This allegation is supported by the personal experience of Richard Baxter, who records how in about 1630 he casually attached himself to a crowd of children waiting in a churchyard for the arrival of Bishop Morton of Coventry & Lichfield and was then confirmed without any preliminary examination of his understanding of Christianity, a story which conflicts with the airy assertion of Morton's biographer that the Bishop confirmed only those who could give an account of their faith.[17] Indeed, several visitation articles conceded that such practices were rife when they enquired whether or not the parish clergy catechised not only the unconfirmed but also those who had received confirmation and were still ignorant.[18] Other bishops exercised more discretion than Morton. Bishop Lake of Bath & Wells is reputed to have confirmed no one without a certificate from their minister or before examination by one of his chaplains.

Moreover, the Bishop would not condone the inadequate knowledge of many children. In an ordination sermon he delivered in Wells Cathedral, Lake castigated those clergy who did not provide proper catechetical instruction, with the result that ignorant children were presented to him for confirmation.[19] Bishop Thomas Ravis had confronted the same problem during his visitation of Gloucester diocese in August 1605. He ordered the clergy to bring forward only those children who were thoroughly prepared 'and such as they will answere for'.[20] Bishop John Howson of Oxford adopted a different strategy to overcome attitudes of ignorance and hostility towards the office in Oxford diocese. On Howson's instructions, at his primary visitation in September 1619, his chaplain Edward Boughen preached a sermon ad clerum in which he defended the confirmation rite and sketched out the theological significance of the ceremony, while refuting both papal and precisionist positions. The purpose of this exposition, Boughen added, was to encourage the diocesan clergy to catechise the young carefully 'that they may be fit for that holy imposition of hands by the bishop'. The articles of visitation then circulated among his audience included a long clause asking if the minister catechised diligently in preparation for confirmation and how many catechumens attended these classes. Addressing the clergy, Howson added:

> And this we require you to have especial care of, as also to bring your children to be confirmed when the Bishop shall come about that holy service.

There is no evidence of the response made to this injunction, but Howson's continuing interest in the issue is apparent from the inclusion of the same lengthy clause in his articles of visitation for 1622 and 1628.[21]

This respect for the confirmation office was matched by that of the Crown. Princes Henry and Charles and Princess Elizabeth were each examined and then confirmed by the dean of the chapel royal amid considerable splendour between 1607 and 1613, and in 1622 a group of influential courtiers headed by the Marquis of Buckingham followed the royal example and were

confirmed by Bishop George Montaigne of London in his chapel 'where they had choise musicke and all the ceremonies belonging to that action'.[22] The confirmation of royalty was a firm refutation of the views of some precisionists who derided the rite as a vestige of popery, a view lying behind the request in the Millenary petition that confirmation might be omitted from the Prayer Book 'as superfluous'.[23]

Despite the interest that a number of Jacobean bishops displayed in the office, none could hope to comply with the exacting requirements of the Book of Common Prayer, which stated that all parishioners should be confirmed before they took communion, which, by canons 21 and 112, they were obliged to do three times a year from the age of sixteen.[24] The enormous size of many English dioceses made it inconceivable that every child could receive confirmation from the hands of the bishop, unless the latter sacrified most other duties to that single function. Contemporaries were well aware of this problem and it is no surprise to find considerable evidence that many laity took communion without first being confirmed. Thomas Sparke candidly admitted as much in a conformist tract written in 1607, for otherwise 'the bishops would be driven to spend all their time and living in confirming of the unconfirmed', while William Ames scored a palpable hit on the same theme in the course of a printed controversy with Bishop Morton over the ceremonies of the Church of England. If Morton was correct in averring that confirmation was a personal profession of faith, why had an eminent archdeacon received confirmation only recently from Morton's hands, years after taking his first communion?[25] Bishop Francis Godwin acknowledged the existence of this large body of unconfirmed laity when he ordered the ministers of Llandaff diocese in 1603 to permit only those who were fit to be confirmed to receive communion. Lake of Bath & Wells deplored this general state of affairs, but he laid the blame firmly at the door of indolent pastors, parents and godparents who did not present children for confirmation.[26] Buckingham's

belated confirmation in 1622 occurred two years after James I had publicly congratulated him for his regular taking of the Eucharist, which provided an ironical twist to the sarcastic remark of one court gossip, that 'I remember not to have read in the Council's Decretals, that the practice was to confirm after receiving the communion, but before'.[27]

The taxing problems facing conscientious bishops in confirming myriad numbers of laity were responsible for a genre of story that stretches from Cardinal Wolsey in the early sixteenth century to Bishop Zachary Pearce of Rochester in the late eighteenth century, which all recount the physical exhaustion which overcame prelates as they confirmed scores and scores of children at individual services.[28] The Jacobean contribution to this literary tradition concerns Matthew of Durham and York and Searchfield of Bristol. Matthew confirmed 'sometimes 500, sometimes 1000 at a time', so that on occasion he was forced 'to betake himself to his bed'. Similarly on his primary visitation to Dorset in September 1619 Searchfield consecrated Chantmarle chapel where he confirmed five hundred people, young and old, until he was so weary that leaving some still unconfirmed he rode on to Melbury to lodge with Sir John Strangeways.[29] Repetitive these stories may have been, but they do suggest that the ceremony was popular among many laity.

Indeed, even if a bishop was punctilious in confirming children, it would be difficult for him to ensure that all the candidates were first thoroughly examined, a point raised by John Rainolds at the Hampton Court conference; and he proposed instead that every minister be authorised to confirm his own flock. Bancroft hotly denied this allegation and claimed that the bishop was assisted by chaplains and other ministers so that he 'lightly confirm none', a remark somewhat vitiated by Nicholas Ferrar's recollection that he had been confirmed twice by Bancroft in his primary visitation of London in 1598, since the precocious six year old believed that two blessings were better than one.[30]

It is not surprising therefore that Samuel Harsnett was a lone voice when

he asked in his articles for Norwich in 1620 whether or not any had received the Eucharist while remaining unconfirmed, an enquiry which met with resounding silence in the churchwardens presentments which survive.[31] Energetic bishops concentrated their finite time and resources on more immediate matters, by holding frequent services of confirmation and by scrutinising the knowledge of candidates presented to them, as the examples of Tobie Matthew and Arthur Lake illustrate. In short, in view of the scattered evidence that confirmation was practised in a number of dioceses and that at least three bishops took care to see that it was properly performed, the existence of a sizeable number of unconfirmed laity is more a comment upon the awesome responsibility that was laid upon the episcopate than unimpeachable evidence of either episcopal neglect or the unpopularity of the office.

* * * * *

Preaching was another feature of the pastoral care extended by the episcopate to the laity. Diligent preaching of the Word of God had long been regarded as a central function of the episcopate. St. Paul's exhortation to Timothy to 'preach the Word, be instant in season, out of season' was taken up and elaborated by patristic writers such as Chrysostom and Nazianzen, Ambrose and Gregory in their works upon the office of a bishop.[32] In the early sixteenth century humanist scholars drew on these sources to delineate a model of the apostolic bishop who led by teaching and example as much as by the exercise of spiritual jurisdiction, so that the prime episcopal duty of preaching received fresh emphasis from Tridentine and English protestant divines alike.[33] Many Jacobean tracts and treatises commented on the intimate association of preaching with the episcopal office,[34] as is exemplified by the impassioned statement of John Williams, himself a future

bishop, in his biography of Bishop Vaughan of London:[35]

> At, Deus bone, quid in episcopatu illius quod cuiusquam praedicatio vel transilire vel praetervehi debeat?

Like the confirmation rite, there is no single source available to demonstrate how frequently the episcopate of the reformed Church of England preached in their cathedral churches, on visitation or at the market towns 'in combination'. For the Elizabethan period, the historian can muster an impressive battalion of literary evidence to support William Harrison's famous declaration in his Description of England (1577) that every Sunday most bishops might be found preaching up and down the country, among whom may be numbered John Jewel, John Whitgift and John Piers.[36] This literary evidence consists primarily of the unverifiable statements of devout biographers, and only rarely can it be critically evaluated in the light of independent documentary evidence. One such case concerns Bishop Curteys of Chichester. The testimonial to Richard Curteys by his Sussex protégés claimed that the Bishop preached assiduously throughout Chichester diocese, an assertion borne out by the visitation returns for 1579, which disclose that the Bishop had expounded from the pulpits of at least six parish churches in the countryside around his Cathedral city.[37]

The more substantial diocesan archives of the Jacobean Church permits literary evidence to be tested more rigorously. No one can doubt that the bishops of King James included a number of silver-tongued preachers, as is apparent from a cursory perusal of Harington's thumbnail sketches of the early Jacobean bench, when time and again he commends the preaching aptitudes of individual prelates.[38] The most famous of these was Tobie Matthew of York, whose prodigious feats of preaching may be reconstructed from his diary, an intimate source which survives for only one other Jacobean bishop, Laud of St. Davids. Though Laud, in view of his non-residence, could scarely be expected to match the labours of Matthew, his diary discloses that he preached

regularly in the course of two brief visits to his diocese, in 1622 and 1625.[39] Harington's encomium on these preaching prelates is echoed by other observers, and Montaigne of Lincoln and London was the only bishop to be criticised for his uninspired court preaching.[40] The reputation that most bishops enjoyed as fine preachers implies that they could command large audiences, to judge from the remarks of contemporaries such as John Hacket. When Nicholas Assheton travelled south from Cheshire to London in November 1618, he made a point of sampling episcopal sermons. On Sunday 8 November he heard Bayley of Bangor preaching at Daventry, and a week later listened Bishop King in St. Sepulchre in the city of London.[41] This impression of plentiful episcopal preaching receives some support from the fact that the only pamphleteer before 1640 persistently to argue that bishops were strangers to the pulpit was William Prynne, during a choleric attack on the Laudian episcopate, and by implication their Jacobean predecessors emerge with some credit in this respect. This credit is further enhanced by the dutiful claims of a number of official apologists that bishops did indeed minister the Word, whenever they had the opportunity and leisure.[42] Can these claims be substantiated by documentary evidence?

The names of divines who delivered sermons at visitation meetings or at ordination and consecration services are occasionally entered in the diocesan records. The extant documentation is remarkably uneven: the concise headings in the ordination registers customarily omit to mention that a sermon was preached at all, many bishops were never required to dedicate chapels and the lists of preachers on visitation are missing for many dioceses. Moreover, since a bishop officiated at every stage of the services of ordination and consecration, there may have been a natural inclination for him to delegate the duty of preaching the sermon to allow him a short respite. In practice, however, this consideration did not seem to deter many bishops, as will be demonstrated below.

The episcopal visitation lasted for several weeks as preliminary sessions were held for the clergy in each deanery, generally in the presence of the bishop himself.[43] Although the number of meetings depended on the size of the see, ranging from fourteen in London to four at Ely, in all dioceses there was ample opportunity for the bishop to preach to the clergy, churchwardens and inquisitors on one or more occasions. Ralph Barlow, for example, as Archdeacon of Winchester, preached eight times in the course of two archidiaconal visitations, in 1618 and 1619.[44] In the five dioceses of Bath & Wells, Ely, Gloucester, Lincoln and London, the bishop included his name on the rota of preachers twelve times in sixteen visitations between 1597 and 1623, and among these prelates, Bancroft of London and Barlow of Lincoln alone preached twice in a single visitation.[45] Details survive of the consecration of twenty-five chapels and churchyards in nine dioceses between 1607 and 1629 at which the bishop preached on only eight occasions;[46] similiarly, prelates expounded at two out of nine services of ordination in Gloucester and London dioceses between 1605 and 1613.[47] These bald statistics demand considerable qualification and amplification, but it is immediately apparent that the episcopate as a group preached fitfully rather than regularly.

Who were the preaching bishops? Primarily they were those prelates who have a reputation for diligent preaching from the literary sources: Abbot of Canterbury, Lake of Bath & Wells, Parry of Gloucester and latterly Worcester and Morton of Coventry & Lichfield. In the course of a debate in the House of Lords in May 1610 George Abbot had quoted with approval Jewel's prayer that he might die preaching in the pulpit, and he was commended by contemporaries for his indefatigable preaching and patronage of preachers even after his elevation to the primatial see of Canterbury in 1611.[48] Both Bishops Lake and Parry preached on visitation and at ordination services.[49] In the 1580s Parry had publicly expressed his disquiet at the paucity of preaching

ministers, so that many 'distressed soules' were lost for want of 'the bread of life, the Word of God, the onely preservative of the soule' and he urged the episcopate to increase the numbers of preachers in their sees. Twenty years later, after his translation from Gloucester in 1610, Bishop Parry was remembered as 'that painefull preacher' and the inscription on his tombstone in Worcester Cathedral describes him as 'assidua verbi divini praedicatione'.[50] It has been suggested that Arthur Lake may have also preached at lectures 'in combination' with his diocesan clergy, a practice alluded to in the statement of his biographer that while journeying through his diocese Lake would leave no place 'if it were a fit time of preaching, unsupplied'.[51] The tribute paid to Thomas Morton's practice of regular preaching in his diocese by his biographer is supported by evidence from the three consecration services that he conducted, when each time he chose to expound on a suitable text.[52] To their number may be added John King, Bishop of London from 1611 to 1621, who was nicknamed somewhat lamely 'the King of preachers' by his appreciative sovereign. King's case indicates that the documentary evidence cited above is an incomplete guide to the pattern of episcopal preaching. Although the Bishop did preach on his primary visitation in 1612, he also consecrated eight chapels and churchyards without mounting the pulpit once;[53] and yet there is ample literary evidence to indicate that he often preached in the diocese. Not merely was King fêted by his contemporaries for the style as well as the regularity of his preaching,[54] but, according to his son Henry, the Bishop also preached most Sundays in parish churches throughout the City of London, a claim confirmed independently by Roger Ley, a diocesan clergyman who had been ordained by King in May 1618.[55] It was therefore appropriate as well as singular that Bishops Lake and King should describe themselves respectively as 'preacher' and 'minister of God's holie Worde and sacraments' in the preamble to their wills.[56]

This pride of preaching prelates can be enlarged to include Richard

Vaughan, Robert Abbot and Gervase Babington, if the testimony of unverifiable sources is admitted. Richard Vaughan, the early Jacobean Bishop of London, was praised by his biographer for preaching almost as often as John Calvin had done in Geneva, a practice matched by Robert Abbot, a former city lecturer - like his brother George, and Bishops King and Babington - who was Bishop of Salisbury for twenty-seven months before his premature death in 1618. According to Daniel Featley, chaplain to his brother, Abbot preached on the first Sunday after his arrival in Salisbury and subsequently 'every Lords day, whilst he enjoyed his health, either in the City or in neighbouring townes.'[57] Although Gervase Babington wrote lengthy commentaries on the Pentateuch, his editor pointed out that the Bishop always remained an assiduous preacher, a claim echoed in an anonymous dedication Babington received in 1601, that commended his extensive writings and 'painfull preaching'.[58]

There is a strong presumption from fragmentary evidence that a number of other Jacobean bishops were industrious dispensers of the Word. Martin Heton of Ely preached on each of his three visitations between 1601 and 1607 and it is reasonable to infer from this that he also preached on other, unrecorded occasions, but no personal archive to draw on to test such a contention.[59] The same may be said for John Buckeridge of Rochester and James Mountagu of Bath & Wells, each of whom preached at court and delivered at least one sermon at their sees.[60] The names of preachers have not survived for the visitations, ordinations and consecrations performed by Samuel Harsnett in Chichester and Norwich between 1609 and 1629, yet he is known to have preached at six sessions of Bancroft's visitation of London diocese in 1598. There also exist two miscellaneous references to the Bishop preaching in his diocese, once at the Green Yard in Norwich Cathedral on Easter day 1620 before the Mayor and aldermen, and once on visitation in King's Lynn in May 1627, which partially substantiate his protestation in the

Parliament of 1624 that he had preached frequently in both dioceses, in answer to accusations that he had suppressed lecturing in Norwich diocese.[61]

It is equally significant that only two Jacobean bishops - Miles Smith and John Thornborough - can be shown to have consistently neglected the opportunity to preach. As Bishop of Gloucester between 1612 and 1624 Smith attended three visitations in twelve years and listened to at least seventeen different sermons without preaching once. In a posthumous biographical sketch of Smith, one notable omission was the customary praise of diligent preaching by the bishop and the fifteen sermons to which this notice was prefixed were preached before his appointment to Gloucester.[62] John Thornborough was another unenthusiastic preacher. During his residence at York after 1606, where he held the deanery in commendam, Thornborough quarrelled with Lord Sheffield, President of the Council of the North. Sheffield complained to the Privy Council of 'the unholy Bishop of Bristow' who preached only twice a year. He was probably speaking no more than the truth. In 1615 Thornborough was reported to the Privy Council for failing to supply a preaching minister for the living of Pickering, a parish with a congregation of forty thousand, which lay in his gift. Thornborough initially offered to pay for a monthly sermon, and only when summoned before the Council did he agree to provide a resident preaching minister.[63]

The content of episcopal sermons is as elusive as the occasions on which they were preached. Diocesan sermons survive in print for only two of the sixty-five bishops of King James I: two by John King of London, both preached at Paul's Cross on state occasions, and sixty-seven by Arthur Lake of Bath & Wells, which he delivered in the Cathedral of St. Andrew, in St. Cuthbert's at Wells and at SS. Peter and Paul, Bath.[64] Internal evidence proves that a number of these latter sermons were preached on festival days, at the ordination of ministers and at the public penance of notorious culprits,[65] but the majority were simple expositions of related texts expounded in the

Cathedral week by week over a number of months. One theme was pursued by Lake in the course of forty-seven sermons preached over a period of about a year. The Bishop began with seven sermons on the Ist Psalm in which he outlined God's convenant with man, which was followed by twenty sermons on Psalm 51 in order to demonstrate how man can perform his vow of repentance. Lake admitted that no sooner had he ended this series of sermons than 'it came into my mind that the next way to perswade any man to follow it was to teach him how he might best bee acquainted with his own state'. Accordingly he selected the Mosiac Law as his text and by way of an introduction he gave ten sermons on Christ's interpretation of the Law and a further ten on Exodus 19, which he aptly described as 'a remarkable preparation to the twentieth', that chapter which contained the Decalogue.[66] By delivering such homiletics week by week, Lake was treating the Cathedral congregation as if they were his own parishioners. The sermons themselves read as plain yet incisive expositions of scripture, filled with pithy exempla. Lake's intention was to educate his audience to turn away from controversy and contention and concentrate upon self-examination. As he observed on one occasion:[67]

> I doe not desire that our people should have...few sermons, the canons of the Church have provided for the people better then so; but this I desire, that the people would make use of that which they learne and let their lives shew that they are the better for the minister's paines; for sure I am, that it is their negligence that maketh the minister's diligence the more needfull; and though knowledge be wanting in too many places of the Land, yet is acknowledgement wanting much more.

The regular ministration of the Word might be the most public affirmation of a bishop's evangelical zeal, yet some contemporaries recognised that it was only one method among many for proselytizing the laity. Miles Smith, for one, advised his lay readership that in addition to attending sermons they would do well to peruse the scriptures and accompanying commentaries and to confer with their parish minister.[68] Very few prelates personally took

up these challenges. Only one bishop, Gervase Babington, devoted his time to writing exegetical works for the benefit of the untutored layman. In the same year as his elevation to Llandaff, Babington published an unadorned English commentary on the book of Genesis, and companion volumes on the remainder of the Pentateuch appeared in subsequent years, the exposition of Numbers and Deuteronomy being printed posthumously.[69] The title-page to his work on Genesis eloquently expressed Babington's purpose in writing these bulky tomes:[70]

> Certaine plaine, briefe and comfortable notes upon every chapter of Genesis, gathered and laid downe for the good of them that are not able to use better helps and yet are carefull to reade the Word, and right heartily desirous to taste the sweet of it.

The four editions that his Works ran through in twenty-two years attest to its popularity, but it was a market ignored by other Jacobean prelates. Arthur Lake specified in his will that his sermons should be published, primarily 'for the good of younger students' and similiarly Atheomastix, the posthumous publication of Fotherby of Salisbury, was aimed 'the most to the learned'.[71] It should cause little surprise that Babington's industry was unmatched by other bishops. Faced with conflicting claims on their attention, the episcopate preferred to expound on familiar texts, which was less costly in time and labour than writing commentaries.[72] Moreover, they seem to have acknowledged that the spiritual wellbeing of the laity was best promoted by the supervision of the aptitudes and conduct of the parochial clergy, a subject which is pursued in the next chapter.

* * * * *

An assessment of disparate literary and archival evidence suggests that the sight of the bishop preaching from the pulpit or blessing confirmation candidates was a characteristic feature of diocesan life under James I. This

finding is consistent with the evidence presented in previous chapters. The episcopate as a group resided in their dioceses and supervised their visitations in person, so there was plenty of opportunity to instruct or confirm the laity. That the opportunity was taken so regularly reflects in part the popularity of each occasion with the laity, in part the strength of the Pastoral ideal. The large size of English sees was a permanent obstacle in the way of bishops who wished to lead through personal instruction and example. Nevertheless the periodic visits that prelates made to different parts of their diocese, as on visitation, when they preached and confirmed in turn, symbolised the vitality of the apostolic model. As will be argued below in Chapter Seven, such symbolic gestures by the episcopate won them much credit with their diocesan clergy.

Footnotes to Chapter Five

1. Calendar of Wynn (of Gwydir) Papers, ed. J. Ballinger (Aberystwyth, 1926), pp.101-2.

2. I Tim. iii. 2; Isaacson, Life and Death of Lancelot Andrewes, pp.47-8; Lake, Sermons, sig.S2; B(addeley), Life of Dr Thomas Morton, p.76. Archbishop Abbot's accounts do survive, and have been analysed by Felicity Heal: 'The Archbishops of Canterbury and the Practice of Hospitality' Journal of Ecclesiastical History, xxxiii. (1982), pp.544-63.

3. Boughen, A Sermon of Confirmation, p.24; Edmund Reeve, The Christian Divinitie, contained in the Divine Service of the Church of England (1631), pp.154-6; Hacket, Scrinia Reserata, i. p.123.

4. Sources are no better for a study of the ceremony after 1660: N. Sykes, From Sheldon to Secker (Cambridge, 1959), pp.13-5; idem, Church & State, pp.116-37. The most thorough treatment of the confirmation office after the Reformation is S.L. Ollard, 'Confirmation in the Anglican Communion' in Confirmation and the Laying On of Hands by various writers, i. (1926), pp.60-245.

5. Collinson, The Religion of Protestants, pp.51-2.

6. Diocese of Norwich: Bishop Redman's Visitation, 1597. Presentments in the archdeaconries of Norwich, Norfolk and Suffolk, ed. J.F. Williams (Norwich Record Society, xviii. 1946), pp.37,61,63-4,67,81,88, 102; GL, MS 9537/9 fos.74r,99r,100v,122r,127,128r,172r. I owe the first reference to Christopher Haigh.

7. Hooker, Works, ii. p.441; Bodl., Bodley MS 124 pp.11-2. I owe the first reference to Peter Lake.

8. Joseph Hall, Works, ed. P. Hall (12 vols., Oxford, 1837), x. pp.464-5.

9. NNRO, Har/3 fo.384; LPL, Reg.Bancroft fos.223v,226r, VG 4/6 fos.9v, 20v; Olland, 'Confirmation', pp.118-9; SRO, D/D/Ca 270 fo.153r; PRO,

SP 16/164/23; Calendar of Wynn...Papers, p.176; WSRO, Ep.I/17/17 fos.150r-1v; 'The Primary Visitation of...Bishop Neile', p.43; Hacket, Scrinia Reserata, i. p.123, ii. pp.54,61; Dorset RO, MW/M4 fo.23v. I owe this last reference to Robert Dunning.

10. Boughen, A Sermon of Confirmation; Richard Milborne, Concerning Imposition of Hands. A Sermon at the Lord Archbishop his Visitation metropolitical, held at St Mary Cray in Kent, by the Bishop of Rochester his Graces Commissioner, the 7 of September last (1607), sig.Br-B2r.

11. Sykes, From Sheldon to Secker, pp.192,217; Olland, 'Confirmation', pp.119-22.

12. Andrewes, Chichester (1606), sig.A3iv; Babington, Worcester (1607), sig.A3r; Henry Parry, Gloucester (1607), sig.A3v; Thomas Ravis, London (1607), sig.A3iv; King, London (1612 & 1615), sig.A3v; Henry Cotton, Salisbury (1614), sig.A3iv; Robert Abbot, Salisbury (1616), sig.A3r,A3iv; Howson, Oxford (1619), sig.A2ir. See also Richard Stokes, Norfolk archdeaconry (1608), sig.A2v; George Goldman, Essex archdeaconry (1615), sig.A3v; William Goodwyn, Middlesex archdeaconry (1616), sig.A3r.

13. Andrewes, Chichester (1606), sig.B2r; Abbot, Salisbury (1616), sig.A3r,A3iv; Howson, Oxford (1619), sig.A2ir.

14. Chaderton, Lincoln (Cambridge, 1604 & 1607); Richard Neile, Lincoln (1614); Montaigne, Lincoln (1618); Williams, Lincoln (1622) & (1625).

15. 'The Primary Visitation of...Bishop Neile', p.43; Hacket, Scrinia Reserata, i. p.123, ii. pp.54,61; The Ferrar Papers, ed. B. Blackstone, (Cambridge, 1938), p.38.

16. The Booke of Common Prayer and the Administration of the Sacraments (1607), sig.05iiv.

17. A Survey of the Booke of Common Prayer (1606), p.114; Olland,

'Confirmation', p.124; Barwick, The Fight, Victory and Triumph of S.Paul, p.85.

18. Andrewes, Chichester (1606), sig.A3iv; King, London (1612), sig.A3v & (1615), sig.A3v; Howson, Oxford (1619), sig.A2ir & (1622), sig.A2iv & (1628), sig.A2v-3r.

19. Lake, Sermons, sig.+r, iii. p.237; see also iii. p.172. For a practical illustration of this concern, see SRO, D/D/Ca 223 fo.178v.

20. GDR, 96 p.111.

21. Boughen, A Sermon of Confirmation, sig.A2r, p.2; Howson, Oxford (1619), sig.A2ir & (1622), sig.A2iv & (1628), sig.A2v-3r.

22. The Old Cheque-Book, pp.171-3; Chamberlain, Letters, ii. p.419.

23. Babbage, Puritanism & Richard Bancroft, p.44. See also BL, Add.MS 39330 fo.55r; Samuel Collins, A Sermon preached at Paules-Crosse upon the I of November, being All-Saints day, Anno 1607 (1607), p.27; George Hakewill, The Auncient Ecclesiasticall Practise of Confirmation Confirmed by arguments drawne from Scripture, reason, councels, fathers, and later writers. Upon occasion of the Confirmation of the Prince his Highnesse, performed on Munday in Easter-weeke, 1613... (1613), p.9.

24. The Booke of Common Prayer, sig.05iiiir.

25. Thomas Sparke, A Brotherly Perswasion to Unitie and Uniformitie in Iudgement and Practise touching the received and present Ecclesiasticall Government and the Authorised Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of England (1607), pp.60-1; [Ames], A Reply to Dr Mortons Particular Defence, p.22. I owe the first reference to Christopher Haigh. See also Marchant, Puritans and the Church Courts, p.66.

26. Godwin, To the Parson, Vicar or Curate, p.2; Lake, Sermons, iii. p.172.

27. James I, A Meditation upon the Lords Prayer written by the Kings

Maiestie for the benefit of all his Subiects, especially of such as follow the Court (1619), sig.A4iiir; Court and Times of James the First, ii. p.282.

28. Cavendish, Life and Death of Cardinal Wolsey, p.144; Sykes, Church & State, pp.119,123,137.

29. R. Thoresby, Vicaria Leodiensis: or the History of the Church in Leedes in Yorkshire (1724), p.165; Dorset RO, MW/M4 fo.23v, printed in John Hutchins, The History and Antiquities of the County of Dorset, (4 vols., 1973), i. p.6.

30. William Barlow, The Summe and Substance of the Conference which it pleased his excellent Maiestie to have with the Lords, Bishops, and other of his Clergie...in his Maiesties Privy-Chamber at Hampton Court Ianuary 14 1603...at Hampton Court (1604), pp.33-4; The Ferrar Papers, p.10. I owe the second reference to Judith Maltby.

31. Harsnett, Norwich (1620), sig.A2v; NNRO, Vis/5.

32. 2 Tim. iv. 3; The six books on the Priesthood of St John Chrysostom, pp.113-31; A Select Library, vii. p.212, xii. books 2, ch.4, 3; Humfrey, Saint Ambrose his Christian Offices in 3 Bookes, pp.1-9.

33. See above pp. 15-6.

34. Carpenter, A Pastorall Charge, pp.61-2; Featley, Clavis Mystica, pp.142-3; Richard Marshe, A Sermon preached at the Consecration of the right reverend father in God Richard Senhouse Lord Bishop of Carlile, in the metropoliticall Church of York, the six and twentieth day of September 1624 (1625), p.32; Potter, A Sermon preached at the Consecration of...Barnaby Potter, pp.55-6; Richardson, A Workeman, pp.11,19.

35. BL, Harl.MS 6495 fo.109r.

36. Houlbrooke, 'The Protestant Episcopate', pp.96-7; Collinson, The Religion of Protestants, pp.49-51; John King, 'A Sermon preached at

the Funerals of...Iohn, late Arch-bishop of Yorke' attached to his Lectures upon Jonas delivered at Yorke 1594 (1611), p.681.

37. Richard Curteys, An Exposition of certayne Words of S.Paul to the Romaynes entiteled by an old wryter Hugo: A Treatise of the Workes of Three Dayes. Also an other Worke of the Truth of Christes Naturall Body (1577), sig.iii; BL, Add.MS 39454 fos.16v,30v,33,44v,45v.

38. Sir John Harington, A Briefe View of the State of the Church of England as it stood in Q. Elizabeths and King James his reigne, to the yeere 1608: a character and history of the Bishops of those Times (1653), pp.26,81,119,140,148,152-3,155,194,209.

39. Collinson, The Religion of Protestants, pp.48-9; Laud, Works, iii. pp.138-40,170-4.

40. DWL, RNC 38.34 p.57; Chamberlain, Letters, ii. p.470.

41. Hacket, Scrinia Reserata, ii. pp.38-9; The Journal of Nicholas Assheton of Downham...for part of the year 1617 and part of the year following, ed. F.R. Raines (Chetham Society, xiv. 1848), pp.113-4.

42. [Prynne], A Looking-Glasse, pp.4,53-4,76,79,93,97; George Downame, A Defence of the Sermon preached at the Consecration of the Bishop of Bath & Welles, against a Confutation thereof by a namelesse Author (1611), i. pp.139-40; Francis Mason, Of the Consecration of the Bishops of the Church of England: with their Succession, Jurisdiction, and other things incidental to their Calling: as also of the Ordination of Priests and Deacons (1613), p.19.

43. See above pp.57-8,61.

44. HRO, D/I/D pp.14,70.

45. I omit those occasions when bishops attended only one or two visitation sessions. SRO, D/D/Ca 174 fo.305r; Lake, Sermons, iii. pp.249-72; EDR B/2/18 fo.60r, B/2/23 fos.1r,38r; GDR, 80 pp.6,108,135, 96 (unfoliated: 31 August 1605), 110 p.9, 115 pp.159,315,463; LAO, Add.

Reg.3 fo.3; GL, MSS 9537/9 fos.151r,157r, 9537/11 fo.64r.

46. English Orders for Consecrating Churches, pp.3,15,26,30,36,45,79,82, 86,97,292; GL, MS 9531/13 ii. fos.358v-9r,393v-5v,397r,400v,406v,407v, 408; Borth., Precedent Book ii. pp.349,355-7; OCRO, MS Oxf.Dioc. Papers c.265 pp.30-1,38-41; Bodl., Rawlinson MS D 818 fos.30r-5r; WSRO, Cap.I/12/2 pp.327-55; Sampson Price, The Beauty of Holines: or the Consecration of a House of Prayer by the example of our Saviour. A Sermon preached in the Chappell at the Free-Schoole in Shrewsbury...At the Consecration of the Chappell by the right reverend father in God, the Lord Bishop of Coventrey and Lichfield (1618); LJRO, B/A/I/16 fo.73v.

47. GDR, 27A pp.298,307,312,316-7,325,331,365; GL, MS 9535/2 fos.148r, 150r,151v.

48. Proceedings in Parliament 1610, i. p.78; Edward Chetwind, The Strait Gate and Narrow Way to Life (1612), sig.¶1 2r; John Downame, Consolations for the Afflicted (1613), sig.*3i; idem, A Guide to Godlynesse (1622), sig.A4r; Robert Barrell, The Spiritual Architecture: or the balance of Gods Sanctuary to discerne the Weight and Solidity of a True and Sincere, from the Levitie, and Vanitie of a False and Counterfeit Profession of Christianity (1624), sig.A2r-ir; William Prynne, The Antipathie of the English Lordly Prelacie, both to Regall Monarchy and Civill Unity (1641), p.152. See GL, MS 9531/13 ii. fo.394r; English Orders for Consecrating Churches, p.36.

49. Lake, Sermons, i. pp.53-64, iii. pp.184-91,221-41,249-72; GDR, 27A pp. 325,331, 110 p.9.

50. Henry Parry, The Summe of Christian Religion, delivered by Zacharius Ursinus in his Lectures upon the Catechisme (1611), sig.A3v-A4ir; Edmund Graile, Little Timothe His Lesson: or a summary Relation of the historicall part of Holy Scripture, comprised in Meeter (1611),

sig.A3r; Willis, A Survey of the Cathedrals, ii. p.649.

51. Collinson, Godly People, p.488; Lake, Sermons, sig.S2r.

52. Barwick, The Fight, Triumph and Victory of S.Paul, p.85; B(addeley), The Life of Dr Thomas Morton, p.75; GL, MS 9531/13 ii. fo.406v; English Orders for Consecrating Churches, p.86; LJRO, B/A/I/16 fo. 73v.

53. DNB, xxi. p.137; GL, MS 9537/11 fo.64r; MS 9531/13 ii. fos.397r,400v, 407v,408; English Orders for Consecrating Churches, pp.26,30,82,292.

54. William Hull, The Third Worke of Mercy: or, a sinnners entertainement of harbourlesse Christ, 6 sermons (1612), sig.A4; Westerman, Iacobs Well, sig.¶4iiiv-ivr; H(enry) H(olland), Monumenta Sepulchraria Sancti Pauli (1614), sig.F3v.

55. Henry King, A Sermon preached at Pauls Crosse the 25 of November 1621, upon occasion of that false and scandalous Report (lately printed) touching the supposed Apostasie of the right reverend father in God, Iohn King, late Lord Bishop of London (1621), p.62; BL, Stowe MS 76 fo.245r; see Chamberlain, Letters, ii. p.47; The Journal of Nicholas Assheton, p.114.

56. PRO, Prob.11/137/35, 149/99.

57. BL, Harl.MS 6495 fo.109v; Thomas Fuller, Abel Redevivus: or the Dead yet speaking. The Lives and Deaths of Modern Divines (1651), pp.548-9.

58. Gervase Babington, Workes (1615), sig.A3iii; S.I., Certaine Godlie and Learned Sermons (1601), sig.¶3ir (S.T.C. 14058).

59. EDR, B/2/18 fo.60r, B/2/23 fos.1r,38r.

60. Borth., Precedent Book ii. pp.355-7; SRO, D/D/Ca 174 fo.305r; Clark, 'Dr Plume's Pocket-Book', p.218; PRO, SP 14/86/61; Chamberlain, Letters, i. p.424, ii. p.47; S.T.C. 4005. Notes taken from a court sermon delivered by Mountagu in 1615 are preserved in Bodl., North MS e.41 fos.142r-51r. I owe this last reference to Paul Seaward.

61. GL, MS 9537/9 fos.99r,108r,122r,131r,163r,169r; Bodl., Rawl.MS D 1088 fo.117v; LPL, MS 943 p.125; Lords' Journals, iii. pp.388-90.

62. GDR, 115 pp.159-573; Smith, Sermons, sig.¶¶3r. Internal evidence shows that at least two of these fifteen sermons were preached before 1603 and three after 1605. Smith, Sermons, pp.1-22,79,107,116,256; idem, A Learned and Godly sermon preached at Worcester, at an Assise (Oxford, 1602).

63. HMC, 9 Hatfield House, xix. p.274; Acts of the Privy Council 1615-1616, pp.53-4,136-7.

64. John King, A Sermon of Publicke Thanks-giving for the happy recovery of his Maiesty from his late dangerous Sicknesse: preached at Pauls-Crosse the 11 of April 1619 (1619); idem, A Sermon at Paules Crosse, on behalfe of Paules Church. March 26 1620 (1620); Lake, Sermons, i. pp.1-470, iii. pp.127-50,161-99,221-72,295-305, iv. pp.1-105. Professor Collinson points out that there survive only two of the two thousand sermons of Tobie Matthew. The couplet was preached before Matthew's consecration: The Religion of Protestants, p.51; Tobie Matthew, 'Two Sermons', The Christian Observer (1847), cxviii. pp.603-18, cxix. pp.664-75, cxx. pp.722-34, and appendix, pp.776-90. There survive some notes in Avington parish register (1610-60, 1673-1812), Hampshire, which have been claimed as part of a sermon preached by Andrewes in the church 'on Christmas Day: before the day of his decease -A.D. 1626', but they seem to be nothing more than jottings from the Bishop's 1605 and 1606 Christmas sermons at court. Andrewes, Works, i. pp.1-31; HRO, 22M 69A PRI, pp.469,500.

65. Lake, Sermons, i. pp.75-95, iii. pp.127-50,161-99,221-48,295-305, iv. pp.1-105.

66. Lake, Sermons, i. pp.1-470; see pp.243,367-8,457. Lake may have preached on the Decalogue, but the sermons are not extant.

67. Lake, Sermons, i. pp.92,246,285,428, iii. pp.6,161,189,238.

68. Babington, Workes, sig.A3i-iii; idem, Comfortable Notes upon the Bookes of Exodus and Leviticus (1604), sig.A2r; Martin Fotherby, Foure Sermons lately preached. Whereunto is added an Answere unto certaine obiections of one unresolved, as concerning the use of the Crosse in Baptisme (1608), pp.27-54.

69. Certaine Plaine, Briefe and Comfortable Notes upon Everie Chapter of Genesis (1592); idem, Comfortable Notes upon the Bookes of Exodus and Leviticus (1604); and 'Comfortable Notes upon the Bookes of Numbers and Deuteronomie' attached to his Workes (1615). Babington also wrote a series of more concise catechetical works.

70. Certaine...Notes upon Everie Chapter of Genesis (1592).

71. PRO, Prob.11/149/99; Martin Fotherby, Atheomastix: clearing Four Truths, against Atheists and Infidels (1622), sig.B4v.

72. Lake never spent more than a few days mentally preparing his sermon; to the astonishment of Miles Smith, Babington continued to preach regularly after he had begun to write his commentaries. Lake, Sermons, sig.Ar; Babington, Workes, sig.A3iii.

Chapter Six: The Provision of Pastoral Care by the Episcopate

(ii) To the Clergy

> How many blind seers may be seene here, foolish teachers, lame forerunners, negligent pastors and dumbe cryers: shepheards indeed, but fitter to keepe sheepe, then to care for soules. Bubulcos, non pastores, neatheards, not feeding shepheards; as if those over whom they are placed were beasts and not men, irrationall animals not reasonable creatures. If you aske me then, how chance the flockes are in no better looked unto? I answere, because the seers are blind; if you demaund further, why blinde men are made seers, I must reply with Saint Bernard. The fault is in the overseers, dant episcopi sanctum canibus et margaritas porcis, bishops give that which is holy (as orders, and church livings) unto dogs and pearles unto swine...

This accusation of culpable negligence was levelled at Tobie Matthew, late Bishop of Durham, in the course of a synodal sermon delivered before his successor, William James, in April 1608. The preacher Thomas Oxley ended his philippic with a plea that the new Bishop should exercise a close oversight of his diocesan clergy, a theme periodically touched upon in Jacobean sermons and treatises, but rarely addressed with such candour.[1] Etymologically, the bishop was superintendent of the clergy, the pastor of pastors, a responsibility which stood at the very heart of the episcopal office, according to Richard Hooker.[2] This chapter explores the pattern of episcopal supervision of the diocesan ministry outside the consistory. Several opportunities existed for the bishop to control and enhance the vocational skills of his clergy. He could influence recruitment into the diocese through his authority to deny ordination or institution to unsatisfactory candidates, and could also remove inadequate clergy, already beneficed in the diocese, through his judicial power of deprivation. More positively, the bishop might improve clerical standards by judicious patronage and by conducting schemes of theological training. Dr Rosemary O'Day has examined the practical operation of these powers in her study, The English Clergy: the Emergence and Consolidation of a Profession

(Leicester, 1979). The work demonstrates that clerical standards of learning improved considerably between the Reformation and the English Civil War, a development that the author ascribes to the influence of the universities, to the exercise of patronage and also to the endeavours of many bishops at diocesan level. Her evidence for the Jacobean period relies heavily on the figure of Thomas Morton of Coventry & Lichfield, who raised clerical standards by careful use of the ordination examinations and his patronage rights.[3] This chapter draws on a wider body of material: the dioceses of Bath & Wells, Chichester and Ely provide the core of the analysis, but evidence is also taken from seven other dioceses. Its findings broadly support O'Day's general emphasis on the distinctive contribution that bishops made to improving the performance of their diocesan clergy, but it necessarily qualifies and amplifies several of her remarks. What emerges, in particular, is the variety of forms that episcopal supervision of the clergy could take, a point epitomised by the contrasting practices of Lancelot Andrewes and Arthur Lake.

* * * * *

The regulations of the Church of England governing ordination were set out in detail in canons 31 to 35 of 1604. The responsibility for examining candidates was transferred from the archdeacon to the bishop or his surrogates,[4] who were to admit only those who were over twenty-three years of age and conversant in Latin, possessing letters testimonial or dismissory concerning their life and learning, and a benefice or fellowship to take up. None were to be ordained deacon and priest on the same day, and ordination services were limited to four a year on the Sundays following Ember weeks. However these latter two injunctions could be waived with the express consent of the archbishop. There is a heavy weight of evidence from contemporary

writings that several of these canons were regularly contravened, for it was repeatedly claimed that unsuitable candidates were received into the priesthood.[5] Even divines sympathetic to the problems of episcopal government conceded as much. In the 1590s Richard Hooker had warned of the dangers attending the careless ordination of ministers, and Francis Mason, in an apology for the canons of the Church, originally preached at the Green Yard in Norwich in the summer of 1605, could not deny that some were admitted 'of meaner qualifications than the law allows'. Indeed, one bishop - Arthur Lake of Bath & Wells - publicly criticised a number of his fellow prelates for their slack examination of ordinands.[6] Some tried to exonerate the episcopate by pointing out that the laity frequently signed inaccurate and misleading letters testimonial on behalf of candidates, but the weakness of this argument lay in its unwarranted assumption that the evidence of testimonials were in any sense a substitute for the examination of ordinands.[7] It is not immediately obvious how these contemporary criticisms may be reconciled with O'Day's statement that there is 'considerable evidence' of unsuitable candidates being rejected by the early seventeenth century episcopate, although she only cites the examples of Bishops Morton, Goodman and Bancroft to support her case.[8] The answer may lie in testing this literary evidence against the documentary material in diocesan archives.

The Jacobean registers of ordination yield little information on this subject. Where they exist,[9] their cursory entries never record the names of those candidates who were turned away as unsuitable and often do not state if the bishop personally conducted the examination or delegated the duty to his household chaplains.[10] No Jacobean register is comparable to the magnificent ordination book of Richard Cox, the Elizabethan Bishop of Ely, which lists the status and learning of those candidates who failed to satisfy the examiners.[11] When the registers record an ordinand being admitted either simultaneously to the diaconate and priesthood or <u>extra tempore</u>, reference is usually, but not

invariably, made to the requisite archiepiscopal dispensation; when this is not entered in the register, it may proceed from scribal indolence or indicate that no faculty was granted.[12] It seems reasonable to propose that the canons were contravened only on those occasions when there is no reference to a special faculty in registers which habitually record these dispensations. On these grounds, Bishops Ravis of Gloucester and London, Abbot of London and Parry of Gloucester scrupulously adhered to the letter of these canons; while canon 32, prohibiting simultaneous admission to the diaconate and priesthood, appears to have been breached on a handful of occasions by Bridges of Oxford, Vaughan and King of London and Smith of Gloucester.[13]

The care exercised in examining ordination candidates is a theme more central to this chapter. The canonical practice of holding these interviews some days before the ordination service was observed in at least four dioceses, which may imply that these occasions were more than mere formalities.[14] The diocesan records are singularly opaque on the pattern of episcopal participation at these examinations. The ordination registers for London state that the bishop presided 'in propria persona suo' accompanied by his chaplains; Howson of Oxford also conducted the examination before celebrating his first ordination in 1619, capriciously turning-away one well-qualified candidate, according to a hostile source.[15] Conversely, Jegon of Norwich and Chaderton of Lincoln consistently delegated this responsibility, as James Mountagu of Bath & Wells may also have done.[16]

Other bishops took personal control of the examination of ordinands. The exacting interviews conducted by Thomas Morton have been described by O'Day, who showed that on several occasions deacons were instructed not to proceed to the priesthood without the Bishop's express permission.[17] Arthur Lake was another strict examiner of ordination candidates. In a visitation sermon at Bath he openly aired his disapproval of the more casual practice of some colleagues, a remark probably aimed among others at Bishop Theophilus

Field, who had been impeached by the House of Commons in 1621 for brocage and defalcation. In his visitation of 1623, Lake suspended two curates who had received ordination from Field, although as Somerset men they should have been ordained by Lake. They had gone to Field presumably because they had heard that he accepted candidates more readily than Lake and other prelates.[18] The sermons that Lake preached during ordination services furnish important evidence of his elevated conception of the ministry. He urged the ordinands before him to lead by their own example and to become adept at teaching what he called 'the bread of life' to their congregation, through careful catechising, skilful preaching and discreet private advice. Elsewhere, he etched out a daunting model for ministers to imitate:[19]

> being salt, wee must ever be seasoners of the world; being light, we must ever be dispelling the darkenesse of men; being architects, wee must ever be building of Gods house; being husbandmen, wee must ever bee labouring in Gods field; finally, being shepheards, we must ever be attending on Christs flocke...God knowes there is too much of this neglect of our calling in many, at whose hands God will require the blood of many perishing soules.

John Williams of Lincoln was a third bishop who interviewed ordinands in person. His biographer praised Williams for his refusal to ordain non-graduates and his alacrity in rejecting unsuitable candidates, practices that apparently made his ordinations 'the discourse of divers yet alive' thirty years later.[20]

This trio of scrupulous prelates is balanced by at least three Jacobean bishops who conferred orders with less discrimination. John Sterne, the suffragan Bishop of Colchester between 1592 and 1608, narrowly escaped suspension for ordaining too many clergy, presumably for financial profit, on behalf of the bishop of London. On one occasion Sterne charged over £1.50 for holy orders, well above the ceiling of ten shillings stipulated by canon 135 of 1604.[21] Other bishops, such as John Jegon and Samuel Harsnett, also seem to have exceeded the recommended fee, which demonstrates how the rite

could become a lucrative source of illicit income. However, there is no suggestion from other sources that either Jegon or Harsnett allowed unworthy candidates to enter the ministry.[22] One bishop who was criticised for exercising little discretion at ordination examinations was Thomas Dove, Bishop of Peterborough from 1601 to his death in 1630. A recent study has also found that between 1612 and 1630 Dove ordained about one in eight of all episcopally-ordained nonconformists ejected in 1662, which can be partly explained in terms of Peterborough's proximity to the precisionist seminaries at Cambridge University. It may also imply that Dove did not enquire too deeply into the views of those candidates presented to him for ordination. This view receives some support from the evidence in the Peterborough registers that, in direct contravention of canon 22, Dove regularly admitted ordinands to the diaconate and priesthood on consecutive days.[23] It has been argued above that James Mountagu of Bath & Wells gave preaching licences to several unsuitable clergy,[24] and the same wayward judgement is apparent from his willingness to ordain the future judaiser, John Traske. Although his chaplain Samuel Ward pronounced Traske to be unfit for holy orders, he was overruled by Mountagu, who was impressed by Traske's ostensible grasp of theology and his glowing references. After his ordination, Traske became an unlicensed itinerant preacher, first in Somerset and Devon, and later in Ely, before his imprisonment in London for doctrinal unorthodoxy.[25] It is quite possible that Traske was not the only beneficiary of Mountagu's gullibility.

In certain upland dioceses, bishops could not always afford to reject unworthy candidates. Laud records that, on a visit to St. David's diocese in 1625, he sent away the only ordination candidate, but the experience of Bishop Bayley of Bangor is more typical of the problems that faced the Welsh bishops. In 1630 Bayley was accused of ordaining poorly educated candidates, but he argued that he faced little choice:[26]

> I was sometimes compelled to make some few ministers that were but country scholars, to serve poor Welsh chapels where the stipend is not sufficient to maintain a university man.

In short, it seems that although several bishops took care in bestowing orders and were prepared to turn away unsuitable ordinands, an equal number of prelates did not or could not display such vigilance. The persistence of slack examinations helped fuel the flames of contemporary criticism, and may have prompted the royal orders of 1629 that bishops should not ordain 'unworthy persons'.[27]

* * * * *

In the episcopal office was vested the authority for granting or withholding institution to livings, which was a second device available to the bishop to control clerical recruitment in his diocese. Canon 39 of 1604 stated that a minister seeking institution should first be examined by his diocesan, who might reject him as uneducated, of scandalous life, irreligious, an excommunicate or simoniacal. Legal redress was available both to the rejected minister and his patron. The bishop might face a suit of duplex querela in the provincial courts of Audience and Arches from the aggrieved cleric, to force him to justify his decision to withhold institution, while the patron was entitled to bring a case of quare impedit against the bishop in the common law courts for hindering his right of presentation.[28] The register of institutions, like that of ordination, records only the names of successful candidates, so it is not clear how often the episcopate exercised this theoretical right to refuse institution to those whom they considered to be unsuitable. O'Day contends that the threat of suits of quare impedit and duplex querela deterred many bishops from rejecting candidates for institution, and cites six cases as evidence, all but one drawn from the

Elizabethan period. The most suggestive of these is the recollection of Ralph Brownrig that Archbishop Abbot had been fined £100 by common law judges for refusing to admit a clerk 'so meanly qualified as the law allows'.[29] However, O'Day leaves several important questions unresolved. What were the precise common law judgements on the right of the ordinary to withhold institution? Was a bishop more likely to receive a favourable hearing in the appellate courts of Arches and Audience in cases of duplex querela? Is there, indeed, any substantative evidence that the threat of legal redress was an effective constraint on the bishop's authority to grant institutions? These lines of enquiry are pursued in the analysis presented below.

A series of judgements in the Elizabethan common law courts seriously curtailed the practical opportunities for bishops to debar insufficient clergymen. In 1565 Bishop John Parkhurst of Norwich faced a suit of quare impedit for having refused to institute a clergyman notorious for drunkenness to the living of Stoke-by-Nayland. Parkhurst's plea that the clergyman was 'criminous' was unanimously rejected by the justices of the Common Pleas, who held that drunkenness was not male in se, but rather a crime by legal prohibition. This case created an important precedent and was quoted by Sir Edward Coke in the Parliament of 1621 to demonstrate that the ordinary could not refuse a candidate presented by the patron.[30] Coke himself had been involved in a similarly influential case heard before the court of Common Pleas in 1588 and subsequently brought into the King's Bench on a writ of error. Bishop John Woolton of Exeter had rejected John Holmes as a schismatic, but both courts found against the bishop, on the grounds that 'schismaticus inveteratus is too generall to be alledged on the case of a refusal of a clerk'. This sentence was based on curious reasoning, since the justices conceded that they were not competent to judge a more detailed definition of a schismatic.[31] In more minor cases the common law courts were equally unsympathetic to the rights of the ordinary. In Trinity term 1586 the court of

Common Pleas accepted that the Bishop of St. Asaph was obliged by a statute of 1563 to withhold institution from a non-Welsh speaking cleric, but the judgement went against the Bishop since he had given the patron insufficient time to find another candidate before claiming the living through lapse.[32] In 1591 the same court heard a suit of quare impedit against the Bishop of Peterborough, who had refused to institute a minister until he had seen his letters of testimony and ordination. While the justices noted that a statute of 1571 stipulated that none should be admitted to a living who was not a deacon, they did not interpret this to mean that the cleric was compelled to exhibit his documentation, and therefore judged that the Bishop had disturbed the patronage of the advowson.[33] The episcopate may have also lost important suits of duplex querela. Thomas Atkinson was denied institution to Fornham Geneffa in about 1571 by Parkhurst of Norwich and retaliated with a suit of duplex querela. Parkhurst justified his action by proving that on examination he had found Atkinson to be 'an ignorant asse...[and]...an earnest papest', but Atkinson evidently won the case and was subsequently instituted to the living.[34]

The acculumative effect of these decisions was to make many prelates wary of withholding institution to benefices. Thomas Bilson of Winchester complained at the Hampton Court conference in January 1604 that bishops were legally obliged to institute clergy 'of a very meane and tollerable sufficiency' and, among the reforming proposals that he and other bishops drew up two months later, was the suggestion that the common law courts and the episcopate should cooperate closely in excluding unworthy ministers from livings. It was proposed that whenever a minister was rejected for inappropriate conduct or inadequate learning and his patron replied with a suit of quare impedit, the common law judge would halt proceedings once he had received a certificate from the bishop confirming the candidate's unsuitability.[35] This idea was not followed up and the episcopate remained

vulnerable to the decisions of the common law. It was with some justification that in the course of a polemical exchange in 1622, William Ames taunted Bishop Morton with the relative impotence of the bishop to reject candidates for institution.[36] However, this episcopal power may have been emasculated, but it had not been eradicated. A bishop might successfully reject a candidate provided the patron did not challenge this action in law. This happened on several occasions in the Elizabethan Church, and was recorded in passing in other disputes over the ius patronatus.[37]

It is not easy, however, to adduce the relative weakness of episcopal authority over institutions from the extant documentation of Jacobean ecclesiastical and common law records. The acta of the provincial courts of Audience and Arches were dispersed during the Civil War and those that survived, stored in the archiepiscopal Church of St. Mary-le-Bow in Cheapside, were destroyed by fire in 1666. In contrast, the records of the common law courts are voluminous. Nevertheless, an investigation of the suits of quare impedit brought before the court of Common Pleas against the bishops of Chichester between 1602 and 1621 provides no evidence that the power to deny institution to unsuitable clerics was being used. The bishops were cited to answer eleven cases in twenty years, and at issue in each was not the calibre of the clergyman but the location of the ius patronatus.[38] For example, a dispute over the advowson of West Grinstead resulted in Bishop George Carleton, James Hutchinson BD, and the Earl of Arundel answering a charge of quare impedit in Trinity term 1621, brought by Sir Henry Parker and Sir Richard Mollineux. The case was adjourned until Michaelmas, when Carleton entered his plea that he had no right or interest in the case save as the authority for granting institutions, had accepted Arundel's letter presenting James Hutchinson to West Grinstead and had immediately instituted him.[39]

This negative evidence from one diocese may be significant in view of the common law decisions against bishops who were prepared to reject

unsuitable candidates for institution. Certainly there may have been less occasion to withhold institution, given the rising number of graduates entering the ministry by the early seventeenth century, but this argument does not entirely explain the chorus of contemporary complaints against the number of scandalous and incapable clergy who were still being admitted to benefices.[40] Only one Jacobean bishop won a reputation for standing firm on his rights as authority for instituting clergy,[41] and this was in opposition to simoniacal practices rather than clerical inadequacy. The biographers of Lancelot Andrewes affirm that, in the course of keeping a careful watch for simoniacal pacts, the Bishop incurred many suits of quare impedit and duplex querela.[42] In a sermon he gave before the southern convocation in St. Paul's Cathedral in February 1593, Andrewes himself strongly condemned the prevalent trading in benefices. He reproved the episcopate for enriching themselves from the spoils of the Church and urged them to guard against covert simoniacal agreements:[43]

> Nec hoc solum in nobis minoritis, qui rectorias nostras fere paciscimur; sed et apud vos majoritas, quos sic cathedras vestras, nempe vel pecuniarum summis, vel ecclesiarum spoliis foede cauponari vulgo dictitant. Quo morbo male jam diu et habet et audit Ecclesia nostra...

This was not empty rhetoric. Later that decade Andrewes declined two bishoprics since his elevation to each carried with it an exchange of land with the Crown, scruples which did not deter Bilson and Heton accepting Winchester and Ely on similar terms in 1597 and 1599.[44]

Direct evidence from the diocesan archives is thin on Andrewes's stand against simony. A fee-book from the court of Audience for 1607-1614 records that two of the eleven suits of duplex querela before the court were brought by clergy who had been denied institution by Andrewes, but his objection to them cannot be traced.[45] Something may be gleaned from the correspondence arising from the contested right of presentation to Shorwell rectory in

Winchester diocese during the autumn of 1625. One of the interested parties, George Warburton, recorded that a rival cleric had been refused institution by Andrewes on the suspicion of simony. The Bishop resolved the dispute in October 1625 by suing for a ius patronatus to determine the ownership of the advowson, and he appended to the standard enquiries issued to the commission a detailed question asking if any of the candidates were guilty of simony.[46] Indeed, it would be characteristic of Andrewes to fight simoniacal practices through the common law courts, for he was not afraid to resort to the courts to challenge lay patrons on other matters. As Bishop of Ely he deliberately provoked a suit of quare impedit to recover the advowson of Little Abington from lay hands.[47] It may be concluded, therefore, that the weight of positive as well as negative evidence implies that the theoretical right to refuse institution was not used by the Jacobean episcopate as an effective control over the quality of their diocesan clergy.

* * * * *

The power to remove a clergyman from his living was another tool available to the episcopate in maintaining clerical standards. The deprivation of nonconformist clergy is reserved for a later chapter,[48] and this section explores the use made of this sanction against negligent clergy.

In July 1610, during the second reading of a bill against scandalous ministers, George Abbot of London proclaimed in the Lords that its provisions were superfluous since unworthy clergy were regularly ousted from their benefices, and cited as evidence three cases since 1608, adding with a dash of drama 'this night...there shall be another cast out of the diocese of Gloucester'.[49] Abbot's contention is not wholly supported by the diocesan archives. Two schools of thought existed among the episcopate on the use of deprivation. The majority view was that the consistory should be an active

agent to reform erring clergy, and that to deprive a minister was an admission of failure rather than a mark of resolute government. Bishops Lake, Neile and Williams were the chief exponents of this line of thinking. Opposed to them were Abbot and Andrewes, who had no misgivings about depriving ministers for scandalous conduct.

In the three dioceses of Bath & Wells, Chichester and Ely, eight prelates removed only eighteen ministers from their livings for negligent or reprehensible behaviour between 1600 and 1628.[50] Ten of these were deprived by Lancelot Andrewes, who displayed marked impatience with clerical shortcomings. In four years at Chichester he dislodged at least two and possibly three ministers for ignominious conduct.[51] One was George Simpson, Vicar of Findon, who had been in persistent trouble with Chichester consistory since 1589. He had suffered imprisonment in 1592, presumably on a writ of de excommunicato capiendo, and four years later was responsible for an interdiction being placed on his church. A particular fondness for drink landed him in the stocks in Arundel, Tarring and Broadwater, and his churchwardens reported that one December morning in 1594 he was too drunk to administer the communion.[52] For similar offences, Andrewes had him removed from Findon by March 1607.[53] Andrewes was equally firm with first offenders. In 1609 John Ringe of Albourne was deprived for drunkenness and Nicholas Chauntler, convicted of sexual relations with two parishioners of Udimore, avoided deprivation thanks only to Andrewes's translation to Ely in the autumn of that year.[54] In 1608 Andrewes also reported Richard Barwicke to the Ecclesiastical Commission in London, which sentenced him to be deprived of his benefice for gross ignorance, negligence and perjury. Barwicke only evaded the sentence by introducing a prohibition from the common law courts.[55] Later events vindicated Andrewes's action. Barwicke remained a thorn in the side of Chichester consistory for the next decade[56] until Samuel Harsnett was finally goaded into action in 1617. Barwicke was presented for

administering the Christmas Eucharist in 1616 with a bottle of wine concealed in his breeches, so that when the communion wine ran out, he refilled it with the neck of the bottle protruding from his codpiece, an action understandably 'to the great disliking and loathing of ye communicants'.[57] Even then the wily Barwicke fought a lengthy and expensive defence in the courts of Arches and Delegates which lasted until the summer of 1622, when he finally accepted the sentence of deprivation, originally pronounced against him in 1619.[58]

As Bishop of Ely, Andrewes also deprived between four and seven ministers for non-residence, as has been analysed above.[59] His victims included at least three pluralists who did not reside for the forty days a year specified by canon law, although they did employ curates, so that divine service was celebrated regularly.[60] The campaign may have enjoyed some success, since at the primary visitation of Andrewes's successor Nicholas Felton in 1619 no clergyman was presented for non-residence.[61] Andrewes's severity was unmatched by his fellow prelates: in fifteen years at Bath & Wells John Still deprived only one clergyman, his successor James Mountagu a mere couple in eight years,[62] a pattern also true for Lake, Harsnett and Carleton.[63] Only George Abbot of Canterbury pursued a similar policy to that of Andrewes, for, as is argued elsewhere, he used the powers of the Ecclesiastical Commission more rigorously than his predecessor Bancroft.[64]

Some prelates openly questioned the desirability of regular deprivation of clergymen. John Williams so disapproved of Abbot's harsh discipline that he avoided attending the Ecclesiastical Commission at Lambeth, for he held that the pastoral staff was 'made to reduce a wandering sheep, not to knock it down'. Moreover, he objected to the removal of the clergyman's freehold and livelihood, which made him destitute of security and income.[65] Richard Neile proudly informed Archbishop Laud in January 1637 that in twenty-eight years as Bishop of six sees he had never deprived a nonconformist, electing instead to admonish and guide them 'with meekness and patience'. There is no

evidence that he deprived negligent clergy in this period, either.[66] Many bishops subscribed to this attitude and adopted alternative solutions to the problems of clerical misconduct and non-residence. Bishops Lake, Harsnett and Carleton all personally supervised the administration of justice in their consistories and used the weapons of admonition, suspension and excommunication against erring clergy in preference to deprivation. Arthur Lake removed only one minister, William Buckland of East Coker, who was convicted of a variety of offences, principally for serving his cure while under sentence of excommunication and for whipping a twenty-one year old maid 'most unseemlie, uncivilly and lasciviouslye'.[67] More characteristic of Lake's style of government was his gentle handling of Thomas Keene, the wayward rector of Winford, whom he reproved and suspended on a number of occasions between 1617 and 1623.[68] Periodically George Carleton could act peremptorily, as may be adduced from his deprivation of William Collinson in 1628, but he usually adopted a more conciliatory approach to clerical insufficiency.[69]

Nor did these bishops ignore the problem of absentee clergy. Andrewes's draconian measures at Ely need to be seen in the context of a diocese where poorly endowed or impropriated livings surrounded a University town at which many clergy were still studying for higher degrees. Andrewes's predecessor Martin Heton had tackled the problem by sequestering the fruits of non-resident ministers' livings, and had deprived one cleric, Edward Williams, for persistent absence, but the scale of Andrewes's campaign may suggest that Heton did not appreciate the frequency of its occurrence.[70] Non-residence extended far beyond the confines of Ely diocese, however. The issue had been at the centre of a vigorous debate over the state of the Church, conducted in and outside Parliament during the early years of James I's reign, and was the subject of royal directives in 1605 and 1610.[71] At Bath & Wells and Chichester, to judge from the churchwardens' presentments, the number of absentee

ministers was small and consequently deprivations remained rare.[72] James Mountagu did remove one minister, Simon Sturtevant, in August 1613, while Samuel Harsnett threatened to oust two absentee clergy on the Cathedral staff at Chichester, and at Norwich he deprived John Allen and Arthur Pye for non-residence.[73] Notwithstanding the peculiar circumstances of Ely diocese, the rapidity of the deprivations by Andrewes is very striking. Proceedings from the first citation to the act of deprivation took an average of three to four months, compared to the nine months of preliminary moves by Heton against Edward Williams, or the four years that elapsed before Mountagu deprived Sturtevant. This speed may reflect as much the determination of Lancelot Andrewes to eradicate this abuse as the efficient administration of a compact diocese like Ely.

Non-residence and pluralism were germane issues. In view of the poverty of many benefices, clergy were permitted by Parliamentary statute and ecclesiastical canon to hold a number of livings in plurality within certain well-defined limits.[74] Canons 41 and 47 of 1604 stated that the livings should be no more than thirty miles apart and that the pluralist must possess at least an MA degree and support a preaching curate in the benefice at which he did not reside. Before their elevation to the episcopate most prelates had been pluralists themselves and after consecration many also held livings <u>in commendam</u>.[75] Nor did they make a discernible attempt to curb the number of pluralists in their jurisdiction, simultaneously collating protégés to two or more episcopal livings,[76] or granting benefices to clergy who already possessed a living in the diocese.[77] Bishop Carleton is a rare example of a prelate who may have disapproved of pluralism, for he never conferred more than one episcopal living at a time on a protégé and usually expected him to resign other benefices prior to collation.[78] Having therefore condoned pluralism, many bishops took a lively interest in the selection and supervision of curates. In a number of dioceses the authority to grant licences to curates

had been appropriated by the chancellor and surrogates; Bishops Chaderton of Lincoln, Cotton of Salisbury and Parry of Gloucester all attempted to recover their personal control over the recruitment of curates, presumably because their officials were concerned less with the calibre of applicants than the financial perquisites appertaining to the office.[79] In Bath & Wells and Chichester the bishop's authority was less fettered in this matter. Both Harsnett and Lake examined the suitability of curates, who had often insinuated themselves into cures without licence, and they showed no compunction in suspending some, inhibiting others and, where necessary, ordering beneficed clergy to find more sufficient assistants.[80]

It seems, therefore, that Jacobean prelates addressed the problem of clerical misconduct in a variety of ways. Most, however, avoided the sanction of deprivation, except against the most incorrigible offenders, preferring, instead, to use suspension sentences against curates and beneficed ministers alike.

* * * * *

The careful screening of candidates for ordination and the suspension or deprivation of miscreants were policies which barely affected the majority of the parochial clergy entrusted to the bishop's care. The quality of their pastoral ministry remained a closed book to most prelates, who often had to rely on information gleaned from their officials,[81] from personal contact on visitation and from the examination of negligent clergy in the consistory. The vocational skills of diocesan clergy might be enhanced by meetings and discussions with their fellow ministers at synods or at combination lectures,[82] but there was a strong presumption in the ordinances of the Church that regular studying should underpin these activities. Canon 75 of 1604 obliged the clergy to put time aside for reading the scriptures and theological texts, which

one Jacobean bishop interpreted as meaning seven hours daily.[83] Theological learning and proper pastoral care were traditionally considered to be inseparable sisters. The Elizabethan episcopate had responded to the low educational attainments of their clergy by devising schemes of theological training in many dioceses, while official concern culminated in the regulations passed in the southern convocation in December 1586. Non-graduates were ordered to study a chapter of the Bible every day and a sermon from Bullinger's Decades each week, and to submit their notes to the scrutiny of a neighbouring preacher every quarter.[84] Such schemes are a familiar feature of the Elizabethan Church. It has not been recognised, however, that similar programmes flourished in many dioceses long after 1603, notwithstanding the rising number of graduates entering the ministry in the early seventeenth century. A study of the libri cleri for nine sees in the southern province reveals that educational programmes were introduced in at least four, and perhaps five, dioceses after 1603: namely Chichester, London, Gloucester, Bath & Wells, and probably Norwich.[85] These schemes were fairly uniform in character, but were devised for very different motives. At London and Gloucester, continuity with the Elizabethan programmes is very apparent. At Chichester, and probably Norwich, they were intended to appease vociferous criticism of the diocesan clergy; while at Bath & Wells they were very much the personal creation of one bishop, Arthur Lake.

It was the custom in several dioceses to examine poorly educated ministers on visitation, as has been described above.[86] Matters were taken further in a handful of cases, such as occurred at Henry Parry's second visitation of Gloucester in 1610 when Thomas Rock, Rector of Shipton-Sollars, was denounced to him for ignorance and scandalous life. It transpired that Rock was unable to construe elementary Latin and propounded a novel doctrine of the Eucharist as 'a visible signe of an invisible grace...the bred is the signe and soe are our soules refreshed by the wine'. At this point Parry

had heard enough and ordered him to attend the next sitting of the consistory at Gloucester.[87]

At other times these examinations were the occasion as much as the cause for ordering a number of clergy to return exercises in theology. In Chichester diocese, clerical shortcomings had been exposed by local puritans in the petitioning campaign preceding the Hampton Court conference, criticism which stung an embarrassed local administration into introducing a series of remedial measures between September 1603 and October 1606.[88] Chief among these was the provision, for the first time since the 1570s, of theological training to raise levels of clerical learning in the diocese. In September 1603 Bishop Anthony Watson ordered the rural deans in Lewes archdeaconry to examine the education and sufficiency of their less learned brethren and, where they saw fit, to give instruction in theology.[89] In all probability the scheme affected very few clergy, for two years later, at the metropolitical visitation of Archbishop Bancroft, the rural deans returned only fifteen names in response to a similar injunction. These fifteen ministers appeared in Lewes consistory the following month and were either referred to senior neighbouring ministers or were dismissed for unspecified reasons.[90] This concern reached an apogee in the orders promulgated at Lancelot Andrewes's primary visitation in October 1606. Fresh lists of insufficient clergy were drawn up by the rural deans, and these 'inferior' ministers were required to report monthly to their clerical supervisors in order to give an account both of their studies and of the homilies they read week by week. The numbers involved from the western archdeaconry may have been larger than in Lewes, to judge from loose visitation papers which record the names of fourteen ministers from two of the four deaneries of Chichester archdeaconry entrusted to the care of six senior clergy. The majority of these fourteen were non-graduates.[91]

The timing of these experiments implies that they were intended to

appease local criticism, an aim which the administration considered had been achieved by 1609. At Andrewes's second visitation that summer, these schemes were allowed to lapse and were not revived under his successors, Harsnett and Carleton. The continuation of this educational programme between 1603 and 1606 under the jurisdiction of three different prelates - Watson, Bancroft and Andrewes - reflects the exigencies of the moment rather than the proclivities of the ordinary. Watson, certainly, had taken minimal interest in diocesan affairs before the petitioning campaign of 1603.[92] The active interest of Andrewes in standards of clerical conduct[93] is quite consistent with the scheme introduced in his name in 1606, but there is no direct evidence to link him with the compilation of the 'orders' of 1606, which were probably drawn up by his chancellor, John Drury.[94] Nor did Andrewes impose any comparable programme in the course of six visitations in Ely and Winchester dioceses between 1610 and 1625.

The response of Chichester consistory to puritan criticism in 1603 may have been followed elsewhere. In Norwich diocese, a survey in February 1604 of the degrees and aptitudes of the parochial clergy noted that ignorant ministers 'have been injoyned exercises' to broaden their theological knowledge, although from the context it is unclear whether this referred to schemes newly hatched or those in operation since the convocation orders of 1586.[95] Certainly, there is no allusion to these exercises in the liber cleri for John Jegon's primary visitation that October, nor in that for Bancroft's metropolitical visitation the following year, so if a scheme were introduced in 1603-4, it must have been short-lived.[96]

In contrast to Chichester, strong threads of continuity link the Elizabethan and Jacobean training schemes in London and Gloucester dioceses. In the 1580s Bishop John Aylmer had been a vigorous advocate of vocational training for the London clergy, and at his final visitation in 1592 theological exercises were still being performed by over twenty-five clergy.[97] Libri cleri

survive for only two episcopal visitations over the next twenty years: that is to say, the primary visitations of Richard Bancroft in 1598 and Thomas Ravis in 1607. Both indicate that Aylmer's programme had not been abandoned. In 1598 over a hundred clergy were referred to episcopal commissioners to be examined.[98] While no record of these interviews is extant, it is clear that some of these ministers had to satisfy the commissioners of their fitness to hold or retain preaching licences. Others were examined for unspecified reasons, and it may well be the case that they were assigned exercises, as the registrar noted against the name of one clergyman sent to the commissioners.[99] The liber cleri is less equivocal for Ravis' visitation in 1607. The enforcement of conformity was accompanied by an examination of the preaching aptitudes and scriptural knowledge of many ministers. The curate of Dagenham, for example, was ordered to prove his ability to preach and, failing that, to undertake some theological exercises. At least a dozen clergy, mostly non-graduate curates, were sent to their archdeacons for tuition in the scriptures.[100] The major part played by the archdeacons as commissioners and supervisors of vocational training links this visitation with those of Aylmer and Bancroft, and it is plausible to suggest that educational schemes may have been introduced at other visitations between 1592 and 1607. They were shelved, however, in John King's two visitations of 1612 and 1615, a reflection, perhaps, of the small number of clergy needing tuition by 1607.[101]

That vocational training continued in Gloucester after 1600 is less surprising than its survival in London, which was well-stocked with preaching ministers. The Gloucester clergy's celebrated ignorance, revealed by Bishop Hooper in the visitation of 1551,[102] had not improved greatly by the end of the century. In 1603 Bishop Goldsborough had to report to Archbishop Whitgift that there were only sixty-nine licensed preachers in a diocese of two hundred and sixty-seven parishes, a proportion of 27% which is comparable to other backward and unfashionable dioceses such as Hereford or Coventry &

Lichfield, and is in stark contrast to the healthy figures produced for London.[103] The Elizabethan episcopate had not entirely neglected the problem, however. In Grindal's metropolitical visitation of the diocese in the 1570s the scriptural knowledge of all clergy below MA status was investigated and in 1594 they were ordered by Bishop John Bullingham to return exercises on Bullinger's Decades, to be composed in Latin by BAs and in English by non-graduates.[104] The timing of these latter instructions is baffling, since Bullingham had already been at Gloucester for thirteen years, had announced them during his fifth ordinary visitation and did not reissue them at his last visitation in 1597. Possibly Bullingham was satisfied with the quality of the exercises that he read or perhaps he felt that the experiment was unprofitable. After his death in 1598, however, his successor Godfrey Goldsborough returned to the problem.

Goldsborough was an administrator of some energy, who conducted his primary visitation in 1599 in person and then sat in consistory to judge presentments arising from it. Within two years of his arrival Goldsborough also removed his corrupt and wily chancellor, William Blackleech, whom Bullingham had failed to dislodge.[105] At Goldsborough's second visitation of 1602 one hundred and fifty clergy were given specified chapters from the Old and New Testaments and a commonplace topic to study, on which to return an account three months later.[106] Within two years, however, Goldsborough was dead, and the attention of his immediate successors, Ravis and Parry, was distracted by other urgent matters. In his sole visitation of 1605 Ravis enforced the canons promulgated the previous year and imposed full subscription and conformity. Ravis' successor Parry did not attend his primary visitation of 1607, which took place within days of his consecration at Lambeth, and three years later at his second visitation he was anxious to implement the detailed instructions sent down from Lambeth that July.[107] Parry was translated to Worcester in October 1610 and his place was eventually

filled by Giles Thompson, who died on 9 June 1612, the first anniversary of his consecration.[108]

That autumn George Abbot conducted a metropolitical visitation during the sede vacante and his commissaries instructed sixty-one clergy to receive monthly theological tuition from forty neighbouring ministers, who were to report quarterly to the chancellor on their progress.[109] As at Chichester between 1603 and 1606, the insufficiently educated were almost all non-graduates. This initiative faltered as soon as the visitation was concluded. Miles Smith was consecrated Bishop of Gloucester as the visitation was taking place and arrived in his diocese to find that Abbot's commissaries had assigned to him the supervision of two clergy of Gloucester deanery. Smith, however, in four visitations between 1613 and 1622, took no discernible interest in the problem of clerical learning so that the scheme of 1612, like its predecessor of 1602, remained an isolated effort to improve educational standards.[110] Its origins may be tentatively located within the circle of George Abbot's intimates. Vocational training was not a regular feature of Abbot's metropolitical visitations and did not occur at Chichester or Ely in 1615, at Coventry & Lichfield in 1616 or at Winchester in 1618.[111] However, Abbot did have channels of information from many dioceses, as becomes apparent from the visitation articles he issued to Cathedral chapters, choristers and servants. His predecessor Bancroft invariably issued a standard set of thirteen questions,[112] but Abbot modified his articles in line with the local knowledge he had received. At Salisbury in 1612 he included three pointed questions on the corrupt presentations to advowsons in the gift of the Dean and Chapter, and the same year he asked the Bristol Chapter the reason why the Mayor and aldermen refused to attend divine service in the Cathedral.[113] Abbot's knowledge of the poor education of the Gloucestershire clergy in 1612 was probably derived from Sebastian Benefield, an incumbent of the diocese from 1605 and his domestic chaplain after 1610.[114] Although Benefield resided for

part of the year at Oxford as fellow of Corpus Christi and later Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, he frequently returned to his cure at Meysey Hampton, as testified by the three quarto volumes of 'country sermons' he preached there, which were published between 1613 and 1629.[115] Benefield also attended successive episcopal visitations and therefore had ample opportunity to assess the learning of his country cousins in the ministry.[116]

Arthur Lake of Bath & Wells was the only Jacobean bishop to devise more than one training programme for his clergy. His biographer John Harris stated that on triennial visitations Lake took immense care to supervise the learning of his diocesan clergy, and noted that it was the Bishop's custom:

> to examine strictly all those of whose sufficiencie hee any way doubted, as well touching their course of studie, as of their preaching; and as he would restraine those from preaching for a time, whom hee found weake and ignorant, so would hee with all direct them both for the bookes they should read, and the method they should use for the better enabling of themselves to that exercise, and thereof would he take account as occasion served; by which meanes he alwayes quickned their industrie, and drew many of them to such a commendable improvement of their talent, that the countrie was much edified thereby.

The eulogistic tone of Harris's account excites the general suspicion that partiality may have clouded his assessment of Lake, yet these particular claims are endorsed by the diocesan archives.[117] In three visitations between 1617 and 1623 Lake removed preaching licences from a number of ministers and ordered one hundred and six clergy, about one in four of the Somerset ministry, to submit theological exercises to him, usually on the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion and the Pauline epistle to the Romans.[118]

At his first visitation in 1617 Lake proceeded cautiously, instructing two ministers to write exercises in divinity and a further nineteen to appear before him at Wells palace by the following April on unspecified business. These interviews were probably connected with the clergy's inadequate learning, since the nineteen included several who were ordered to compose exercises at

later visitations.[119] The timing of his primary visitation may explain why Lake restricted his attention to these twenty-one clergy. Although he had been consecrated Bishop of Bath & Wells in December 1616, Lake remained at Oxford until the end of the academic year as Warden of New College and Vice-Chancellor of the University. Having resigned the wardenry, Lake arrived in Somerset in the middle of July and was still being feasted by local society and familiarising himself with his diocesan administration when his primary visitation began the next month.[120] The series of visitation sessions he attended throughout the diocese provided a splendid opportunity for Lake to meet the majority of his clergy, but not, it seems, to distinguish the clerical sheep from the goats. By the time of his second visitation in the summer of 1620, Lake could draw on the knowledge he had accumulated from three years' residence in the diocese, especially from his supervision of justice in consistory and from his examination of clergy petitioning for institution or licences. Thus fifty-five clergy were ordered to return exercises to the Bishop in his second visitation of 1620, fifty-one at his third and final visitation of 1623.[121]

These ministers were of diverse background and status. Just as they comprised forty-eight graduates, including ten MAs, and fifty-eight non-graduates, so exactly half their number were beneficed clergy, the remainder being stipendiary curates. With a few notable exceptions, their common characteristic was that none held a preaching licence. Since not all non-preaching clergy were obliged to return exercises, it seems clear that these hundred and six clergy were selected on the basis of a personal examination by Bishop Lake, as indeed his biographer averred. The inclusion of a large number of graduates indicates that Lake's scheme was more ambitious than those introduced at Chichester between 1603 and 1606, at London in 1607 and at Gloucester in 1612.

Lake's involvement with every stage of the training programme is very

apparent. The Vicar of Berrow, Hamish Hambridge BA, was instructed to submit an exercise on the Articles of Religion at Lake's visitation of 1620. Hambridge was absent from the next visitation, but Lake evidently remembered his poor scriptural knowledge, and ordered him to be cited and thereupon to compose another theological exercise.[122] In 1623, the vicar of South Brent was required to return an exercise to the Bishop by Christmas, but he appeared at Wells a month late, in January 1624, to learn that Lake had left for London to attend Parliament and he was told to return again when the Bishop was back in the diocese. In one or two cases, the registrar noted that the exercises were handed to Lake personally, which is important since the libri cleri rarely mention their submission or inspection, while invariably recording the assignation of the exercises to the clergymen.[123] Nor is it likely that clergy who were tardy in returning exercises escaped undetected, for the registrar recorded that several ministers were to produce exercises on pain of suspension.[124]

Lake deftly used this tool of vocational training to serve several different purposes. First, a number of unlicensed curates appeared at each visitation and were often required to return theological exercises to prove that they merited a licence to serve their cure.[125] A similar tactic was occasionally used with unlicensed preachers.[126] Lake was also anxious to increase the number of preachers in the diocese and he granted licences to at least eight clergy immediately after reading their exercises.[127] This relatively small number is consistent with Lake's circumspection in granting preaching licences. Like his predecessors Mountagu and Still, Lake issued an average of six preaching licences a year,[128] yet the standards of learning he demanded from successful candidates were considerably higher than those of Mountagu. Lake never gave exercises to clergy whom he had licensed to preach, but he requested them from at least eight ministers holding preaching licences from Mountagu, two of whom had their preaching licence duly

revoked.[129] One of these was John Stansall, curate of West Pennard, licensed to preach by Mountagu in August 1610, who had lost his licence by Lake's second visitation of 1620, when Stansall was ordered to write an exercise on the Thirty-Nine Articles. Two months later he was before the consistory for preaching without a licence, in answer to which Stansall pleaded that he had already been ordered to preach before Bishop Lake by All Saints' day. The Bishop was evidently unimpressed by Stansall's performance, for he remained unlicensed and had to produce another exercise at the visitation of 1623.[130] Both Bishops Mountagu and Lake acknowledged the importance of a strong preaching ministry in Bath & Wells, but they proceeded in very different ways. Lake avowed that ministration of the Word was a principal conduit of divine grace, a view which underpinned his practice of regular preaching and his novel instructions to non-preaching ministers to return certificates of the number of sermons preached in their parish churches.[131] Yet the rigorous standards of learning and probity that Lake expected from preaching ministers reflected a wariness of the dangers of idle and contentious preaching, a theme which surfaced periodically in his sermons and writings.[132] Mountagu was less restrained by such scruples. Within a month of arriving at Wells in August 1608, he had declared that an increase in the number of diocesan preachers was a major objective of his administration, and he took personal charge as the sole authority for issuing preaching licences.[133] The licences he granted show him to be less discriminating than Lake, who considered a number of recipients to be insufficiently educated. Mountagu's desire to enlarge the preaching ministry, coupled with his ignorance of many of the Somerset clergy as a result of his residence in London for ten months out of every twelve, explains why he licensed a number of clergy who later became notorious offenders. Chief among these were Meredith Mady and William Buckland, who were the only Somerset ministers to lose their livings under his successor Lake.[134]

The majority of the hundred and six clergy undertaking theological

exercises at Lake's behest were neither unlicensed curates nor aspiring preachers, but merely poorly educated ministers who were not in the habit of studying regularly. Typical of these was Thomas Webber, curate of Brushford. Lake examined him and enquired 'in what divinitie hee hath busyed himself in study?'. When Webber answered that he was not studying any text or commentary, Lake instructed him to compose an essay on the Articles of Religion and the Pauline epistle to the Romans. It was this sort of clergyman that Ralph Cudworth, Rector of Aller, condemned in a letter to James Ussher a year after Lake's appointment to Bath & Wells. His neighbouring ministers were incapable or uninterested in conferring together on theological topics, so that Cudworth could only conclude that he was 'seated in a barren place'. Two years later, eight of Cudworth's fellow clergy in Ilchester deanery were selected to write theological exercises at Lake's second visitation.[135] The continuity provided by Lake's schemes was one of its strengths. In the course of consecutive visitations, the Bishop could chart the progress of the more unlearned clergy, thirteen of whom returned exercises at both visitations of 1620 and 1623. The laconic entries in the clerus books which have formed the basis of this analysis may represent only a part of Lake's supervision of the clergy's learning and studies, if we accept the remarks of his biographer that the Bishop also provided advice on what books the clergy should read and the methods they might adopt to improve their preaching aptitudes.[136] In short, a premium was placed upon vocational study, and compulsory exercises over three visitations brought this point home even to the more indolent of ministers, an atmosphere quite absent from the ad hoc experiments at Gloucester in 1602 and 1612.

The majority of vocational training schemes in the Jacobean Church were aimed at non-graduate clergy. As the numbers of these clergy declined, so too did the training programmes, which occur in only one diocese after 1612. Lake's scheme at Bath & Wells is significant precisely because he

abandoned any rigid distinction between graduates and non-graduates, as he tried to improve the general level of scriptural knowledge amongst the Somerset ministry. His standard for what constituted 'sufficiency' was correspondingly higher than that used in the other four dioceses. It remains the case, however, that the practical benefits of all these schemes are hard to quantify, except in the crude numerical terms of those who won preaching licences by returning impressive exercises.

* * * * *

The distribution of the considerable personal patronage possessed by the episcopate provided another opportunity to improve the quality of the diocesan clergy. Talented clergy could be enticed into the diocese and able ministers already resident there could receive further preferment. The scale of episcopal preferment differed markedly between bishops and between dioceses, since it was dependent not merely on the number and value of advowsons and cathedral prebends attached to any one bishopric, but also on the fortuitous pattern of vacancies through death, resignation or deprivation. The bishops of Winchester and Ely were both powerful local patrons. In the gift of the bishop of Winchester were forty-six diocesan benefices and a string of livings elsewhere, together with two archdeaconries and twelve Cathedral stalls.[137] Following the great exchange with the Crown in 1598-9, the Jacobean bishops of Ely held the advowson of at least thirty-three of the one hundred and fifty livings in the diocese together with an archdeaconry, eight prebendal stalls, and a number of extra-diocesan benefices, twenty-eight of which fell vacant between 1600 and 1626.[138] Less powerful were their colleagues at Chichester, in whose gift were twenty-eight livings, two archdeaconries, three Cathedral dignities and thirty canonries.[139] The bishops of Bath & Wells were similarly endowed. They possessed the advowson of only

fifteen benefices and the patronage of four Cathedral offices, three archdeaconries and forty-six prebendal stalls, most of which were of modest value.[140] Some of these bishops were more fortunate beneficaries of vacancies than others. Samuel Harsnett and George Carleton held the see of Chichester for an almost identical length of time, but Harsnett enjoyed virtually twice as many opportunities of patronage as did his successor Carleton.[141] Another telling example comes from Bath & Wells diocese. Between 1608 and 1616 James Mountagu filled a number of wealthy offices including all three archdeaconries of Bath, Taunton and Wells, so that the next bishop, Arthur Lake, complained that 'I have scarce a gleaning left after my predecessour, who had a full harvest [of] all preferments which fell to his guift'.[142] Indeed, neither Mountagu nor Lake had many opportunities to fill vacant episcopal livings, for only eleven vacancies occurred in the eighteen years of their tenure.[143] When such vacancies arose, the poverty of many episcopal livings meant that a protégé had to be provided for more than once to guarantee him a competent stipend, which may explain why the majority of bishops condoned pluralism, but it inevitably limited the width of episcopal patronage.[144] Moreover, like all patrons, prelates faced regular requests for preferment, often with the backing of powerful lay interests, which could not always be ignored.[145] In 1615 John King of London told one suitor that he had been so importuned by Crown and courtiers for vacant livings for their clients that he was scarely able to grant livings to those who had done him particular service.[146] Having made allowances for these constraints on episcopal patronage, O'Day concludes that Thomas Morton of Coventry & Lichfield increased the number of zealous preachers in his diocese through judicious patronage.[147] Is this conclusion equally applicable to other Jacobean prelates? A study of the three dioceses of Bath & Wells, Chichester and Ely indicates that all bishops were able to attract clerical talent into their dioceses, yet a case can only be made for three prelates - Mountagu, Lake and

Andrewes - having purposefully used their patronage to improve the calibre of their diocesan clergy.

All bishops granted a number of episcopal livings to graduate clergy from outside the diocese. A favourite recruiting ground for talent was the university or particular college that the bishop had attended and in many cases the connection was still strong, since twenty-three Jacobean prelates had been heads of Oxbridge colleges prior to their consecration to the episcopal office.[148] Thus ten New College men followed Warden Lake to Somerset after 1616,[149] and four Pembroke men were beneficed in Chichester diocese by their Master, Samuel Harsnett.[150]

Both James Mountagu and Arthur Lake used their patronage to introduce several notable graduate preachers into Bath & Wells. Mountagu appointed his cousin Gerard Wood to the archdeaconry of Wells and conferred the archdeaconry of Bath on another Cambridge graduate, Timothy Rivett, a regular preacher who delivered Mountagu's funeral sermon in Bath Abbey in 1618.[151] Mountagu's most illustrious acquisition was the prolific author and precisionist Richard Bernard, who had temporarily lost his Nottinghamshire living for nonconformity in 1605 and had toyed with separation before coming back into the bosom of the established Church. Mountagu invited Bernard into Somerset during the summer of 1612, licensed him to preach throughout the diocese and secured him the rectory of Batcombe, to which Bernard was instituted in November 1613.[152] For the next thirty years, Bernard was a leading light in the combination lectures of eastern Somerset and wrote a score of scriptural commentaries and spiritual tracts. Some details of his parochial ministry may be recovered from a letter he wrote to James Ussher in 1619. Bernard related that many of the congregation reassembled at Batcombe rectory after Sunday morning service to hear the sermon repeated and have their sermon notes corrected. They were then catechised on it by Bernard 'and all before ye second sermon in ye afternoone'.153

Bernard's most influential publication was The Faithfull Shepheard, originally printed in 1607 and substantially revised in 1621, which was cited with approval by a number of contemporary divines.[154] The edition of 1621 was prefixed by a dedication to thirty-four beneficed preachers in the diocese, who constituted a self-conscious elite in Somerset clerical society.[155] Among these thirty-four was Ralph Cudworth, whose contempt for his less erudite colleagues around Aller has already been cited; another was William Sclater, Vicar of Pitminster, who claimed in a sermon at Paul's Cross in September 1609 that less than one in five congregations in Somerset enjoyed regular sermons, so that diligent preachers were accounted puritans. A third was Samuel Crooke, whose experience supports Sclater's argument, for on his arrival at Wrington in 1602 he discovered that the parish had never had a preaching incumbent. Crooke made amends by preaching seven thousand sermons over the next forty-seven years.[156]

Bernard's dedication furnishes clear evidence of the contribution made by episcopal patronage to the preaching strength of the Somerset clergy. Mentioned in the dedication was Timothy Rivett, and also Gerard Wood, who later presented Bernard's son Cannanuel to two livings in his gift.[157] Also included was Edward Chetwind, a city lecturer who became Dean of Bristol in 1617 through Mountagu's good offices; Henry Allen, appointed to a Cathedral canonry by Mountagu and to the vicarage of South Brent by Wood; Richard Adams and Thomas Woodyeates, both chaplains and protégés of Lake, who had accompanied him into the diocese, and Sclater, another chaplain to Lake, who received the prebendal stall of Wedmore II in 1619.[158] The affinity between the patronage of Mountagu and Lake is also very apparent. Bernard received the same preferential treatment from Lake as he had done from Mountagu, to the extent that he publicly praised Lake as 'a blessed Bishop, a very man of God'; another example is Richard Hadley, who accepted a canonry from Mountagu and the post of domestic chaplain from Lake.[159] In short, like

Thomas Morton of Coventry & Lichfield, James Mountagu and Arthur Lake used their patronage to raise the numbers of zealous preachers in Bath & Wells, a policy consonant with the interest they expressed elsewhere in the level of diocesan preaching.[160]

It is less easy to characterise the patronage of Samuel Harsnett and George Carleton at Chichester between 1609 and 1628. The plum positions in Harsnett's gift went to a group of relatives and protégés from his college of Pembroke in Cambridge, who included Richard Buckenham DD, collated within the space of five years to the archdeaconry of Lewes, a brace of Cathedral stalls and the episcopal living of Eartham; Owen Stockton and Theophilus Kent, who received two episcopal livings and a canonry apiece and John Hullwood, who was preferred to two other episcopal livings. All but Kent were Harsnett's domestic chaplains and remained in the diocese after the Bishop's translation to Norwich in August 1619.[161] This inner circle of intimates was penetrated by only two local clergy with no previous connection with Harsnett, who became chaplains and were granted episcopal livings.[162] Although a number of other episcopal livings were given to long-serving diocesan clergy, including at least three unbeneficed curates,[163] the weight of Harsnett's patronage leant towards Pembroke graduates, who distinguished themselves primarily by service in the diocesan administration.[164]

Harsnett's successor Carleton beneficed three Oxford graduates in Chichester diocese, the most eminent of whom was Thomas Vicars, a fellow of The Queen's College, Oxford, who took his BD in 1622. Vicars married Carleton's step-daughter, became an episcopal chaplain and was collated to a canonry and the rich living of Cuckfield.[165] His published works show him animated by the evangelical fervour characteristic of Queen's men of his generation.[166] In 1622 Vicars translated into English Bartholomew Keckermann's theological primer 'to further the simplest of my country-mens growth in all godlinesse' and also wrote a catechism which quickly ran through

three editions and was warmly commended by Daniel Featley, for one.[167] His commitment to proselytising may be adduced from the prayer he composed to conclude a synodal sermon delivered in Chichester Cathedral in the autumn of 1626:[168]

> O Lord, that givest thy holy Word,
> send preachers plenteously;
> that in the same we may accord,
> and therein live and die.
> O Holy Spirit, direct aright
> the preachers of thy Word,
> that Thou by them maiest cut downe sinne,
> as it were with a sword.

It would be quite wrong to suppose that Vicars was a representative example of the clergy patronised by Carleton. The majority seem to have made little impression on Chichester diocese and one or two acquired a reputation for negligence. In 1624 Carleton granted a canonry and the vicarage of Selsey to Robert Johnson BD, a chaplain to the King, who received the royal living of St. Andrew's Chichester in 1625.[169] At Carleton's triennial visitation that year, the churchwardens of St Andrew's complained that no sermons were preached nor catechising classes held, while it also transpired that Johnson was absent from Selsey and had not appointed a curate 'by reason whereof divers children have dyed unbaptised for want of a minister.' In 1626 Johnson was again cited for omitting to catechise or preach, charges which it seems he did not deny. On two occasions in 1630 he was once more accused of not catechising his parishioners and this time Johnson claimed that the fault lay not with him but with his congregation, who did not send their children and servants to him for instruction. The regularity of these presentments implies that they were not fabricated.[170]

William Hickes MA, another protégé of Carleton's, was collated to West Wittering prebend in 1620 on the resignation of Jerome Beale. Under the Cathedral statutes the prebendary was required to deliver lectures in theology, which Beale had delegated to others since he resided elsewhere, a practice

that prompted a bitter exchange with Bishop Harsnett at his visitation in 1616.[171] Hickes followed Beale's example by residing outside the diocese and was only checked at Richard Mountagu's primary visitation in 1628, when he promised in future to give the lectures personally. Three years later, Mountagu complained that Hickes had only twice fulfilled his promise and instead sent in his place 'any riff raff he can light upon, shifters, unconformitants, curatts, young boyes, puritanes', a charge never levelled against his predecessor Beale. Mountagu had his own reasons for attacking Hickes, but he claimed that his low opinion of the man was shared by at least two of the Cathedral canon-residentaries.[172]

One other case reflects unfavourably on Carleton's assessment of his own clergy. In 1622 the Bishop granted Yapton vicarage to Anthony Hilton, a dogged precisionist who from 1589 had been intermittently prosecuted by Chichester consistory for nonconformity and had narrowly escaped deprivation in 1605.[173] In 1624 Hilton was again accused of failing to observe the Book of Common Prayer and the canons of the Church on various accounts.[174] He had omitted to wear the surplice, had administered the Eucharist to communicants who did not kneel, admitted women to be churched without insisting that they wore a veil and had not announced saints days. Nonconformity was hardly a burning issue during Carleton's tenure of Chichester and cases rarely reached his consistory, yet it seems unlikely that he would have endorsed such flagrant contempt for the ordinances of the Church.[175] In short, there is little suggestion that George Carleton's patronage markedly improved the calibre of the Chichester clergy.

In contrast to Carleton, there is considerable evidence that Lancelot Andrewes used his patronage to promote able divines in the Church. His biographers claimed that the Bishop asked his chaplains and friends to scout for talent and they cited as examples 'Master Boys and Master Fuller'.[176] Independent sources support their argument. Andrewes collated the

distinguished Greek scholar John Bois BD to the first prebendal stall in Ely Cathedral on August 25 1615, confiding that:

> 'he did bestow it freely on him, without any one moving him thereto, though' said he, 'some pickthanks will be saying, they stood your friends herein.'

In return Bois was set to work comparing the Vulgate with modern versions of the New Testament to identify superfluous contemporary textual variants.[177]

Perhaps the best documented case is Andrewes's patronage of the Hebraist Nicholas Fuller. Educated at Hart Hall Oxford, Fuller financed himself by teaching during the day and studying at night, receiving his MA in 1590. He was beneficed at the poor living of Allington in Wiltshire, supplemented by a prebendal stall in Salisbury Cathedral, but the publication in 1612 of his major work Miscellanea Theologicorum brought him only limited recognition. Andrewes himself knew nothing of Fuller until Thomas Erpenius, Professor of Oriental Literature at Leyden, enquired after him in correspondence with Andrewes. Erpenius's praise for Fuller's scholarship prompted Andrewes to action. Shortly afterwards, on a royal progress to Salisbury, Andrewes summoned Fuller and presented him with the collation to the wealthy benefice of Bishop's Waltham concealed in a box of sweetmeats.[178] Fuller later became Andrewes's chaplain and shortly before his death entrusted his family and literary remains to the Bishop's care.[179] Similiarly Andrewes's discriminating eye for talent led him to patronise a number of young clergy who later rose to prominence in the Caroline Church. Andrewes gave early preferment to three future bishops - Matthew Wren, James Wedderburne and Ralph Brownrig - and was particularly close to Wren, appointing him to be a domestic chaplain.[180] Another chaplain was Wren's brother Christopher, later dean of Windsor under Charles I, to whom Andrewes granted two livings in Wiltshire.[181] Other examples are the two Laudian archdeacons of Chichester diocese who received benefices from Andrewes in 1607-12, at the very beginning of their careers.[182]

Moreover, Andrewes was did not forget gifted clergymen when he was translated from one diocese to another. As Bishop of Chichester Andrewes had patronised Thomas Emerson, a clergyman beneficed in the diocese since 1596. After Andrewes's departure for Ely in 1609, Emerson remained at Chichester, serving as a surrogate in the consistory. Only in 1615 did he resign his livings to move to Ely, where Andrewes collated him to St. Mary Wisbech, where he resumed his duties as one of the Bishop's chaplains.[183] The case-history of Christopher Greene is a striking testimony of the strong bonds forged between Andrewes and one of his protégés. Greene was educated at Corpus Christi College Oxford, and while studying for his BD was presented by the Crown to Southease living in Chichester diocese in 1617 on the recommendation of the college fellowship. The Crown's claim to the advowson was successfully challenged through the common law courts in the Trinity term of 1609 and Greene lost the living and his successor was instituted in August 1609. However, Greene had evidently impressed Andrewes, since a week later he was collated to the episcopal benefice of Fittleworth. Greene did not follow Andrewes to Ely in 1609, but he received other livings in Essex and Wiltshire over the next sixteen years, and ended as his domestic chaplain.[184] Nor are the cases of Greene and Emerson isolated examples.[185]

Andrewes's alacrity in rewarding talent was matched by his impatience with clerical insufficiency. In 1605 he denounced those Oxbridge colleges which produced poorly educated graduates, who then filled the ministry 'and so hazard mens soules'.[186] It has been noted above that he also had no hesitation in ejecting a large number of clergy from their livings for negligent or scandalous conduct.[187]

Andrewes's probity in handling episcopal patronage is somewhat marred, however, by one of the more gross examples of nepotism in the Jacobean Church. Spiritual preferments were regarded as legitimate fruits of office and all bishops conferred a number on relatives. Mountagu granted the

archdeaconry of Wells to his cousin Gerard Wood, Lake gave canonries to his nephew Philip Mahat and his cousin John Cooth, and among the recipients of Harsnett's patronage in Chichester diocese were his nephew Owen Stockton and his cousins Richard Buckenham and Clement Corbett. Harsnett's successor George Carleton collated his two sons-in-law, Thomas Vicars and George Benson, to Cathedral stalls.[188] Andrewes's patronage of his brother Roger far exceeded these modest preferments. It included the livings of Chigwell in London, Nuthurst, Cocking and Cuckfield in Chichester, Elm and Emneth rectory in Ely and Cheriton rectory in Winchester dioceses. Canonries in three dioceses were accompanied by the archdeaconry and Cathedral chancellorship of Chichester and the Mastership of Jesus College, Cambridge. To hold a number of these livings and offices in commendam required at least four royal and archiepiscopal dispensations.[189] Roger Andrewes was certainly an able scholar, for he held a doctorate in divinity and assisted in the translation of the Authorised Version of the Bible, yet his personality remains elusive for much of his career, except for the evidence of his acrimonious quarrel with the fellowship at Jesus which ended in his enforced resignation in 1632.[190] Comparable examples of nepotism practised on this scale are relatively scarce. Two possible parallels were Richard Neile's patronage of his half-brother Robert Newell and Bishop Cotton's lavish preferment of his son William.[191] Nevertheless, the important fact remains that the preferment of his brother never seriously limited the scope of the Andrewes's patronage, for, in contrast to several colleagues, he collated regularly to livings falling into his gift by lapse.[192]

It may be claimed, therefore, that a number of bishops did explore the opportunities presented by patronage to enhance the quality of their clergy. While all patronised graduate clergy, a bishop such as Andrewes was more concerned with rewarding learned ministers, a Mountagu or a Lake with patronising zealous preachers. A similar division may be found in the practice

of others prelates. Richard Neile's patronage policy was not dissimilar to that of Andrewes, in contrast to George Abbot and John King, who favoured preaching ministers.[193] The implications of this different emphasis are the subject of the next chapter.

* * * * *

The general contention of this chapter has been that many Jacobean bishops used a variety of means to supervise the conduct of their diocesan clergy outside the consistory. The contrasting government of Lancelot Andrewes and Arthur Lake illustrate the different forms this care might take. Both bishops shared the objective of promoting a learned and diligent ministry. To secure this, Andrewes regularly deprived negligent clergy, fought legal battles against simoniacal clergy and patrons, and made effective use of his episcopal patronage. In contrast, Lake made imaginative use of vocational training schemes, carefully scrutinised the abilities of ordinands and relying on the weapon of suspension against wayward clergy. The pattern of their patronage implies a different view of the importance of the preaching ministry in the Church, and to this subject we now turn.

Footnotes to Chapter Six

1. Oxley, The Shepheard, sig.D3v,E; for contrast, see the cautious remarks of Richardson, A Workeman, p.33.

2. Hooker, Works, iii. I. p.387.

3. O'Day, The English Clergy, pp.55-7,133,147-55.

4. Curiously, the ordinal after 1604 continued to imply that the archdeacon and not the bishop conducted the examination of candidates: The Forme and Maner of making and consecrating Bishops, Priests and Deacons, sig.A2v.

5. William Attersoll, A Commentarie upon the Fourth Booke of Moses, called Numbers (1618), pp.472-6; Carpenter, A Pastorall Charge, p.55; Marshe, A Sermon preached at the Consecration of...Richard Senhouse, pp.8-9; PRO, SP 14/1/68.

6. Hooker, Works, iii. I. pp.382-3; Francis Mason, The Authoritie of the Church in making Canons and Constitutions concerning things indifferent and the Obedience thereto required: with particular application to the present state of the Church of England (1607), pp.17-20; Lake, Sermons, iii. p.266.

7. Phillips, The Fisher-Man, pp.4-6; Hacket, Scrinia Reserata, ii. p.41; CUL, MS Mm I.35 p.380.

8. O'Day, The English Clergy, pp.55-8.

9. None survives for Bath & Wells, Chichester or Winchester, although the list of ordinands can be recovered from the libri cleri compiled on visitation.

10. This remark applies to Ely (1599-1619), Gloucester (1599-1622), Norwich (1624-1629), Oxford (1603-1623) and Salisbury (1599-1625). BL, Harl.MS 7044 fos.113r-23r; CUL, MS Mm 1.39 pp.146-7; GDR, 27A pp.244-465, 142A pp.7-23; NNRO, Reg/16/22 ii. fos.5r-33r; OCRO, MS

Oxf.Dioc.Papers c.264 fos.9r-109r; WRO, Reg.Cotton fos.38r-42r, Reg.Abbot fos.6r-7r, Reg.Davenant fos.58r-9v.

11. Analysed by O'Day, The English Clergy, pp.49-65.

12. This problem could be resolved by cross-reference with the faculty registers, but only a fragment of their records exists for the Jacobean period. LPL, Fairhurst MS 2006 fo.167; PRO, SP 14/55/41-4; Faculty Office Registers 1534-1549 ed. D.S. Chambers (Oxford, 1966), p.xiii.

13. OCRO, MS.Oxf.Dioc.Papers c.264 fos.25r,31r,44v-5r; GL, MS 9535/2 fos.143v-4r,192v-3v,203v,204v,216r,217v-8v,220r; GDR, 27A pp.452-3.

14. Namely Chichester, Ely, Norwich and London: Borth., Precedent Book ii. pp.216-9; NNRO, ORR/Ib fos.70v-86v; GL, MS 9535/2 fos.141r-196r; R. Phillimore, The Ecclesiastical Law of the Church of England (2 vols., 1895), p.100.

15. GL, MS 9535/2; Bodl., Rawl.MS Letters 89 fo.30, John Ley to James Ussher, 23 August 1619. I owe this latter reference to Peter Lake.

16. NNRO, ORR/Ib fos.72v-86v; Hajzyk, 'The Church in Lincolnshire', p.48; Fuller, Church History, v. p.459.

17. O'Day, The English Clergy, pp.55-7.

18. Lake, Sermons, sig.S2iv, iii. p.266; SRO, D/D/Vc 82 (unfoliated: Matthew Budgin of Emborough and Robert Fortune of Butcombe).

19. Lake, Sermons, i. pp.53-64, iii. pp.184-92,221-48,267.

20. Hacket, Scrinia Reserata, ii. pp.41-2.

21. Two Biographies of William Bedell, Bishop of Kilmore, pp.5,81; HRO, C 73 fo.24v.

22. Bodl., Tanner MS 228 fo.86r; WSRO, Ep.I/51/3 fo.206r; BL, Add.MS 18597 fo.168v. A third may have been Cotton of Exeter: Bodl., Rawl.MS D 47 fo.42r.

23. Fuller, Church History, vi. p.81; G.F. Nuttall, 'Peterborough Ordinations 1612-1630 and early Nonconformity' Journal of

Ecclesiastical History xxx. (1979), pp.231-4; R. O'Day, 'Clerical Patronage and Recruitment in England during the Elizabethan and early Stuart periods, with special reference to the diocese of Coventry and Lichfield' (London Ph.D. thesis, 1972), p.239 fn.1.

24. See above p.42.

25. David Lloyd, Memoires of the Lives, Actions, Sufferings of those... excellent Personages that suffered...for the Protestant Religion (1668), p.164; [John Falconer], A Briefe Refutation of Iohn Traskes Iudaical and Novel Fancyes [St Omer] (1618), pp.8-9; SRO, D/D/Vc 74 fo.23r, D/D/Ca 177 (unfoliated: 15 October 1612), 185 fo.303v; Cassidy, 'The Episcopate of William Cotton, Bishop of Exeter 1598-1621', p.87; EDR, B/2/35 fos.3,62,75r,77v.

26. Laud, Works, iii. p.173; PRO, SP 16/164/23. See also the experience of Parry of St. Asaph: PRO, SP 14/61/10; and O'Day, The English Clergy, pp.57-8.

27. Laud, Works, v. II. p.307. How rigorous the ordination examinations were after 1629 is beyond the purview of this thesis, but one recalls the fate of Nicholas Perkes of Hart Hall, Oxford, 'a very civil, studious youth', who hanged himself after being put back at the Christmas ordination of 1632: Bodl., MS Top.Oxon c.378 p.261.

28. See the succinct explanation of the laws of ecclesiastical patronage in O'Day, The English Clergy, pp.75-85.

29. Ibid., pp.79-82,135.

30. The English Reports, lxxiii. (1907), pp.564-5; Commons Debates 1621, ed. W. Notestein, F.H. Relf & H. Simpson (7 vols., New Haven 1935), ii. p.440, iii. p.473.

31. The English Reports, lxxiii. pp.631-2, lxxvii. (1907), pp.141-5, cxxiii. (1912) pp.423-4.

32. The English Reports, lxxiv. (1907), pp.29-30, lxxviii. pp.376-7; 5

Eliz.c.28.

33. The English Reports, lxxiv. (1907), p.211, lxxviii. p.497; 13 Eliz.c.12.

34. The Letter Book of John Parkhurst Bishop of Norwich compiled during the years 1571-5, ed. R.A. Houlbrooke (Norfolk Record Society, xliii. 1974-5), pp.97-100; NNRO, Reg/14/20 fo.245v.

35. Barlow, The Summe and Substance, p.53; BL, Add.MS 28571 fos.187-92, printed in Usher, Reconstruction, ii. pp.331-5.

36. [Ames], A Reply to Dr Mortons Generall Defence, p.85.

37. The English Reports, lxxiii, pp.740-1,765-6; see also O'Day, The English Clergy, p.81.

38. My knowledge of these suits was orginally derived from the Dunkin transcripts in the British Library, which for accuracy and completeness have been checked against the originals and a representative sample of the contemporary indices. Iping: PRO, CP 40 1693 (Hil.45 Eliz.I) m.1234, Borth., Precedent Book ii. pp.43-7; West Thorney: CP 40 1791 (Mich.5 Jas.I) m.3382; Warbleton: CP 40 1778 (Hil.5 Jas I) m.1328; Southease: CP 40 1804 (Trin.6 Jas I) m.1625; West Grinstead: CP 40 1809 (Mich.6 Jas I) m.1117, 2088 (Mich.19 Jas I) m.1707, WSRO Ep.I/51/5 fos.41r-3r, BL, Add.MS 27950 fo.31v; Hunston: CP 40 1843 (Trin.8 Jas I) m.1181; Pulborough: CP 40 1961 (Trin.13 Jas I) m.3719; Iden: CP 40 2003 (Mich.17 Jas I) m.2344; Clapham: CP 40 2048 (Mich.17 Jas I) m.2710; Itchingfield: CP 40 2052 (Hil.1 7 Jas I) m.1711.

39. PRO, CP 40 2082 (Trin.19 Jas I) m.2084, CP 40 2088 (Mich.19 Jas I) m.1707.

40. See above pp. 105-6.

41. Hacket does relate one story of Williams delaying the institution of an MA for three months until his learning had improved: Scrinia Reserata, ii. p.42.

42. Andrewes, Works, v. p.303; Isaacson, Life and Death of Lancelot Andrewes, p.54.

43. Andrewes, Works, ix. pp.37,48.

44. Andrewes, Works, ix. pp.299-300; Heal, 'Archbishop Laud revisited', p.142; Harington, A Briefe View, pp.78-80.

45. BL, Add.MS 27950 fo.68r.

46. PRO, SP 16/5/50; Borth., Precedent Book ii. pp.393-7.

47. Sir William Jones, Reports (1675), pp.45-51; BL, Harl.MS 7044 fo.117.

48. See below Chapter Eight.

49. Proceedings in Parliament 1610, i. pp.134-5.

50. Excluded from this figure are the four ministers deprived between 1608 and 1626 on the orders of the Ecclesiastical Commission - John Packe and Thomas Bide (Chichester), and Edmund Peacham and Meredith Mady (Bath & Wells). See BL, Stowe MS 424 fos.161v-2r; PRO, CP 40 1811 (Mich.6 Jas I) m.2651, SP 14/78/78, 92/38, 16/26/81.

51. One of these three, Richard Robinson, was deprived by September 1607, when his successor was instituted to the rectory of St. Clements Hastings, although there are no surviving records of judicial proceedings leading up to his removal: WSRO, Ep.I/1/8 fo.38r.

52. BL, Add.MS 33410 fo.96; WSRO, Ep.I/17/8 fos.149r,345v, I/17/9 fo.130r. See also Ep.I/17/7 fos.57r,95v, I/17/8 fo.9r, I/17/9 fos. 66v,130r,263v, I/17/10 fos.20r,55v,125v.

53. WSRO, Ep.I/18/26 fo.17v, I/20/6 fos.6,13, I/17/12 fo.12v, I/1/8 fo.36r.

54. WSRO, Ep.I/15/1 Box 128, 1609 folder, fo.17, II/9/11 fos.209, 210v,215r,238v. Chauntler's case is particularly instructive, since Samuel Wilkinson, curate of Bosham, was convicted of an identical offence in 1615 by Andrewes's successor, Samuel Harsnett. Wilkinson escaped with a sentence of public penance at the market cross and in the Cathedral, later commuted to a fine: Ep.I/17/15 fos.146v,185r.

55. WSRO, Ep.I/17/12 fos.63r,65r,103r; BL, Stowe MS 424 fo.162.

56. WSRO, Ep.I/17/13 fos.5r,10v,161v, I/17/15 fos.68v,135v,151r,176r, 209r, I/17/17 fo.3v, I/18/33 fo.7r.

57. WSRO, Ep.I/17/17 fos.114r-68v, I/17/18 fos.13v-241r, I/15/3/20 bound file of depositions v. Barwicke, passim, & fos.7-15.

58. PRO, DEL 8/70 fo.6r, 4/8 fos.218r-67v, 4/9 fos.85v,95r. See also Stac/8/151/9.

59. See above p.40.

60. EDR D/2/30 fos.67v-8v,97, D/2/31 fos.121v-2r.

61. EDR B/2/37 fos.36r-96r.

62. Namely Philip Martin, Thomas Jones and Simon Sturtevant: SRO, D/D/Ca 146 fos.256v-7,271r,297r, 149 (unfoliated: 9 October 1606), 155, 158 fo.324r, 174 fos.43r,144r,309v-10, D/D/B Reg.43 fos.14r, 18r,23r.

63. William Buckland was deprived by Lake, Peter Smith and Richard Barwicke by Harsnett and William Collinson by Carleton: SRO, D/D/B Reg.19 fo.8v; WSRO, Ep.I/1/8 fos.64r,73r, I/7/1 fo.2v.

64. See above pp.34-5.

65. Hacket, Scrinia Reserata, i. pp.97-8.

66. SRO, SP 16/345/85. Andrew Foster, Neile's modern biographer, assures me that there is no evidence in the registers or visitation detecta that Neile removed a clergyman from his benefice.

67. SRO, D/D/Ca 201 fos.113r,180r, 204 (unfoliated: 3 October 1617), 209 fos.38v,47r, D/D/B Reg.19 fo.8v.

68. SRO, D/D/Ca 209 fo.84r, 214 fo.64r, 231 fo.33v, 232 fos.114v-5r, 236 (unfoliated: 26 September 1623), D/D/Vc 82 (unfoliated).

69. WSRO, Ep.I/17/22 fos.120v,126r,136v, I/7/1 fo.2v.

70. See above p.40; EDR, G/2/20 fos.119,146r,173r,185r, D/2/27 fo.30v, G/1/9a fo.61r.

71. Babbage, Puritanism and Richard Bancroft, pp.45-53,93,136,238,250-5,308-10,319-21.

72. In the diocese of Bath & Wells, there were on average 11 presentments for non-residence at episcopal visitations between 1603 and 1620: SRO, D/D/Ca 133-4, 140, 142, 149-51, 160, 162, 173, 177, 191, 194, 204, 206, 219, 220. In Chichester diocese in 1603 it was claimed that there were only six non-resident ministers who held single benefices, a figure endorsed by the paucity of presentments for this offence. See, for example WSRO, Ep.I/17/17 fo.99r, I/17/18 fo.27v, I/17/21 fo.49v; Babbage, op.cit., p.51.

73. SRO, D/D/Ca 162 (unfoliated: 16 October 1609), 171 fos.342v-3r, 173 (unfoliated), 174 fos.36r,144r,309-10r; WSRO, Ep.I/17/15 fos.127v, 143v,150v,171r-207v; NNRO, Vis/5 (unfoliated: 28 September 1627), ACT/58b (unfoliated: 21 October 1628).

74. 21 Henr.VIII c.13; canon 41 of 1604.

75. For example, the dispensation rolls for the years 1595-1615 record 18 future bishops as pluralists and also 19 prelates holding livings in commendam: BL, Add.MS 39533 fos.3v-126v.

76. For example, Andrewes collated Jerome Beale to the rectories of Cowfold and Nuthurst (Chichester diocese, 1609), and to Hardwick rectory and Barton vicarage (Ely diocese, 1613), and Roger Andrewes to the rectories of Cuckfield (Chichester, 1609) and Elme and Emneth (Ely, 1615); Harsnett granted John Hullwood the vicarages of Brighton and Oving (Chichester, 1614); episcopal benefices fell vacant only seven times during Lake's decade at Bath & Wells and he collated Richard Adams to three of them: WSRO, Ep.I/1/8 fos.42v,44v,66v-7r; CUL, MS Mm 1.39 pp.133-4; Somerset Incumbents, ed. F.W. Weaver (Bristol, 1889), pp.114,230,450.

77. Through episcopal patronage in Chichester diocese, Andrewes created

a further five pluralists (Emerson, Wilshaw, Scott, William Mattock and James Hutchinson) and Harsnett a further six (Buckenham, Stockton, Anthony Mattock, Lewes, Wady and Martin): WSRO, Ep.I/1/8 fos.34r-73v.

78. As occurred when he preferred Anthony Hilton, Thomas Hudson and Thomas Vicars (all in 1622) and Samuel Eburne (in 1627). The only exception was Thomas Doe, who received the rich episcopal living of Brighton in 1622, yet retained Newick rectory. George Carleton's register is lost, but it can be reconstructed from the returns made to the First Fruits office in the Exchequer: PRO, E 331 Chichester/5-7.

79. Hajzyk, 'The Church in Lincolnshire', p.21; Ingram, 'Ecclesiastical Justice in Wiltshire', pp.46-7; GDR, 103 fo.289r.

80. WSRO, Ep.I/17/14 fo.17r, I/17/15 fos.127v,135r,144r,202r, I/17/17 fo.99r; SRO, D/D/Ca 209 fos.16v-7r, 232 fos.114v-5r, 236 (unfoliated: 17 September 1623), 241 fo.125v, D/D/Vc 80 fo.9v, 82 passim.

81. Hacket relates that Williams's secretary compiled a speculum of the Lincolnshire clergy, so that the Bishop could check 'their abilities and manner of life' at a glance: Hacket, Scrinia Reserata, i. p.86.

82. Collinson, The Religion of Protestants, pp.123-7,132-3 idem, Godly People, pp.474-5,498; and see above pp.79-80.

83. Barlow, Rochester (1605), sig.A3v.

84. Strype, Life of Whitgift, iii. p.260, Appendix, pp.113-4; Collinson, The Religion of Protestants, pp.94-5, which is a neat summary of a generation of work by various scholars; O'Day, The English Clergy, pp.66-74. I am also indebted to the locus classicus of this subject, the second chapter of D.M. Barratt's seminal thesis 'The Condition of the Parish Clergy between the Reformation and 1660, with special reference to the dioceses of Oxford, Worcester and Gloucester' (Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1949), pp.39-89.

85. There is no mention of similar schemes in the libri cleri for Coventry & Lichfield, Ely, Lincoln and Winchester between 1603 and 1625. It is quite possible that theological training was provided in some of the dioceses whose visitation records are lost, such as Oxford, Rochester or Worcester.

86. See above pp.64-5.

87. GDR, 110 pp.95-6. Rock translated 'and he said to his disciples' as 'et dixit discipulos meos'.

88. Fincham, 'Ramifications of the Hampton Court conference', passim.

89. WSRO, Ep.II/1/1 fo.126v. That a similar scheme was begun in Chichester archdeaconry may be adduced from the archidiaconal survey of preachers carried out in 1605, which mentions several ministers already receiving instruction: Ep.I/18/27A.

90. WSRO, Ep.II/11/1 fos.141v,146r,152r, II/9/10 fos.7,8r,9r,16v,17r.

91. WSRO, Ep.I/20/7 fos.40,46-8, I/18/27 fos.15r,24v, Par.460/1/1/1 fo. 26v; and see appendix IX.

92. Watson's role in diocesan affairs between 1596 and 1603 was restricted to attending one visitation: WSRO, Ep.II/10/1 fo.1r.

93. See above pp.174-7,200.

94. The fine print of the 'orders' of 1606 presupposed a detailed understanding of Chichester diocesan administration, which could not have been available to Andrewes, who arrived in the diocese for the first time only nine weeks before the 'orders' were issued. The fact that the draft and fair copy of the 'orders' are written in the hands of the registrar and his deputies, and not that of Andrewes's secretary William Greene, suggests that it was drawn up in the registry, not in the episcopal household. Chancellor Drury's complete control over diocesan affairs may be adduced from the visitation acta of 1606 and from the sole surviving copy of Andrewes's visitation articles for 1606,

which is annotated in Drury's hand in preparation for the Bishop's second visitation: WSRO, Ep.I/18/27, I/20/7; Andrewes, Chichester (1606), passim.

95. NNRO, Vis/3, 1603 volume; Collinson, The Religion of Protestants, p.130.

96. NNRO, VSc/1 books Ia,Ib.

97. H.G. Owen, 'The London Parish Clergy in the Reign of Elizabeth I', (London Ph.D. thesis, 1957), pp.132-5; O'Day, The English Clergy, p.71; GL, MS 9537/8, passim.

98. GL, MS 9537/9 fos.67r-173v.

99. Ibid., fo.105v.

100. GL, MS 9537/10 fos.1v,16v,20v,36r,45v,69r,73r,75v,80r,81r; GLRO, DL/C/306 pp.50,57.

101. GL, MS 9537/11-2.

102. F.D. Price, 'Gloucester diocese under Bishop Hooper 1551-3', TBGAS, lx. (1938), pp.51-151.

103. BL, Harl.MS 280 fos.158r-61r, Harl.Chart G Roll 25; Bodl., MS Linc. Coll.(e).Lat.124 fo.192v. The statistics returned to Whitgift in the autumn of 1603 were intended to provide official ammunition against puritan criticism; and the reliability of the figures of licensed preachers differs from diocese to diocese. In Bath & Wells and in Winchester, the figures accurately present the number of licensed preachers. In Gloucester the figure of 129 in fact includes 60 unlicensed preachers, as revealed in the separate return, although Whitgift chose to amalgamate the two statistics in his table and then to claim, quite falsely, that the figures omitted unlicensed preachers. The same is probably true of the totals for Chichester, Lincoln and Exeter dioceses, for although the breakdown of statistics has not survived, the number of licensed preachers is considerably greater

than can be reconstructed from diocesan sources. At least one bishop, Dove of Peterborough, improved his figues by licensing 50 clergy to preach between receiving Whitgift's circular and making his return: BL, Harl.MS 280 fos.157v-72r,252r-57v; SRO, D/D/Vc 72; WSRO, Ep.I/19/3-6,8, I/18/22, I/18/27A, II/11/1-2; The State of the Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I as illustrated by documents relating to the diocese of Lincoln, i., ed. C.W. Foster (Lincoln Record Society, xxiii. Horncastle, 1926), p.lvii; Cassidy, 'The Episcopate of William Cotton, Bishop of Exeter 1598-1621', p.82; Allen, 'The State of the Church in the Diocese of Peterborough', pp.31-4. I owe the Bodleian reference listed above to David Palliser.

104. Barratt, 'The Condition of the Parish Clergy', pp.68,75.

105. GDR, 80 pp.101-91, 87; Price, 'Bishop Bullingham and Chancellor Blackleech', pp.175-98.

106. GDR, 80 pp.198-266.

107. GDR, 96, 97, 102, 110 pp.11-3,17,80.

108. Perceval, An Apology, p.182; GDR, 27A p.353.

109. GDR, 115 pp.1-151. Five of the insufficient clergy were not assigned tutors and a further two from Gloucester deanery were referred to Miles Smith, Bishop-elect of Gloucester.

110. GDR, 115 pp.127,130,158-573.

111. WSRO, Ep.I/18/32; EDR, B/2/33; LJRO, B/V/1/32; HRO, B/1/A/27.

112. LPL, Reg.Bancroft, fos.181,217,230v-1r,251v-2r.

113. LPL, Reg.Abbot i. fo.229r; HLRO, Main Papers (Parchment), 17 May 1499 - 1 April 1624 (unfoliated).

114. GDR, 27A p.297; Sebastian Benefield, Doctrinae Christianae Sex Capita (Oxford, 1610), sig.*3v. However, by 1614 Benefield was no longer Abbot's chaplain: LPL, MS 1730, fo.8.

115. Sebastian Benefield, A Commentarie or Exposition upon the First

Chapter of the Prophecy of Amos. Delivered in XXI Sermons in the Parish Church of Meisey Hampton in the diocesse of Gloucester (Oxford, 1613), sig.¶¶2r; idem, A Commentarie or Exposition upon the Second Chapter of the Prophecie of Amos. Delivered in XXI Sermons in...Meysey-Hampton in the diocesse of Glocester (1620); idem, A Commentary or Exposition upon the Third Chapter of the Prophecie of Amos. Delivered in XVII sermons in...Meysey-Hampton in the diocesse of Glocester (1629).

116. GDR, 96 (unfoliated: 29 August 1605), 107 (unfoliated: 14 September 1609), 115 p.50.

117. Lake, Sermons, sig.+. Anthony Wood attributes the authorship of 'A Short View of the Life and Vertues of the Author', which prefaces the sermons, to John Harris: Athenae Oxonienses, iii. p.455. Harris's account can only be challenged on two substantial points: (i) that Lake was unambitious, which has been refuted above, pp.27-8; (ii) that Lake was anxious to confer canonries on the diocesan clergy 'wherein it was his want of opportunitie rather then of desire and forwardnesse that he did no more.' Yet in Lake's ten years at Bath & Wells, twenty-six stalls in his gift fell vacant and only one of these went to a local clergyman, who was beneficed in the diocese before Lake's arrival and had no previous connection with the Cathedral: Lake, Sermons, sig.S2iir; John Le Neve's Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae 1546-1857, ed. J.M. Horn, D.S. Bailey and D.M. Smith (5 vols., 1969-79), v. passim.

118. SRO, D/D/Vc 78 (unfoliated), 80, 82 (unfoliated).

119. SRO, D/D/Vc 78. Edward Ballett, Thomas Miller, Andrew Powell and Thomas Smith are examples in point.

120. SRO, D/D/B Reg.19 fos.1r-3v; Hembry, The Bishops of Bath & Wells 1540-1640, p.217.

121. SRO, D/D/Vc 80 fos.3v-27r, 82; see also appendix XII. In 1623 two

clergy were told to hand in their exercises to senior local ministers, one of whom was William Sclater, Lake's domestic chaplain.

122. SRO, D/D/Vc 80 fo.9r, 82.

123. SRO, D/D/Vc 82, passim.

124. SRO, D/D/Vc 80, fo.3v, 82 (unfoliated: Emmanuael Mason, curate of Bruton).

125. SRO, D/D/Vc 79 fos.9r,22r,40v,42v, 80 fos.4v,12v,24v,25v, 82 (unfoliated: Mason of Bruton, John Carpenter of Kilmington, Thomas Plumpton of Lamyatt).

126. Six of the thirteen ministers listed as unlicensed preachers in 1620 were assigned exercises, five out of fifteen in 1623: SRO, D/D/Vc 80 fos.4v,8v,11v,13,21r, 82 passim.

127. Namely Henry Barnard, Humphrey Jenkins, William Mullett, Humphrey Stone, Nicholas Tomkins, John Baylie, Thomas Hill and Hugo Pearde: SRO, D/D/Vc 37, 80-2, 83.

128. SRO, D/D/Vc 37, 73, 74, 76, 79, 83. I have found evidence of many more grants of preaching licences than Stieg presents in Laud's Laboratory, p.86.

129. Namely Edward Ballett, Thomas Close, Richard Coggan, John England, Thomas Hall, Thomas Smart, John Stansall and George Woolton. England and Stansall lost their preaching licences. SRO, D/D/Vc 74, 79 fo.28v, 80 fos.4v,12r,15r,17v,19v,22r, 82 passim.

130. SRO, D/D/Vc 37 fo.28r, 79 fo.19r, 80 fo.12r, 82 (unfoliated), D/D/Ca 220 (unfoliated: 8 September 1620).

131. Lake, Sermons, i. p.140, iii. p.189; SRO, D/D/Vc 80, 82.

132. Lake, Sermons, i. pp.508-9, iii. pp.237-8,268. Writing to Samuel Ward on the eve of the Synod of Dort, Lake expressed his hope that the assembly would settle rather than provoke controversies, and therefore urged that only doctrine which 'is least doubtful and most

useful' should be included in public confessions 'which are to bee the measure of the common milke, and strong meat of the Church, I meane the catechisms and popular sermons, whereinto if you insert any problemes that may be canvassed pro and con: you do but sow the seed of contention': Bodl., Tanner MS 74 fo.134.

133. PRO, SP 14/35/58; SRO, D/D/Vc 37, 74, 76, 79.

134. SRO, D/D/Vc 76 fos.13r,28v, D/D/B Reg.19 fo.8v; PRO, SP 14/92/38; see above p.35.

135. SRO, D/D/Vc 80 fos.14v,24v-5v; Bodl., Rawl.MS Letters 89 fo.25.

136. Lake, Sermons, sig.+.

137. BL, Harl.MS 595 fos.214-40; Institutiones Clericorum in comitatu Wiltoniae ab Anno 1297 ad Annum 1810, ed. T. Phillipps (2 vols., 1825), ii. pp.5-13; Somerset Incumbents, pp.30,176.

138. CUL, MS Mm 1.39 pp.141-2; NNRO, Reg/16/22, i-ii; GL, MS 9531/14 fos.239r,247r. No list is available of episcopal livings in Ely diocese, so they are specified below: Barton, St. Giles Cambridge, Conington, Cotenham, Downham, Elm & Emneth, Fen Ditton, Foxton, Fulbourn, Gamlinghay, Great Shelford, Hardwick, Harston, Ickleton, Leverington, Linton, Little Abington, Little Gransden, Littleport, Madingley, Newton, Stanton All Saints, Stretham, Swaffham Bulbeck, Swaffham St. Mary, Swavesey, Teversham, Thriplow, Tydd St.Giles, Waterbeach, Whittlesford, Wisbech and Wivelingham. BL, Harl.MS 7044 fos.113r-23r; CUL, MS Mm 1.39 pp.128-42,146-253; Victoria County History of Cambridge and the Isle of Ely, iv. pp.92,155,204,229, v. p.96, vi. p.99, viii. p.217.

139. The bishops of Chichester also collated to Earnley 'altius vice', nominated the ministers of Climping, Leominster and Poling, and held Littlehampton as a donative cure. Also in his gift was Lewes All Saints, which by the early seventeenth century had had its profits

sequestered and was served by a succession of curates: WSRO, Ep.I/1/8, I/44/3; Bodl., Tanner MS 148 fos.31r-7v; BL, Add.MSS 39335 fos.47-9, 39338 fos.153r-5r, 39339 fo.3v, 39345 fos.75r-8r; John Le Neve's Fasti, ii. passim. I am grateful to Andrew Foster for discussions on this point.

140. SRO, D/D/B Reg.31 passim; John Le Neve's Fasti, v. pp.ix-x and passim.

141. Namely, forty-two to twenty-six: WSRO, Ep.I/1/8 fos.58r-73v; PRO, E 331 Chichester/5-7. Similarly, the bishops of Ely held over twenty livings in Norwich diocese, and seventeen vacancies occurred during Andrewes's decade there (1609-1619), compared to only five under Felton (1619-1626): CUL, MS Mm 1.39 pp.141-3; NNRO, Reg/16/22 ii. fos.1v,12r,14r,16v,18v.

142. Bodl., Ballard MS 44 fos.104-6r.

143. Somerset Incumbents, pp.34,44,114,143,159,230,290; SRO, D/D/B Reg. 19 fos.10r,11.

144. See above p.179.

145. See, for example, BL, Sloane MS 118 fo.17; Harl.MS 7003 fo.370. In 1613 Harsnett of Chichester collated Nicholas Culpepper to Alciston vicarage, although Culpepper had no personal links with the Bishop. The explanation may be the fact that he was a scion of the local influential family of Colepepers: WSRO, Ep.I/1/8 fo.64r; F.W.T. Attree & J.H.L. Booker, 'The Sussex Colepepers. Part II' Sussex Archaeological Collections xlviii. (Lewes, 1905), p.71.

146. PRO, SP 14/81/46.

147. O'Day, The English Clergy, pp.147-55.

148. Namely George Abbot (University College, Oxford), Robert Abbot (Balliol College, Oxford), Andrewes, Felton, Harsnett, Hutton and Young (Pembroke College, Cambridge), Buckeridge and Laud (St.

John's College, Oxford), Carey (Christ's College, Cambridge), Davenant (Queens' College, Cambridge), James (University College and Christ Church, Oxford), Jegon (Corpus Christi College, Cambridge), King and Ravis (Christ Church, Oxford), Lake (New College, Oxford), Matthew (St. John's College and Christ Church, Oxford), Mountagu (Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge), Overall (St. Catherine's College, Cambridge), Robinson (St. Edmund Hall and The Queen's College, Oxford), Still (St. John's College, Cambridge), Whitgift (Trinity College, Cambridge) and Wright (Wadham College, Oxford).

149. Namely Richard Adams, John Cooth, Thomas Crane, John Harris, Thomas James, Philip Mahat, William Oldis, Warner South, William Woodhouse and Thomas Woodyeates. Adams, Mahat and Woodyeates received episcopal livings and Cathedral stalls, the rest canonries. Cooth and Woodhouse procured benefices from others and resided in the diocese: John Le Neve's Fasti, v. passim; Somerset Incumbents, pp.34,114,181,195,230; SRO, D/D/B Reg.19 fo.11.

150. Namely Richard Buckenham, John Hullwood, Theophilus Kent and Owen Stockton. Thomas Murriell and Thomas Talcott were Pembroke men who received Cathedral stalls, but resided outside the diocese: WSRO, Ep.I/1/8 fos.58r-72v.

151. SRO, D/D/0 ii. (unfoliated: James Mountagu to the Dean and Chapter of Wells, 22 October 1612), D/D/Ca 243a fo.1r; Bodl., MS North b.12 fo.179.

152. DNB, iv. pp.386-7; Bernard, A Key to Knowledge, sig.A2; idem, The Ready Way to Good Workes, or A Treatise of Charitie (1635), sig.A3v-4r; SRO, D/D/Vc 79 fo.6r.

153. Bernard, Thesaurus Biblicus seu Promptuarium Sacrum (1644), sig.A3v-ir; Bodl., Rawl.MS Letters 89 fo.28r.

154. See, for example, William Attersoll, A Continuation of the Exposition of the Booke of Numbers: or the History of Balak the K. and Balaam the False Prophet (1610), pp.231-2; Bartholomaeus Keckermann, Heavenly Knowledge: A Manuduction to Theologie, ed. Thomas Vicars (1622), pp.303-4.

155. Bernard, The Faithfull Shepheard: wholy in a manner transposed and made anew, with precepts and examples, to further Young Divines in the studie of Divinitie (1621), sig.A4ir.

156. Bodl., Rawl.MS 89 fo.25; William Sclater, A Threefold Preservative against Three Dangerous Diseases of these Latter Times...Prescribed in a Sermon at S.Pauls Crosse in London, September 17 1609 (1610), p.30; Clarke, Ten Eminent Divines, pp.29-30,48.

157. Somerset Incumbents, pp.107,168; Bernard, A Guide to Grand-Iury Men divided into Two Bookes (1627), sig.A5iv.

158. HMC, 45 Buccleuch-Whitehall, i. p.202; John Le Neve's Fasti, v. pp.75,88; Somerset Incumbents, pp.35,114,230; BL, Add.MS 39534 fo. 37v; PRO, SP 14/164/18; William Sclater, The Quaestion of Tythes Revised. Arguments for the Morality of Tything enlarged and cleared (1623), sig.¶¶2v.

159. SRO, D/D/Ca 204 (unfoliated: 19 September 1617); Bernard, The Faithfull Shepherd (1621), sig.A3v; John Le Neve's Fasti, v. p.62; BL, Add.MS 39534 fo.70v.

160. See above

161. WSRO, Ep.I/1/8 fos.58r-72v, I/9 fo.313; BL, Add.MSS 39533 fo.106v, 39534 fo.42r; NNRO, Reg/16/22 i. fos.81v,83v.

162. Namely William Wady and Godfrey Moore: BL, Add.MSS 39533 fo.103r, 39534 fo.4v, 39332 fo.102r; WSRO, Ep.I/1/8 fo.64r.

163. William Collinson (curate of Fittleworth), Nicholas Culpepper (curate of South Heighton) and Daniel Tomson (curate of Birdham): WSRO,

Ep.I/1/8 fos.61v,64r,73v, I/18/33 fo.6r, II/11/2 fo.43r.

164. See above pp.100-2,105-6.

165. The Oxford recruits were Vicars, Samuel Eburne and John Goldmith: PRO, E 331 Chichester/6 m.62,64; J.H. Cooper, 'The Vicars and Parish of Cuckfield in the Seventeenth Century' Sussex Archaeological Collections xlv. (Lewes, 1902), pp.12-30.

166. C.M. Dent, Protestant Reformers in Elizabethan Oxford (Oxford, 1983), pp.171-7; Thomas Vicars, Manductio ad Artem Rhetoricam (1621), sig.A2.

167. Keckermann, Heavenly Knowledge, ed. Vicars, sig.A3v; Vicars, The Grounds of that Doctrine which is according to Godlinesse. Or a Briefe and Easie Catechisme...with Graces and Prayers for them that want better helps (2nd edition 1630, 3rd edition 1631); Bodl., Rawl.MS D 47 fo.22.

168. Vicars, The Sword Bearer, p.27.

169. Alumni Oxonienses: the Members of the University of Oxford 1500-1714, ed. J. Foster (4 vols., Oxford, 1891-2), ii. p.816; PRO, E 331 Chichester/6 m.74.

170. Churchwardens Presentments: Archdeaconry of Chichester, pp.113, 115-6; WSRO, Ep.III/4/11 fos.135r,152r,154v, III/4/12 fos.33v-4r.

171. PRO, E 331 Chichester/6 m.59; The History and Constitution...of the Cathedral Church of Chichester, pp.38-40; see above p.74.

172. PRO, SP 16/210/36, Mountagu to William Laud, 16 January 1632.

173. PRO, E 331 Chichester/6 m.68; WSRO, Ep.I/17/7 fos.26r,42v,182r, 199v, I/17/8 fos.73r,91v,134r,189v, 190v,204r, I/17/10 fo.79r, I/17/11 fos.10v,32r,113v,236v, I/17/15 fos.109v,116v.

174. WSRO, Ep.I/15/3/24 fo.165.

175. WSRO, Ep.I/17/20 fo.259v, I/17/22 fo.77r.

176. Andrewes, Works, v. p.303; Isaacson, The Life and Death of Lancelot

Andrewes, pp.38-9,54. Little is said in this section about Andrewes's patronage as Bishop of Winchester (1619-1626), since neither his episcopal register nor his returns to the First Fruits office in the Exchequer has survived.

177. Anthony Walker, 'The Life of that famous Grecian Mr John Bois' in Desiderata Curiosa ed. F. Peck (1735), ii. VIII. p.50; CUL, MS Mm 1.39 p.135; DNB, v. pp.311-3; see BL, Sloane MS 118 fo.30.

178. DNB, xx. pp.313-4; Bodl., Rawl.MS B 158 pp.144-5; NNRO, PCD/2 p.42. For an attenuated account of this incident, see John Aubrey, Brief Lives, chiefly of Contemporaries, set down...between the years 1669 and 1696, ed. A. Clark, (2 vols., Oxford, 1898), i. p.3 where he incorrectly states that Fuller received a prebendal stall.

179. BL, Add.MS 39534 fo.40v; Bodl., Add.MS C 279 fo.95.

180. CUL, MS Mm 1.39 pp.129,133-5; DNB, lxiii. p.94.

181. BL, Add.MS 39534 fo.66v; Institutiones Clericorum in comitatu Wiltoniae, ii. pp.10-2.

182. Namely William Hutchinson, Archdeacon of Lewes 1628-44, and Lawrence Pay, Archdeacon of Chichester 1635-40: WSRO, Ep.I/1/8 fos.40r,43v; CUL, MS Mm 1.39 pp.129,131,141.

183. WSRO, Ep.I/1/8 fos.37r,43v,68v-9v, I/17/14-5; BL, Add.MS 39533 fo. 59r; CUL, MS Mm 1.39 p.135; Borth., Precedent Book ii. pp.293-4.

184. Bodl., Tanner MS 179 fo.112r; PRO, CP 40 1804 (Trin.6 Jas I) m.1625, E 331 Chichester/6 m.74,78; WSRO, Ep.I/1/8 fo.43; Borth., Precedent Book ii. pp.157-8; GL, MS 9531/14 fo.239r; BL, Add.MS 39534 fo.91r; Institutiones Clericorum in comitatu Wiltoniae, p.13.

185. Other examples are James Swinhow, William Hutchinson, Jerome Beale and Roger Andrewes. WSRO, Ep.I/1/8 fos.33v-44v; CUL, MS Mm 1.39 pp.128-42.

186. BL, Add.MS 11055 fo.9r.

187. See above pp.176-7.

188. SRO, D/D/O ii. (unfoliated: Mountagu to the Dean and Chapter of Wells, 22 October 1612); PRO, Prob.11/149/99, 154/82, 160/78, SP 16/210/36.

189. The biographical entry on Roger Andrewes in Alumni Cantabrigienses, Part I. From the earliest Times to 1751, ed. J. & J.A. Venn (4 vols., Cambridge, 1922-7), i. p.31 is inaccurate in two respects. It omits that Andrewes received a prebendal stall and Cocking vicarage in 1606 and incorrectly states that he was collated to Cowfold rectory in 1609: WSRO, Ep.I/1/8 fos.34v,42v; BL, Add.MS 39533 fos.53v,61v,75v; PRO, SP 38/12 (22 January 1622).

190. CUL, MS Mm 1.38 pp.53-9.

191. Foster, 'Archbishop Richard Neile', pp.35,66; Cassidy, 'The Episcopate of William Cotton, Bishop of Exeter 1598-1621', pp.43-4.

192. In Chichester, Andrewes collated to lapsed livings on five of the eight occasions that they fell into his gift; his successor Harsnett occasionally used the device, Carleton never: WSRO, Ep.I/1/8 fos.33v-73v; PRO, E 331 Chichester/5-7.

193. A.W. Foster, 'The function of a bishop: the career of Richard Neile, 1562-1640' in Continuity and Change, pp.45-6; and see below pp.228-9,254.

Chapter Seven: Styles of Churchmanship among the Jacobean Episcopate

In a breathless review of the fortunes of the godly between 1604 and 1611, Richard Rogers, of Wethersfield, Essex, contrasted the menace of Bishops Ravis and Neile with the indulgence of Bishops Vaughan and Abbot. Another diarist, Bishop Laud of St. Davids, divided the higher clergy into 'orthodox' and 'puritan' at the request of the Duke of Buckingham in April 1625.[1] Contemporaries, it seems, had little difficulty in detecting a range of practice and belief among the Jacobean episcopate, and it is to the recovery and analysis of these distinctions that this chapter is devoted. It is a subject which has received some scholarly attention. Dr Nicholas Tyacke has demonstrated that theological differences centred on conflicting views of the doctrine of grace, in which the dominant Calvinist interpretation was challenged by an Arminian minority, a division mirrored in the composition of the bench of bishops. He suggests that theological opinions informed diocesan government. Calvinist prelates supported the preaching ministry, which they regarded as the principal means of salvation, and were sympathetic to nonconformist clergy, among whom were many zealous preachers. By contrast, Arminian bishops questioned both the centrality of preaching to salvation and the desirability of lenience to nonconformists.[2] Dr Andrew Foster has traced the practical consequences of these opinions in his study of Bishop Richard Neile, patriarch of the Arminian interest.[3] On a broader front, Professor Patrick Collinson has documented episcopal attitudes to lecturing in the early seventeenth century Church. He has also widened the context of the discussion. While accepting that reconcilation with nonconformists was a distinctive feature of Calvinist episcopalianism, Collinson points to a 'late flowering of pastoral values' among these bishops, nourished by Pauline precepts and Elizabethan puritanism.[4]

The purpose of this chapter is to assess, in the light of these arguments, the image and reality of episcopal government in the Jacobean Church. The material for this analysis is primarily drawn from the previous five chapters. It is suggested that the dominant model of the bishop was as a preaching pastor. In practice this was imitated by a circle of 'evangelical' prelates around Archbishop Abbot, all of whom encouraged preaching and several of whom found common ground with some nonconformists. Other bishops were demonstratively less successful in matching this model of the preaching pastor. This style of churchmanship was deplored by several Arminian prelates, who saw disorder and ill-discipline as its fruits. Consequently, they favoured the bishop's role as governor rather than pastor. The majority of the Jacobean episcopate, however, defy easy classification, for either their activities are poorly documented or their achievements seem slight.

\+ + + + +

Jacobean episcopal biographies and consecration sermons bear eloquent testimony to the pervasive influence of the Pauline model of the apostolic or 'primitive' bishop. The favoured interpretation was of the bishop as preaching pastor, a view endorsed by Daniel Featley in two consecration sermons, entitled 'The Faithful Shepherd' and 'The Apostolick Bishop', that he delivered at Lambeth Palace in 1619 and 1623.[5] Featley's task was to instruct the bishops-elect on their joint office as priest and bishop. While he defended the apostolic origin of episcopacy against the pretensions of the presbyterians, Featley's real interest lay in constructing an image of the bishop as pastor, not as governor. Humility was a prime attribute of the office. Bishops should divest themselves of lordly pomp and lead their flock in a spirit of meekness and charity. 'The lesse you account your selfe a prelate, the more all men will preferre and most highly honour you', Featley advised.[6] In practical terms,

this meant shielding the parochial clergy from rapacious members of the laity, including episcopal lawyers and receivers. Alongside humility went vigilance. The quality of the ministry could best be enhanced by a careful examination of candidates for ordination. At the heart of Featley's argument lay the bishop's role in furthering the dissemination of the Word. In a very candid passage, he explained the double charge of the prelate as both minister and bishop: 'as priests you are to preach, as bishops to ordain priests and countenance preachers...' Featley concluded his case with an eloquent plea for bishops to preach in person:[7]

> I grant you feed in many ways: you feed when you appoint pastors to feed, you feed when you instruct them how to feed, you feed when you censure them for not feeding their flocks, or not feeding them wholesome food, you feed in a synode when you make good canons, you feed in your visitations when you encourage good ministers, and reform abuses in the church; lastly, you feed at your tables when you keep good hospitality. And after all these manners the apostles and ancient fathers fed; yet they thought themselves in danger of a vae, or curse, if they fed not by preaching the gospel in their own persons.

In short, the bishop enjoyed an apostolic authority to lead his flock through personal example and fatherly admonition in the propagation of the Word. These sentiments are echoed, in a more popular vein, in the writings of many other Jacobean divines. With a pardonable pun, the sabbatarian writer Nicholas Bownd could express the hope that John Jegon's rule at Norwich would enlarge 'the bounds of the Gospell in these parts' by his support for 'all faithfull preachers'; similarly, John Downame welcomed James Mountagu's elevation to the episcopal bench in 1608 in the expectation that through his authority 'God may be glorified in the propagation of his truth and in the diligent preaching of his Gospel'. Downame left the Bishop in no doubt that it was his special responsibility 'to plant...a godly, learned and faithfull ministrie'.[8] Both clergymen looked to the episcopate to lead the proselytising mission of the Church.

Featley's image of the bishop as preaching pastor is also mirrored in

episcopal biographies. Archbishop Whitgift, for example, was remembered 'as such a bishop as St. Paul requireth'. His biographer praised Whitgift's qualities of humility, mercy and charity, as well as his practice of regular preaching, which he maintained even after promotion to Canterbury. The clergy, it was reported, returned this fatherly affection with genuine love. According to his biographer, Bishop Lake was another such pastor. His own 'tender and fatherlike' rule of the Somerset clergy took the form of tireless preaching and thorough visitations, at which he would provide 'advice and direction' to poorly educated ministers. His mild demeanour, courtesy and affability ensured that Lake 'was ever welcome where he came' on visitation.[9] The biographies of Bishops Bedell, Morton and Vaughan closely conform to the same stereotype.[10] So powerful was the image of the preaching pastor that it was applied to certain bishops, such as Smith or Williams, whose government scarely matched the claims of apostolic purity made on their behalf, as is demonstrated below.[11] Only the biographical sketches of Lancelot Andrewes do not imitate this model, a result of practice informing the image. To be sure, certain conventions were observed. Andrewes was commended for his charity, hospitality and munificence, his probity in handling episcopal patronage and his trenchant opposition to simony and sacrilege. But it would have been inaccurate and inappropriate to cast Andrewes in the mould of a preaching pastor. Not merely was he absent from his diocese for ten months each year, but, as will be shown below, he publicly criticised excessive preaching and the concomitant absence of ceremonial discipline in the Church.[12]

* * * * *

Inadequate sources for many Jacobean prelates make it hard to judge the reality against the image. Some bishops died within a year or two of consecration, so little can be established about their government, and others

are the victims of incomplete archives. In the first category fall Bishops Thompson, Fotherby, Tounson and Searchfield, and into the second, Bridges, Buckeridge, Howson and Thornborough. Investigated below is the government of twenty-six Jacobean bishops in thirteen dioceses, all but one drawn from the province of Canterbury.[13]

The clearest attempt to imitate the model of the preaching pastor was undertaken by a group of evangelical prelates, associated with Abbot of Canterbury, which included King of London, Lake of Bath & Wells and Morton of Coventry & Lichfield. Their slender resources and finite energies were devoted to strengthening the proselytising role of the church. As practical divinity, this implied that their own regular preaching was accompanied by the encouragement of a learned, resident and preaching ministry. The emphasis that St. Paul placed on the bishop as pastor and teacher[14] blended with the fervour of evangelical Calvinism to create a style of churchmanship which was acclaimed by many contemporaries.

In an age of preaching prelates, each of these four bishops was a celebrated preacher and all but Abbot were familiar figures in the pulpits of their dioceses. As Archbishop of Canterbury, Abbot resided away from his diocese, but preached regularly in London and at his archiepiscopal home in Croydon.[15] Most also tried to improve the calibre of their parochial clergy. In contrast to the practice of certain bishops, Morton and Lake personally examined candidates for ordination to weed out the weak and insufficient;[16] and, as noted above, for those poorly educated ministers already in possession of a benefice or curacy, schemes of vocational training were introduced to improve their learning, by Abbot at Gloucester in 1612 and by Lake at Bath & Wells between 1617 and 1623. Both were devised at a time when such measures were becoming unfashionable, and, unlike similar schemes at Chichester, and probably at Norwich, they were not primarily a response to extraneous circumstances. Neither King nor Morton followed their example.

At London, John King was evidently satisfied with the general level of learning of his clergy, whom he dubbed 'his crown and glory', so he did not revive the educational schemes of his predecessors, Aylmer, Bancroft and Ravis.[17] There survive the records of only one visitation of Thomas Morton at Coventry & Lichfield, which do not mention the problem of clerical education, but Morton's concern was publicly expressed in his blistering attack on 'corrupt ministers' in a convocation sermon of 1614.[18]

All four evangelical bishops used their patronage to promote a preaching ministry in their dioceses, in contrast to the practice of many prelates, such as Andrewes, Harsnett or Carleton.[19] As befitted two former city lecturers, both George Abbot and John King enjoyed a reputation as patrons of godly preachers. Abbot was commended on a number of occasions as 'a principall patrone of sound and solid preaching',[20] as exemplified by his preferment of clergy such as Sampson Price, lecturer at St. Olave's London, and a profilic writer of anti-papal and devotional tracts.[21] Among his domestic chaplains at Lambeth were prominent figures in the preaching fraternity of London diocese, including Thomas Myriell, 'preacher of the Word of God at Barnet' and later rector of St. Stephen's Walbrook, John Vicars, former lecturer at St. Michael Cornhill, and William Ayre, corporation lecturer at Colchester.[22] A passage in one of Myriell's published sermons conveys the flavour of their ministry, as members of a preaching elite. In a sermon delivered in St. Paul's Cathedral, Myriell contrasted the darkness of popery with the light of the Gospel in England, and seized the opportunity to deliver an encomium on London as a centre for that light:[23]

> no place of the world, where God shines so bright as in England; no place of England, like London; no place of London, like this; this is Bethel, the House of God; here have you the choysest wits, the gravest heads, the sharpest iudgements, continually emptying themselves unto you, that whosoever comes in among you may truely fal downe in admiration, and say, "Now verily God is in you indeed". I Corinth 14.25.

Other London professors of the Gospel received episcopal livings from John King. One was Lancelot Langhorne, 'preacher of the Word of God' and chaplain to King, who held the living of St. Martin Ludgate before his premature death in 1614. His only published work, a funeral sermon, was a powerful evocation of the godly and pious life, and had ran through four editions by 1633.[24] Another protégé of King's was Henry Mason, later remembered for his 'exemplary life [and] edifying and judicious preaching', who wrote a series of expositional works on such topics as the doctrine of equivocation for the use of his parishioners at St. Andrew Undershaft in the City.[25] Not merely did the web of patronage spun by Abbot and King reflect similar preferences, but on occasions it entangled the same divines. John Barcham and Samuel Purchas were chaplains to both prelates after 1610, and Abbot's chaplain James Speight was given a City living by John King.[26] Among the intimates of King's chaplain, Henry Mason, were his brother Francis, Daniel Featley and Thomas Goad, who were all domestic chaplains to the Archbishop.[27] As indicated above, zealous preachers were also the chief beneficiaries of the patronage of Bishops Lake and Morton.[28]

The supervision of regular catechising was as important for the spread of the Gospel as was the provision of preachers, for, as one popular author pointed out, unless the laity were first thoroughly schooled in the rudimentary tenets of Christianity, any amount of preaching would be in vain.[29] Visitation articles habitually enquired whether or not the minister provided a weekly catechising class for the young and ignorant, as stipulated by canon 59, but these evangelical bishops went beyond this minimal requirement. Both King and Morton regularly encouraged their clergy to catechise the laity with particular care; Morton, indeed, alarmed at the shortage of printed catechisms in each of his dioceses, distributed 'thousands' of copies to the clergy, which were printed at his own expense.[30] It was during one ordination sermon that Arthur Lake publicly criticised ministers who failed to instruct their flocks

carefully, and he permitted the catechising of the ignorant in front of the congregation during morning prayer in at least one Somerset parish, that of Batcombe. Prior to his death, Lake was planning to write a 'plaine and familiar' exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles and the catechism for the use and instruction of his clergy, for whose benefit he also donated books to Wells Cathedral and Bath Abbey.[31]

Less exceptional was the role that these evangelical bishops took in the administration of ecclesiastical discipline. Like many prelates, Thomas Morton preferred to appoint talented surrogates to run his consistory, rather than to preside in person.[32] Arthur Lake did intervene regularly in the workings of his consistory in order to investigate serious charges against laity and clergy alike, and his practice of preaching sermons at the penance of notorious offenders was unrivalled in the Jacobean Church.[33] Both Abbot and King held courts of audience to settle thorny diocesan cases, but their responsibilities at Whitehall and in the Ecclesiastical Commission necessitated a policy of general delegation.[34] Indeed, the pair attended the Commission with greater regularity than any other prelate, so that they may be considered as the joint architects of the rigorous discipline meted out by the Commission after 1611.[35]

It would be consistent with their commitment to preaching if these evangelical bishops regularly connived at the nonconformity of zealous preachers. Their actual practice is more complex. Certainly the diocesan records do not reveal any drive for conformity under these bishops,[36] but this finding is unremarkable. It will be argued in the following chapter that after 1605-6 all bishops, irrespective of their private opinions, publicly sanctioned occasional conformity. Nevertheless, personal attitudes towards nonconformity can be recovered from articles issued on visitation, which suggests that, in contrast to several colleagues, these evangelical bishops did not attach great importance to ceremonial conformity. On the subject of

ministerial duties, for example, all visitation articles enquired if the rites of the Prayer Book were observed without addition or omission, but beyond this there were significant variations. Bishops Chaderton, Dove, Harsnett, Neile, Overall and Tounson specifically asked if the surplice were <u>always worn</u> at divine service, Davenant, Overall, Thornborough and Tounson also enquiring if the cross in baptism were <u>ever omitted</u>. Andrewes, Chaderton, Dove and Neile wished to know if the liturgy were shortened for the benefit of preaching, while Howson enquired at great length about the observance of every part of the liturgy and whether the minister had attacked the necessity of the sacraments to salvation.[37] By contrast, Abbot, King and Morton merely asked if the surplice were <u>worn</u> and the cross in baptism <u>observed</u>. Indeed, at his metropolitical visitation of Norwich diocese in 1618, Abbot simply enquired if the minister 'commonly' wore the surplice.[38]

It is not surprising, therefore, that several evangelical prelates showed a marked sympathy for the scruples of one or two nonconformists. At Bath & Wells, Lake's consistory warned several ministers to observe the ceremonies during divine service, but Lake could respect the wish of Richard Bernard not to wear the hood, in contravention of canon 59, since Bernard was a devoted preacher and the author of many edifying tracts and commentaries.[39] At Chester, Morton was an indulgent governor of a group of nonconformists, at Coventry & Lichfield he seems to have allowed John Shaw to evade subscription and to have befriended the incorrigible nonconformist, Anthony Lapthorne.[40] On such occasions, Lake and Morton were observing the well-worn theme that the demands of ceremonial conformity could only be satisfied at the cost of evangelism, a line which had led another Jacobean bishop, Rudd of St. Davids, to argue in convocation in 1604 that it would be inexpedient to enforce full conformity.[41] On other occasions, this general sympathy was constrained by more compelling considerations. Archbishop Abbot directed his energies against scandalous, rather than nonconformist clergy, as the records

of the Ecclesiastical Commission attest.[42] Yet the Archbishop could not avoid enforcing a measure of ceremonial conformity, for he acted as James I's agent in hunting down intransigent nonconformists, such as Arthur Hildersham and John Dod.[43] Extraneous pressure made Morton modify his standpoint in 1618. As Bishop of Chester, Morton had tried to win over seven local ministers to the discipline of the Church and in 1618 he published an extended refutation of their views as well as those contained in the Lincolnshire nonconformist petition of 1604.[44] Morton's motives in printing the work were hardly likely to be pastoral, since he was deploying the very arguments that had signally failed to convince the Cheshire nonconformists;[45] moreover, the whole history of the period 1604-11 had shown that public debate stirred rather than stilled the issues of conformity and subscription. Morton's book did indeed precipitate a renewed polemical controversy on discipline, reopening many of the issues that had lain dormant since 1611.[46] His reasons for publication were, rather, to win back royal favour. Morton faced a number of unknown enemies at James I's court, who had tried to block his elevation to the episcopate in 1616 on the charge of peculating church revenues, and who had informed the King of his 'rigorous' proceedings against Sunday sports in Lancashire in 1617. James also learnt of Morton's lenience to Cheshire nonconformists which may have cost him promotion to Lincoln in 1617.[47] As a divine who had won royal patronage through his polemical writings against Rome, it was only natural for Morton to to take up his pen to regain the King's favour, this time against the nonconformists. The publication of Morton's pamphlet may be read, therefore, as a public gesture of his unswerving support for ceremonial conformity; and as the book went to press, Morton was promoted to Coventry & Lichfield, a coincidence that did not escape the sharp eye of his polemical opponent, William Ames.[48] For Morton as much as for Abbot, his commitment to evangelism outran any tolerance of nonconformity.

It would seem, therefore, that there are no good grounds for applying the

epithet 'puritan' to these evangelical bishops. In a recent article, Dr Lake has suggested that Matthew Hutton, Archbishop of York between 1595 and 1606, may be legitimately described as a 'puritan bishop' in the light of the 'evangelical world-view' that he shared with puritan clergy, as exemplified by their common concern at the spread of popery.[49] To label these evangelical bishops as 'puritan' would mask substantial differences between them and their puritan clergy on matters of doctrine as well as of conformity. One well-documented example is the divergent opinions of Bishop Lake and his puritan chaplain, William Sclater. Lake had publicly defended the discipline of the Church in a sermon at Paul's Cross in 1604, where he maintained the classic doctrine that the ceremonies should be observed as matters indifferent which were enjoined by authority. Sclater, by contrast, was before his local consistory in 1606 for his refusal to wear the surplice. In time, their positions grew closer. Sclater was reconciled to the use of the surplice and suggested in a published sermon that bishops should overlook minor disciplinary offences committed by diligent pastors 'in compassion of the churches necessity', an attitude which Lake adopted to Sclater's friend, Richard Bernard.[50] Yet there remained important theological differences between the two. Sclater always retained a bitter hatred of popery, a suspicion of auricular confession, and a passionate belief that preaching and not the admnistration of the sacraments was the 'great and important businesse of the ministery'. His patron Lake held more moderate opinions. In 1623 the Bishop reminded his audience at Paul's Cross that it was 'too much precisenesse' to maintain that all principles of reason and religion were extinguished in the Church of Rome. In a sermon before James I, Lake also advocated the use of auricular confession, as restored in the English liturgy to its native purity. Moreover, he argued that the Word and sacraments were divine gifts which could not be ranked one above another, and at one point suggested that the contempt of baptism 'hazardeth salvation'. Lake was also a hypothetical universalist, informing a

group of ordinands that 'in a minister's commission, grace is universall', an attitude that Sclater denounced as a 'dreame'.[51] These differences could be set aside in their endeavour to further the Gospel in Jacobean Somerset, yet their stated views remained quite distinct. Likewise, the whole tenor of Morton's attack on Cheshire puritan nonconformists implied a contrast of belief and priorities. Their obstinate stand against the ceremonies, claimed Morton, disrupted the peace of the Church and encouraged the growth of popery and separatism.[52] Evangelical these bishops may have been, puritan they were certainly not.

In a convocation sermon of 1624, Joseph Hall urged the episcopate to treat their clergy with kindness and familiarity, for 'no spectacle can be more odious than a proud prelate'.[53] The image of the preaching pastor did not easily marry with the social and political power of the episcopate of the reformed Church of England, as lords spiritual and provincial agents of the Crown. Archbishop Abbot, for one, was reminded by James I to 'carry his house nobly' by maintaining the visible trappings of his pre-eminent rank and wealth.[54] It was a tension that could be resolved by humility of prelate to clergyman. Predictably, Morton and Lake were warmly commended by their biographers for courtesy to their diocesan flock,[55] but contemporary evidence is available to substantiate these claims. If the manner in which bishops mingled with their clergy on visitation, preached with them on the combination roster or entertained them at their table cannot be reconstructed in any detail, then something can be gleaned from epistolary dedications and private memoirs. From such sources it appears that these evangelical bishops heeded the advice of Hall to the extent that they were acclaimed by their parochial clergy for the style as well as the content of their episcopal rule.

One revealing illustration of the bonds forged between a bishop and his clerical flock concerns Arthur Lake and his puritan protégé, Richard Bernard. In the early months of 1617, as the Somerset clergy awaited the arrival of

their new bishop, Bernard celebrated Lake's appointment by writing a detailed description of his concept of the evangelical bishop.[56] What greater blessing could occur, asked Bernard rhetorically, than the selection of 'episcopus vigilantissimus'? He will follow the pattern of the Good Shepherd. The bishop will preach the Gospel to his clergy to strengthen the diligent and to arouse the lethargic. The idle and profligate will be reformed with gentle discipline. The bishop will lead his flock through his personal morality and his protection of orthodox doctrine against the barbs of both brownists and papists. Bernard's vision of the apostolic bishop, which matched that of Featley,[57] furnishes the clearest evidence of the dissemination of the ideal among godly ministers in the dioceses. This exacting standard was met by Lake's government of Bath & Wells, so that Bernard's tone altered from exhortation to commendation. In his writings after 1621, Lake became 'a blessed bishop', 'holy and learned', 'a very man of God', famous for his piety and probity. Bernard alluded to Lake's connivance at his nonconformity when he wrote of the many favours he had received from the Bishop, which modesty precluded him from enumerating.[58] Similarly Edward Kellett, Rector of Croscombe, remembered Lake as 'that man of happy memory...now blessed saint'.[59] Alexander Huish, a fellow of Wadham who had been ordained by Lake, had to cancel the dedication of his Lectures upon the Lords Prayer when he heard of the bishop's death in May 1626, and instead composed this unprinted elegy:[60]

> Dead is the patron of my booke (ay me)
> Patron of learning, goodnesse, pietie:
> Grave, sober, learned, painefull, zealous, wise,
> Mirror of men, under death's strike he lies.

It is among such private sentiments that one senses, however imperfectly, the powerful impression that these bishops made as spiritual leaders.

John King was another bishop who inspired respect and affection in equal measure. Of King's courtesy to his clergy, there is the testimony of John Glanville, a Balliol man who had been ordained by him in 1611. Glanville

justified the dedication of a tract to the Bishop in 1613 not out of respect for his authority or learning but as a tribute to King's singular benevolence and affability.[61] Publicly, King was often congratulated on his incomparable preaching, which led one Sussex minister to describe him as 'the glory of bishops, the miracles of preachers'. Another called him 'a holy and heavenly laborer in the Lords vineyard', an allusion to King's regular preaching in the city of London.[62] A third, Richard Chambers, paused in the middle of a funeral oration to praise King's spiritual care of the Countess of Northumberland on her deathbed.[63] These public pronouncements were repeated in more private sources. King's first chaplain, Thomas Wyatt, confided in his diary that his master was 'a right good man, most learned and eloquent', while Roger Ley, curate of St. Leonard's Shoreditch, who had been ordained at King's hands, wrote poignantly of his death on Good Friday 1621 as Ley listened to preachers at Paul's Cross lecturing on the orders of King, which may be taken as a symbol of the bishop's preaching ministry.[64] Joseph Hall wrapped up these tributes in his recollection of King as 'that most faithful pastor of ours'.[65]

Similar praise was directed at Morton and Abbot. For Morton, it perhaps suffices to recall the bishop's request to Richard Mather at his ordination that he would pray for Morton, and it was for similar gestures that Clarendon labelled Morton as one of 'the less formal and more popular prelates'.[66] Preaching ministers were among the enthusiasts for Abbot's government. The London lecturer John Downame praised Abbot for his defence of true doctrine against Rome and his habit of preaching, 'shaming those who neglect it, by your example'. Downame added that he wrote this testimonial not as 'a servile flatterer' but in the hope that Abbot would be 'a precedent and pattern' to his successors at Lambeth. Nine years later, Downame again publicly congratulated Abbot for supporting 'the sincere truth of Religion' and the preaching ministry, a view echoed by Robert Barrell, beneficed in Canterbury

diocese.[67] It is no coincidence that all three surviving consecration sermons that were preached on Abbot's orders dwell on the cardinal virtues of episcopal courtesy and humility. Featley's two sermons of 1619 and 1623 have been cited above; the third was preached by an unknown clergyman, probably another chaplain to the Archbishop, at the consecration of Robert Abbot to Salisbury see on 3 December 1615. The preacher apologised for his candour in rebuking those bishops who distanced themselves from their diocesan clergy. He urged his audience 'to thincke upon that which followeth':[68]

> 'Illud etiam dico, quod episcopi sacerdotes se esse sicut, non dominos, honorent clericos quasi clericos'...We knowe its a part of Timothy a bishop his charg to provide that painefull presbiters should find double honour of reverence and maintenance...you cannot better provide for your honour, then ye maintainyng of ye reputacion of your sonnes, let it not be a iust complaynt of learnyng and honesty and that sub habitu clericali find as smale incouragment and countenance in bishops pallaces as in laymans houses.

The reputation that these evangelical bishops enjoyed among their diocesan clergy suggests that they habitually observed this injunction.

The four evangelical bishops were united not only by a common style of churchmanship, but also by ties of strong friendship. The affinity between King and Lake was well established by 1613, while King expressed his respect for Abbot by appointing him an overseer of his will.[69] Thomas Morton's friendship with John King dated from a visit to Oxford in 1607, and as Dean of Winchester between 1609 and 1616 he was 'most intimate with, and beloved of, Dr Arthur Lake', who at that stage was Master of St. Cross Hospital and chaplain to Bishop Bilson of Winchester.[70] A fifth figure to be included tentatively in this circle is Nicholas Felton, Bishop of Ely between 1619 and 1626. Very little can be discovered about his episcopal government in order to test Hacket's recollection of Felton as 'a most apostolical overseer of the clergy', although it seems likely that the bishop resided away from his diocese, in London, and did not attend his triennial visitations.[71] Betweeen 1592 and

1617 Felton was 'a powerful preacher in S.Antholins Church' in London[72] and as Bishop of Ely he patronised a number of diligent pastors, one of whom was his chaplain, Ralph Brownrig, the future bishop of Exeter.[73] Felton also backed John Preston, Master of Emmanuel College, in his successful bid for the Holy Trinity lectureship in Cambridge in 1624.[74] His close links with these evangelical bishops can be clearly discerned. In 1616 Felton received a canonry in St. Paul's Cathedral from John King, and he also enjoyed a 'most entire league of friendship' with Arthur Lake, whose biographer referred to them as 'a paire of lights of our Church, comparable even to those primitive ones', Chrysostom and Basil. It was Felton who heard Lake's last confession on his deathbed in May 1626. Five years earlier, at John King's bedside during his last hours were Abbot, Lake, Morton and Felton. It was Morton who preached King's funeral sermon, with Felton in attendance.[75]

To this group of evangelical bishops should be added the name of Tobie Matthew, Archbishop of York between 1606 and 1628. Matthew was an indefatigable preacher, whose diary reveals that he was still progressing from pulpit to pulpit across his sprawling diocese in his late seventies.[76] He was also a great patron of preachers, as exemplified by his preferment of John Favour, chief preacher at the Halifax exercises.[77] Among his protégés was Thomas Morton, whom he collated to a canonry in 1610, and Richard Bernard, whom he won back into the established Church after Bernard's deprivation for nonconformity in 1605. In gratitude, Bernard publicly praised the Archbishop as his 'patri indulgentissimo' and 'a patron to all faithfull pastors'.[78] Matthew's desire to nurture a diligent diocesan clergy is evident from his policy of selecting suitable subjects for the sermons at synodal meetings. In 1613 Matthew provided Bernard with a text upon which to expound to the Nottinghamshire clergy 'to urge my brethren of the ministery, publikely assembled, to the duty of catechising'. Ten years later, the same audience heard a general account of the ministerial office, on the instructions of the

Archbishop. At York, the synodal sermon of 1610 defended the divine lawfulness of the Oath of Allegiance, which, the author indicated, was preached and published at Matthew's direction.[79] In his willingness to promote the Gospel, Matthew was prepared to overlook the nonconformity of a number of ministers, including that of his own chaplain, John Favour.[80] One small story powerfully conveys the temper of his rule. In November 1608, Thomas Bell, a Yorkshire cleric and noted polemicist against Rome, received a copy of a counter-attack against some of his writings. Bell was ill and stranded a hundred miles from his library, so he sent a message to the Archbishop, a mere forty miles away, asking for the loan of some books. Matthew sent the requested volumes at his own charge and offered his whole library, if Bell needed to consult it.[81]

With this style of leadership, it is not surprising that Matthew became so celebrated a figure, 'patriae nostrae splendor, illustrissime Tobia', as one official called him.[82] Matthew's habit of preaching at such an advanced age was commended time and again. In 1610 a London minister saluted Matthew's achievement of forty years of incessant preaching, while in 1619 a Durham cleric publicly prayed that 'your Grace's golden bell may long be heard [to] ring in our assemblies'.[83] Yet Matthew did more than preach. One local clergyman noted that his rule fulfilled 'that pattern of godlie prelacie' outlined by St. Paul through his personal conduct and his careful oversight of the diocese.[84] His chaplain John Favour observed the Archbishop's diligence in study and preaching, his affability in entertainment and his attention to government, all of which encouraged him to emulate Matthew's example.[85] There could no clearer illustration of the Pauline doctrine of the bishop leading through example as much as through the exercise of authority. Matthew also received a telling dedication from Alexander Cooke, curate at Leeds. In 1605 Cooke had lost his Lincolnshire living for nonconformity, but he subsequently enjoyed Matthew's patronage. In 1615 the Archbishop collated

him to Leeds vicarage, allowing him to evade subscription to the three Articles. In a work published five years previously, Cooke had expressed his respect for 'such Church-governors as your Grace is' who study and preach regularly, 'drawing on others, not by words onely, but by example also, to performance of like exercises'.[86] The implication was that Cooke had little time for bishops who saw ceremonial discipline and order as more important elements of the episcopal office than pastoral values.

These tributes of admiration and affection for Matthew took their most eloquent form in the elegy written by John Earle following the Archbishop's death in 1628.[87] As the son of Matthew's registrar, Earle grew up in York during Matthew's long primacy. The opening remark - 'Old reverend Toby's dead' -establishes the tone of respect and familiarity which runs through the poem. Earle treats Matthew's preaching abilities at length. When shall we see again 'Old Toby in the pulpitt?', Earle laments:

> .....Such was hee
> When hee pure manna to our souls did breake,
> Thus did his looke, his gesture, action speake.
> Thus did hee chaine us to him, souls and eares,
> Thus drew our sighs, thus did hee straine our teares.
> Whilste hee noe whirlewind spake, nor with some rude
> Amazing earthquake shooke the multitude:
> Nor raild in fire: but gently layd our sinne
> In that still voice, that voice that God was in.[88]

Earle goes on to praise Matthew's practice of preaching throughout the diocese in a manner intelligible to all his audience:

> Nor breath'd hee only in't Cathedrall aire:
> The meanest scaffold was his seat and chaire.
> Noe place escapt him, even those homely cells,
> And cottage-churches where Christ poorer dwells
> Then in a manger...
> There would he enter too, and perchance make
> Their doome forestald the longer for his sake,
> That had taught there: and did himselfe submitt,
> Both to the simple roofe and simpler witt.
> And made salvation stoope with him, and lye
> Levell unto the lows't capacity.
> Noe threat of sicknes, noe sharpe winters rage
> Excus'd this care, noe impotence of age
> Adiournd this travell, whilst his labours houre
> Did last, and that too did outlast his powre.

In a pleasing conceit, Earle suggests that even after old age had silenced Matthew, he continued to preach through his personal virtues, his 'chaste' and careful government and his lavish hospitality. In short, the Archbishop's life 'was St. Paulls chapter' and Earle predicted that in years to come his reputation would 'eternalise York'. One intimate couplet summarises Earle's own feelings towards Matthew:

> We had a Bishopp: one whome noe time could
> Make tedious to us, whom no age make old.

It is among these professions of esteem that one detects the reconciliatory role of the evangelical bishops towards the godly and nonconformist clergy. These bishops were appreciated in part for their accommodating attitude towards nonconformists, but as much for their assiduity in preaching and furthering the cause of the Gospel. This perception lay behind Featley's proud boast of 'ye golden and silver vessels of Gods sanctuary, our preaching prelates',[89] while nonconformists such as Bernard and Cooke felt accommodated within the national Church by bishops who shared their vision of the episcopal office. Even critics of the pomp of prelacy could not conceal their admiration for certain bishops, as an apologist for the Millenary petition wrote in 1603:[90]

> there are in them men of...vertue, learninge, labour in their mynistery, by preaching and writinge, services of the Church, and all manner of spirituall graces and worthy desert in their callinge.

The issue of hierarchical order in the Church must have lost much of its sting through the government of these evangelicals, which in turn contributed to the stability of the Jacobean ecclesiastical polity.

* * * * *

This style of evangelical churchmanship may well have extended beyond the rule of these six bishops. There were several other prelates who seem to

have pursued similar pastoral ideals, although their government cannot be analysed in detail from the fragmentary records that survive. One may have been Gervase Babington, Bishop of Worcester between 1597 and his death in 1610. Babington began his ministry as a city lecturer and always remained a diligent preacher, but he became famous for his writings on the Pentateuch, which he continued to compose long after his elevation to the episcopate.[91] At Worcester, Babington presided occasionally in his consistory and was active as a local magistrate, yet his role as visitor and pastor remains obscure.[92] Fortunately, something may be recovered from two dedications addressed to Babington in 1601. In the first, Robert Abbot, a former lecturer in the city, recalled it was Babington who encouraged him to publish his sermons of 1596 as 'beneficiall and profitable to the Church' and went on to commend the Bishop's powerful style of preaching. The second was from an anonymous clergyman, who claimed he was unknown to Babington. He also praised Babington's painful preaching and his scriptural commentaries for which many ministers were indebted to him, and added that although he was beneficed outside the diocese, the fame of Babington's pastoral care had reached him. These remarks gain credibility from the candid tone of the dedication, for the author went on to urge Babington to improve the education of the Worcestershire ministry.[93]

Robert Abbot, elder brother of the Archbishop of Canterbury, may also be ranked among the evangelical bishops. Abbot was consecrated as Bishop of Salisbury in December 1615 and died unexpectedly twenty-seven months later. According to Daniel Featley, who knew him well,[94] in that brief time Abbot proved himself to be a diligent preacher in his diocese. He led his primary visitation in person, provided generous hospitality and excelled in his humility to the Wiltshire clergy.[95] In view of Abbot's zeal as a city lecturer in Worcester, Featley's remarks on his preaching habits seem quite plausible. Regrettably, all that the diocesan archive discloses is that the Bishop, in

common with the majority of the episcopal bench, resided in his diocese throughout the year.[96]

Another likely candidate is Henry Parry, Bishop of Gloucester and latterly Worcester. Parry was a diligent preacher in both dioceses, and his support for the preaching ministry is symbolised by his donation of a pulpit to the dean and chapter of Worcester.[97] There are hints that his courtesy and charity won him respect throughout Gloucester diocese, but the absence of non-administrative records makes it difficult to trace his pastoral practice. Certainly Parry was an energetic administrator in the consistory, sitting punctiliously and assuming the sole authority to licence curates and grant commutations. Of his time at Worcester, the damaged diocesan archive yields little information.[98]

Other prelates shared common ideals with the evangelical bishops, but were less successful in implementing them. One was James Mountagu, whose personal standing with James I constricted his role as diocesan leader to one visit to his diocese for two months each year. It has been shown above that as Bishop of Bath & Wells after 1608, Mountagu led several visitations in person and encouraged the growth of a preaching ministry in Somerset. Yet his desire to promote preaching led him to license a number of unsuitable clergy, and he seems to have been less vigilant as an ordainer than, say, Bishops Lake and Morton.[99]

Nor did John Jegon's government at Norwich entirely conform to the exacting model of the preaching pastor. The Bishop's letters to his clergy were written with exemplary humility and fraternal courtesy, and they disclose his desire to propagate the gospel throughout the diocese. It was fitting, therefore, that the Bishop should be hailed as a fellow-supporter of the preaching ministry by the zealous preacher Nicholas Bownd.[100] Jegon may also have arranged for the lesser clergy to receive theological tuition, although, as noted above, the evidence for this is ambiguous.[101] However,

Jegon acquired a reputation for covetousness as a result of the high fees he charged at the ordination and institution of ministers. On occasion profit and pastoralism could be reconciled. When the distinguished divine William Bedell protested at the size of the fees charged for his ordination, Jegon eventually allowed him to pay only as much as he saw fit. Anthony Harison, the Bishop's secretary, adds that although Jegon could be equally indulgent to poor curates, he exacted the full fees from any minister who disputed the high charges.[102] Although many aspects of his government cannot be recovered, Jegon did delegate the task of examining ordinands, in contrast to the practice of Morton or Lake. He also seems to have taken little part in assessing the suitability of ministers seeking institution or licence to preach and serve cures.[103]

Miles Smith, Bishop of Gloucester between 1612 and 1624, also followed to a limited extent the churchmanship of his two patrons, Gervase Babington and George Abbot[104] to a limited degree. Smith was remembered for having filled the churches of Gloucestershire 'with the plentifull preaching of the Gospell' and his own commitment to proselytising was symbolised by his regular attendance in the Cathedral to hear the Tuesday lecture. He was also courteous and affable to his clergy and in turn 'was honoured and beloved of all sorts'.[105] However, Smith was no enthusiastic preacher, and showed little vigour in his stewardship of Gloucester diocese, although there is no truth in the story that he never again entered his Cathedral after his quarrel with the Dean, William Laud, in 1617.[106] Unlike his predecessors Goldsborough, Ravis and Parry, Smith showed little flair for administration and small interest in the routine office business coming before his consistory which he attended very irregularly. His style of government may be adduced from the marginalia in the Gloucester court books. Smith presided in consistory for the first time in September 1613 and departed abruptly halfway through proceedings, to the evident surprise of the registrar. At a visitation session at Chipping Campden

in June 1619, Smith listened to a long sermon from the vicar, Robert Lilly, and 'went to the inne as soone as the sermon was ended and did not sit' to take the churchwardens' oaths.[107]

George Carleton, another protégé of Archbishop Abbot,[108] made a more decisive impression on his administration at Chichester than Smith had done at Gloucester. In his nine years at Chichester, Carleton conducted visitations and synods in person and reorganised the personnel of his local consistory, in which he presided on many occasions. His episcopal patronage, however, did not noticeably improve the diocese's preaching strength; and it is unclear what his preaching habits were, apart from the intriguing remark of his chaplain during a synodal sermon of 1626 that Carleton would be a tireless preacher, if his resources 'were answerable to the minde and intention'.[109] It was a comment that epitomises the limited success of Carleton, Jegon, Smith and Mountagu in fulfilling the exemplar of the preaching pastor.

The relative tranquillity of the Jacobean Church provided the ideal climate in which this evangelical churchmanship could flourish. Pastoral values such as instruction and reconciliation were unsettled, if not jeopardised, by the bitterness and divisions which accompanied the enforcement of ceremonial conformity, as briefly occurred in 1603-6. Both before and after this date, the Church enjoyed some peace in the dioceses. The roots of this evangelical churchmanship go back at least to the 1590s, when Matthew and Babington were already bishops. Its emergence may indicate not merely the happy marriage of Pauline teaching and Elizabethan puritanism, but also the desire among many churchmen to heal the divisions caused by the suppression of the presbyterian movement. The propagation of the gospel, the defence of correct doctrine and the provision of a learned ministry were issues around which many puritan clergy could unite with the hierarchy.

As Elizabethans by birth and breeding, the evangelical prelates of the Jacobean Church may well have taken inspiration from the leading lights of

the later sixteenth century episcopate. Limited evidence suggests that their model may well have been John Jewel, the first Elizabethan Bishop of Salisbury. Contemporary interest in Jewel was quickened with the publication of his Works in 1609, under the aegis of Archbishop Bancroft. Through the good offices of Thomas Morton, Daniel Featley won the commission to write an abbreviated English translation of Laurence Humfrey's biography of 1575. The portrait of the preaching pastor presented by Featley furnished the working model for his two consecration sermons of 1619 and 1623.[110] His patron George Abbot may also have taken Jewel as his exemplar, to judge from his approving citation of the bishop's prayer that he might die preaching in the pulpit, during a debate in the House of Lords in 1610. At the consecration of his brother to Salisbury in 1615, the preacher observed that Robert Abbot's new flock 'promise themselves in you to find their Jewell againe'.[111]

\+ + + + +

Among the Jacobean episcopate were a number of Arminian prelates who rejected the evangelical churchmanship of Abbot and Matthew in favour of a practice that emphasised the bishop as governor and disciplinarian rather than as pastor and shepherd. Behind this difference lay an alternative perception of the problems confronting the English Church. Heading the Arminian interest at Court was Bishop Richard Neile, who from 1617 gathered about him at Durham House in the Strand a group of sympathetic clergy, which included Bishops Buckeridge and Laud. Closely associated with them were Bishops Andrewes, Overall and Howson, and less intimately so Harsnett. Bishop Barlow, who died in 1613, may be considered an Arminian avant la lettre.[112] It is unfortunate that none of these prelates left a clear account of his view of the episcopal office, doubly so since their practice as bishops is so poorly

documented. Little or nothing can be established about the diocesan administration of Buckeridge at Rochester, Overall at Coventry & Lichfield and Norwich, Howson at Oxford and Laud at St. Davids. Yet a study of available literary and archival evidence presents a different assessment of the episcopal office from that of the evangelical bishops.

On 3 December 1626 John Cosin, chaplain to Richard Neile, preached the sermon at the consecration of Francis White at Durham House in the presence of Neile, Buckeridge, and five hundred clergy and laity.[113] On similar occasions, Daniel Featley and other clergy had presented the image of the bishop as the Good Shepherd, who forwarded the propagation of the Gospel,[114] but Cosin criticised this interpretation as responsible for disorder and nonconformity in the Church. He conceded that the bishop's first duty was to preach, but went on to observe that the ministry under him had many duties beside preaching to perform, against those who fondly believed that 'preaching now-a-days should be counted our only office'. As for the bishop himself, he should preach the Law as well as the Gospel, and Cosin explicitly criticised those who concentrated on the dissemination of the Word:

> they now which preach us all Gospel and put no Law among it, **bishops** and priests that tell the people, make them believe that there is nothing to be done more but to believe and so be saved, these men, they preach by some other pattern sure, for Christ, He sent not to preach down the old Law so much as to preach up a new. Now to make men observe and do what the Church teaches is, or should be, in the bishop's hands.

Cosin then pointed out that the consequence of this emphasis on the Gospel was the culpable neglect of many canons of the Church on order, reverence and uniformity. The papists had a fair argument, he added, when they maintained:

> that we have a service, but no servants in it; that we have churches, but keep them not like the houses of God; that we have the sacraments, but few to frequent them; confession, but few practise it; that we have all religious duties (for they cannot deny it), but seldom observed; all good laws and canons of the Church, but

> few or none kept; the people are made to do nothing; the old discipline is neglected, and men do what they list. It should be otherwise and our Church intends it otherwise...

An urgent reassessment was needed, Cosin argued, both of the Church's priorities and the role of the episcopate.[115] Archbishop Laud expressed a similar view in his speech in answer to Lord Say and Sele in the House of Lords in 1641. In a robust defence of the Caroline episcopate, Laud claimed that they were all regular preachers, though he chose to include instruction, conference and writing as forms of preaching. Laud then suggested that preaching itself was but one function of the Church:[116]

> And whatsoever this Lord thinks of it, certainly, though preaching may be more necessary for the first planting of a Church, yet government is more noble and necessary too, where a Church is planted; as being that which must keep preaching and all other things else in order. And preaching (as 'tis now used) hath as much need to be kept in order as any, even the greatest extravagance that I know.

An evangelical bishop such as Lake did indeed accept that preaching needed some regulation, as he sometimes commented from the pulpit itself,[117] but he would hardly have agreed that the Church had been effectively planted in Jacobean Somerset. Only forty per cent of the clergy were licensed to preach and one hundred others needed theological supervision to improve their basic understanding of scripture.[118] In contrast, for Cosin and Laud, the Gospel and the Law were equally important concerns of the episcopate, and the pressing need of the Church in this period was the provision of order and uniformity, not of sermons and lectures.

The implications of these views can be explored in the episcopal government of Bishops Andrewes, Harsnett, Neile and Barlow. As Bishop of three sees between 1605 and 1626, Andrewes enjoyed a very limited contact with his diocesan clergy. He resided in London for ten months a year, presided over only one visitation and never attended his consistory.[119] If Andrewes was no preaching pastor, he did try and improve the quality of the parochial

clergy by patronising talented divines, favoured for their scholarship as much as their preaching aptitudes.[120] Indeed, though his patronage embraced Calvinists such as Thomas Goad, chaplain to Archbishop Abbot,[121] Andrewes's intimate protéges were invariably Arminian divines, such as his chaplains Jerome Beale and Matthew Wren.[122] The vocational training at Chichester in 1606 carried out in his name probably owed little to Andrewes, but it was broadly in line with his stated desire for a well-educated clergy.[123]

The extensive corpus of his writings reveal that Andrewes was much exercised by the absence of effective order and conformity in the Church. In a synodal sermon delivered before the upper house of convocation in February 1593, Andrewes argued that the Church was threatened by the abuse of doctrine, the proliferation of ignorant and false preaching and the persistence of simoniacal practices. The blame for this state of affairs lay with the episcopate, who had failed to maintain order in their dioceses. Andrewes concluded his philippic with a plea to the bishops before him to take up the reins of authority to restore peace, unity and stability to the Church:[124]

> Vos, quaeso, attendite, et medicinam apponite medicinae vestrae. Quae enim ad scelera profliganda data sunt, flagellum Christi, claves Petri, solam jam crumenam pulsant: Ad scelera vero, et flagellum Christi funiculis exarmatum, et claves Petri rubiginosae jam sunt, nisi vos flagello funiculos novos, novum clavibus splendorem, attentione vestra inducatis.

Andrewes returned to many of these themes in his preaching over the next thirty years. Two problems continued to disturb him. One was that excessive preaching had overshadowed the rest of the liturgy, so that prayers and the sacraments were ignored. Like Cosin, Andrewes was not opposed to preaching itself, 'but against our evil-proportioned hearing'. Andrewes never tired of stressing the central liturgical role of the Eucharist and his sermons before the King at Christmas invariably ended on a note of happy expectation at the imminent celebration of the rite. Contemporary indifference to this sacrament he therefore found peculiarly offensive, and it provoked many

bitter comments.[125] Accompanying this preoccupation with the pulpit was irreverence in Church. Andrewes had touched on this problem in his synodal sermon of 1593,[126] and to the end of his life condemned such unseemly behaviour in divine worship. Preaching before James I on Easter Day 1621, Andrewes noted from the text 'Noli me tangere':[127]

> Take this with you: Christ can say noli, then. For I know not how, our carriage, a many of us, is so loose; covered we sit, sitting we pray; standing, or walking, or as it takes us in the head, we receive; as if Christ were so gentle a person, we might touch Him, do to Him what we list, He would take all well, He hath not the power to say noli to any thing.

His sermon at Easter 1614 centred on the refusal of many precisionists to kneel at the Communion rails or to bow at the name of Jesus. Andrewes castigated those who 'cast scruples into men's minds, by no means to do it' and elsewhere showed that kneeling expressed the glorification of God by the body and enabled the heart to learn its duties from outward gestures.[128] These arguments came together in his last sermon before the King, preached on Christmas Day 1624, when Andrewes demanded that the Law, as well as the Gospel, be preached and observed.

> I shall tell you what is come by the drowning of the term 'Law'. Religion is even come to be counted res precaria. No law - no, no; but a matter of fair entreaty, gentle persuasion; neither jura, nor leges, but only consulta patrum, 'good fatherly counsel,' and nothing else. Consilia evangelica were a while laid aside; now there be none else. All are evangelical counsels now. The reverend regard, the legal vigour and power, the penalties of it are not set by. The rules - no reckoning made of them as of law-writs, none, but only as of physic bills; if you like them you may use them, if not, lay them by. And this comes of drowning the term, 'Law'. And all, for lack of praedicabo legem.

Although Andrewes was not entirely explicit about the constituents of the Law, it seems that he was alluding to the liturgical requirements of the Church, the enforcement of which lay with the episcopate.[129] It need hardly to be added that these sentiments find little correspondence in the sermons of

Arthur Lake. Although he did once warn against too much concentration on preaching, and he also pleaded for greater reverence in God's house, Lake centred his preaching on the exposition of scriptural texts.[130] Nor did his colleague George Abbot have much sympathy for Andrewes's notions on ceremony. In 1631 Abbot dismissed the act of bowing at the name of Jesus as 'a theme of so small necessity' and its theological justification as 'so uselesse an argument'.[131]

In his episcopal government, however, Andrewes did not live up to his own forceful rhetoric. His visitation articles repeatedly enquired if parts of the liturgy were sacrificed to accommodate a lengthy sermon, a question most clearly presented in his last set of articles, issued for Winchester diocese in 1625:[132]

> Whether doth he, in regard of preaching, diminish divine service or praier, that the Creed bee not said, and the Commandements read every Sunday, whereby the parishioners may lose knowledge of them both, which it most of all concerns them to know?

In practice, Andrewes left nonconformists well alone.[133] As noted above, he removed a large number of non-resident and scandalous clergy from their benefices in Chichester and Ely, and improved the furnishings of parochial communion tables in Winchester diocese; but at other times his discipline never percolated down to the liturgical practices in the parishes.[134] In part, this was a consequence of Andrewes's natural timidity and dislike of controversy,[135] such as would inevitably follow from any attempt to curb the level of diocesan preaching, as Samuel Harsnett found to his cost at Norwich.[136] Indeed, in the conclusion of the very synodal sermon where Andrewes had demanded that the episcopate beat down the enemies of the Church, he confessed 'sum..avidior, fortasse quam par est, pacis.'[137] In short, his concern at the absence of ceremonial uniformity led Andrewes to emphasise the judicial responsibilities rather than pastoral elements in the episcopal office.

Samuel Harsnett had a more resolute and pugnacious temperament. In 1584 he found himself before the Ecclesiastical Commission for a sermon at Paul's Cross in which he had attacked the doctrine of absolute and double predestination, labelling its exponents as puritans.[138] In the late 1590s Harsnett acted as Bancroft's henchman in investigating exorcist practices, in the course of which he wrote two polemical tracts, replete with sharp wit and withering sarcasm.[139] Although Harsnett did not use his episcopal patronage to promote preaching, circumstantial evidence presented above suggests that he preached regularly in his dioceses.[140] Indeed, the Bishop publicly upheld the importance of the ministry of the Word in a debate in the House of Lords in February 1629, observing that although the fabric of parochial churches must be maintained, 'yet there was an inward and spiritual Church more to be cared for with the preaching of the Word to the salvation of souls'.[141] Alongside this personal commitment was the desire to safeguard the pulpit from ill-affected elements among the clergy. When licensing a Sussex combination lecture, Harsnett warned the local ministers 'to bee carefull not to deliver anything in their sermons, either tending to innovacon or to the disturbance of the governement of this Church of England' and appointed one cleric to keep him informed on this score.[142] Harsnett's suspicions were not shared by all of his colleagues. When Jegon of Norwich licensed several combination lectures, he merely expressed the pious hope that 'the worke shalbe to Godes glory' and 'the good example of other places in my diocess.'[143] Harsnett's concern with unregulated preaching became very evident after his translation to Norwich in 1619. The articles of enquiry that he issued at his primary visitation the following year contain a separate section of six questions on diocesan lecturing, a feature without parallel in other Jacobean visitation articles. Do lecturers read public prayers 'without omission of any part thereof', dressed in a surplice, before the sermon? Do any lecturer maintain doctrines contrary to the Articles of Religion? The fifth question

reveals Harsnett's anxiety:[144]

> Whether is any lecturer admitted to preach in your Church, that is not conformable to the discipline and governement eclesiasticall within the Church of England, but schismatically and phantastically affected to novelties and innovations?

In 1622 Harsnett proscribed Sunday morning sermons in city churches in Norwich and reduced the number of stipendiary lecturers throughout the diocese, which led James I to congratulate him 'for suppressing of populare lectures'.[145]

In common with several evangelical bishops, Harsnett also devoted much time to enforcing moral discipline in his dioceses. He kept an eagle eye over his consistory at Chichester, intermittently attempting to stamp out Sabbath-breaking, and was punctilious in denouncing excommunicates in the Cathedral church. In addition, he supervised three thorough visitations of the Chichester chapter, with an energy that surpassed that shown by Andrewes, Abbot or Carleton in similar visitations between 1606 and 1625.[146] Unlike an evangelical such as Lake, Harsnett on occasion sacrificed courtesy and affability to the higher ideals of discipline and order. In December 1611 Harsnett rebuked his own chancellor for presiding in consistory without wearing proper canonical dress, and ordered him to produce his letters of ordination to prove that he was indeed in holy orders.[147] There are hints in the diocesan records that Harsnett shared Andrewes's concern at irreverence in worship. His reformation of Chichester chapter was intended to produce a more orderly and decorous celebration of divine service in the Cathedral, and Harsnett was the only bishop of that see between 1602 and 1636 to survey the fabric and furnishings of parochial churches, as stipulated by canon 86.[148] At his primary visitation at York in 1629, Harsnett ordered the churchwardens to present parishioners who sat through service with their hats on, or who did not respect the communion table 'to the great dishonour of Almighty God and the prophanation of His holy temple'.[149]

Harsnett's vendetta against what he perceived as ill-disciplined groups in the Church was pursued beyond the grave. He was the first post-Reformation bishop to be buried with an effigy depicting him in full episcopal apparel,[150] wearing a mitre and cope, and carrying a crozier, dress which he judged might offend those as much opposed to Roman iconography as to doctrine. His will[151] therefore specified that the brass effigy was to be:

> moulten into the stone an inch thick...[and] to be so riveted and fastened cleane through the stone as sacrilegious handes may not rend of the one w<u>i</u>thoute breakinge the other.

The third member of this Arminian trio, Richard Neile, also displayed a marked antipathy to unregulated preaching, seen most clearly in the unique survey he commissioned of the lectureships in Lincoln diocese at his primary visitation of 1614.[152] Similarly one of the few theological writings that Neile licensed was a court sermon of 1606 that railed against 'the heddy, giddy, precise disciplinarians' who attended services only to hear the preacher, a view echoed in Andrewes's sermons, as noted above.[153] Neile's role in the suppression of the Burton upon Trent exercise only partially accounts for the accusation against him voiced in Parliament in May 1614:[154]

> [He] hath discouraged ministers in his diocese from preaching twice in one day; for that the contrary would hinder their preferment; and hath put down divers lectures.

Although the poor archives of Rochester and Coventry & Lichfield provide no detail to test this allegation, it is supported by the testimony of one Derbyshire minister, who welcomed Neile's successor at Lichfield with the hope that 'we...in these parts may have a more peaceable proceeding in our preaching'.[155] Moreover, it is clear that the beneficiaries of Neile's patronage were not zealous preachers but Arminian divines, such as Laud and Cosin, who formed the Durham House set after 1617. Like Andrewes and Harsnett, Neile was anxious to conduct divine service with greater decorum, and therefore after 1617 moved the altar at Durham Cathedral to the east end of the

chancel and there refurbished its fittings. As Bishop of four sees between 1608 and 1625, Neile proved his flair for administration, rather than for pastoral care, which led to his appointment as the first clerical Lord Lieutenant of Durham Palatine since the days of Cuthbert Tunstall. One of the few examples of his concern for the parochial clergy was Neile's consistent attempts to ease their financial burdens in tenths and muster subsidies.[156]

The government of William Barlow, Bishop of Richester (1605-8) and of Lincoln (1608-13) shows certain affinities with those of Andrewes, Harsnett and Neile. Nothing survives of Barlow's brief spell at Rochester, but at Lincoln he is known to have suppressed or suspended four combination lectures, probably on the grounds of factious and disorderly preaching.[157] Nor was Barlow a friend to puritan nonconformists.[158] His highly partisan account of the Hampton Court conference showed no sympathy for the cause of godly reformation, and carefully concealed the differences between the King and his bench of bishops as well as divisions within the episcopate itself.[159] It will be argued in the next chapter that between 1606 and 1625 nonconformists ceased to be harried in most dioceses. Many bishops seem to have ignored the royal instructions of May 1611 ordering them to proceed against unyielding nonconformists, with the notable exception of Barlow. At his second visitation that autumn, he prosecuted six intransigent nonconformists in the archdeaconries of Lincoln and Stow, all of whom had come close to losing their livings during the subscription campaign of 1604-6. Ultimately, all were allowed to retain their livings, but at least one was saved from deprivation only by the timely intervention of powerful local gentry interests.[160] The other distinguishing mark of Barlow's rule was his concern with the educational standards of the clergy, a problem that exercised both evangelicals such as Lake as well as Arminians such as Andrewes. His visitation articles for Rochester in 1605 asked an unusual question about the clergy's studying habits, which it was suggested should be 'seven houres a day'; and on visitation in

Lincolnshire in 1611 Barlow rebuked a group of clergy who had neglected to study regularly. This concern, however, did not extend to devising any general educational programmes, in contrast to the practice of Abbot and Lake.[161] Other features of Barlow's government cannot be reconstructed, so his identification with the churchmanship of other Arminian prelates must remain tentative.

It has been argued that the attitudes and practice of Andrewes, Harsnett and Neile suggest a style of churchmanship as distinct as that of the evangelical bishops. The evidence of dedicatory epistles supports this contention. Although Andrewes and Neile were occasionally praised for their courtesy to the diocesan clergy, they were never saluted as preaching pastors, rather as powerful and benevolent patrons.[162] As noted elsewhere, these clerical protéges were as often as not sympathetic to Arminian teaching.

Evangelicals and Arminians alike drew on St. Paul's model of the apostolic bishop, and there was broad agreement on features such as the bishop leading by his own example, practising the virtues of sobriety, patience and hospitality, and enforcing moral discipline through the consistory.[163] Where the two differed was on the balance to be struck between the bishop as teacher and as governor, evaluated in the light of the Church's needs. Just as the evangelicals' view was shaped by the proselytising impulse, so their opponents saw nonconformity and neglect of the liturgy as the fruits of this preaching. This latter view had been anticipated by Richard Bancroft at the Hampton Court conference when he answered the puritan demand for more preachers with a defence of the praying function of the ministry. He was silenced by James I's assertion that 'we meane to plante preachers'.[164] The King's support for the evangelical impulse, together with his lenient attitude to moderate nonconformists,[165] ensured that Arminian opinions remained unfashionable for much of his reign, but under Charles I they were to receive a more sympathetic hearing.

+ + + + +

It is less easy to characterise the government of many other Jacobean bishops. Sometimes this is the inevitable consequence of the loss of non-administrative evidence, such as correspondence and private memoirs. Among the casualties is the churchmanship of Bishops Still, Bilson and Goldsborough. The diocesan records for John Still's time at Bath & Wells only reveal that the Bishop presided fairly regularly in consistory and at his local Ecclesiastical Commission.[166] Likewise those for Winchester show that Thomas Bilson rarely led his visitations in person and delegated the running of his consistory, but nevertheless he retained control over office jurisdiction through the authority of the Winchester Ecclesiastical Commission.[167] In six years at Gloucester, his colleague Godfrey Goldsborough ousted the corrupt chancellor and tackled the educational deficiencies of his clergy.[168] On the preaching and ordination practices of these three prelates, the records are silent. Occasionally, the image of the preaching pastor is reflected in one aspect of a bishop's government. Martin Heton of Ely was an exemplary visitor of his clergy, preaching in his turn and accepting their hospitality, but no other source throws much light on his ten years in the diocese.[169]

Some other prelates may have been more happy as administrators than pastors. Dr Hajzyk has argued that William Chaderton, Bishop of Lincoln between 1595 and 1608, was a talented administrator, who made effective use of his court of audience during the drive for conformity of 1604-6, and asserted his control over several diocesan officials. He usually delegated his visitations to commissaries, did not examine ordinands in person and rarely preached in the diocese.[170] He remained a remote and somewhat inscrutable figure to many clergy, to judge from a letter he received from John Jackson, the nonconformist Vicar of Bourne, in the midst of the subscription campaign. Jackson acknowledged Chaderton's 'generall milde dealeing with all my

brethrene', but added that 'what moved your Lordshipp thereunto I cannot conjecture'.[171]

The most formidable administrator in this study of twenty-six bishops was Thomas Ravis, who held the sees of Gloucester and then London between 1605 and his premature death in 1609. Although non-administrative records do not survive for his government of either see, consistory and visitation books portray a prelate of extraordinary energy, who imposed the canons of 1604 in both dioceses with meticulous care and industry. Issues such as nonconformity, clerical learning, non-residence and parochial church fabric and furnishings were all given equal priority.[172] Ravis's performance matches Usher's model of Bancroftian efficiency in the dioceses between 1604 and 1610. In point of fact, in most other dioceses, any administrative revitalisation scarely lasted beyond 1606.[173]

For Bishop John Williams, the problem of inadequate documentation evaporates. His biographer, John Hacket, cast Williams into the mould of the preaching pastor. During his enforced absence from Lincoln diocese between 1621 and 1625, Williams 'did as much as a Bishop could do' to rule effectively from a distance, Hacket claimed. For the period after 1625, Williams was praised for his munificent hospitality, his regular preaching, his vigilance in examining candidates for ordination and his care as a visitor to his clergy.[174] Independent evidence somewhat sullies this picture. A study of dedicatory epistles addressed to Williams between 1621 and 1640 provides little evidence that his clergy saw the Bishop as an active pastor, and he was commended, rather, for his hospitality and his restoration of Buckden manor.[175] Indeed, it was not until 1634 that Williams attended his first visitation of Lincoln, nine years after his arrival in the diocese and thirteen years after his appointment to the see.[176] Other evidence indicates that the Bishop's prime interest lay in the political arena, and he expended much energy after 1625 in trying to secure his political rehabilitation with Charles I.[177]

Other prelates with strong court connections made little discernible impression on their sees, as may be adduced from the rule of Anthony Watson at Chichester or George Montaigne at Lincoln. Watson, for instance, was appointed to Chichester in 1596, but as Royal Almoner resided outside the diocese for many months each year. His first decisive act as Ordinary came as late as 1603, when, in response to puritan criticisms of his administration, he inaugurated a scheme of vocational training for the lesser clergy.[178]

* * * * *

The bishop as preaching pastor dominated both theory and practice in the Jacobean Church. Its pre-eminence reflects in part the strength of evangelical Calvinism, in part the endorsement it received from the Crown. James I's open support for a preaching ministry and his emphasis on unity rather than on uniformity provided the right conditions for this style of churchmanship to mature. The Arminian vision of decorous public worship necessarily determined their view of the episcopal office. The imposition of ceremonial conformity would fall on the shoulders of the episcopate, in their capacity as governors rather than pastors. That their views failed to win unqualified royal support raises the question of the control exercised by James I over the domestic affairs of the English Church, and to this subject we now turn.

Footnotes to Chapter Seven

1. Two Elizabethan Puritan Diaries, by Richard Rogers and Samuel Ward, ed. M.M. Knappen (1933), pp.31-2; Laud, Works, iii. p.159.
2. Tyacke, 'Puritanism, Arminianism, and Counter-Revolution', pp.119-43.
3. Foster, 'The Function of a Bishop: the Career of Richard Neile, 1562-1640' in Continuity and Change, pp.33-54.
4. Collinson, 'Lectures by Combination: Structures and Characteristics of Church Life in 17th-Century England' in Godly People, pp.467-98; idem, The Religion of Protestants, pp.81-91; idem, 'Popular Prelates: Elizabethan and Jacobean Roots of the Low Church Tradition', Friends of Lambeth Palace Library Annual Report (1982), p.18.
5. Featley, Clavis Mystica, pp.122-44.
6. Ibid., pp.131,137,140-2.
7. Ibid., pp.131,142-3.
8. Nicholas Bownd, Sabbatum Veteris et Novi Testamenti (1606), sig.A2v; John Downame, Lectures upon the Foure First Chapters of the Prophecie of Hosea (1608), sig.A4ir.
9. Paule, Life of Whitgift, pp.20-3,59-60,65-6,77,82-4; 'A Short View of the Life and Vertues of the Authour' attached to Lake, Sermons, passim.
10. Two Biographies of William Bedell, Bishop of Kilmore; Barwicke, The Fight, Victory and Triumph of S.Paul; B(addeley), Life of Dr Thomas Morton; BL, Harl.MS 6495 fos.102v-9v.
11. Smith, Sermons, sig. ¶¶ 3r-Qqv; Hacket, Scrinia Reserata; and see below pp.244-5,258.
12. Andrewes, Works, v. pp.294-306; Isaacson, Life and Death of Lancelot Andrewes, pp.32-57.

13. Namely George and Robert Abbot (Canterbury & Salisbury), Andrewes (Chichester, Ely and Winchester), Babington (Worcester), Barlow (Lincoln), Bilson (Winchester), Carleton (Chichester), Chaderton (Lincoln), Felton (Ely), Goldsborough (Gloucester), Harsnett (Chichester, Norwich & York), Heton (Ely), Jegon (Norwich), King (London), Lake (Bath & Wells), Matthew (York), Montaigne (Lincoln), Mountagu (Bath & Wells), Morton (Coventry & Lichfield), Neile (Coventry & Lichfield and Lincoln), Parry (Gloucester), Ravis (Gloucester & London), Smith (Gloucester), Still (Bath & Wells), Watson (Chichester) and Williams (Lincoln).

14. Acts xx. 28; I Tim. iii. 2-5, iv. 12-6, 2 Tim. iv. 2,5.

15. See above p.148; Welsby, George Abbot, pp.67,86,108; PRO, SP 14/143/32.

16. See above pp.167-8.

17. GL, MSS 9537/11-2; BL, Stowe MS 76 fo.245r; and see above pp.183-92.

18. LJRO, B/V/1/37; [Ames], A Reply to Dr Mortons General Defence, sig.Bv; PRO, SP 14/76/52.

19. See above pp.196-201.

20. Downame, A Guide to Godlynesse, sig.A4r; Chetwind, The Strait Gate, sig.¶2r.

21. In 1617 Abbot collated Price to All Hallows the Great, London: GL, MS 9531/14 fo.228v; S.T.C.20328-20334.

22. LPL, MS 1730 fo.8; Thomas Myriell, The Devout Soules Search, with the happie Issue of Comfort found. In a Sermon preached at Paules Crosse. Ian.14 1610 (1610), titlepage; P.S. Seaver, The Puritan Lectureships: the Politics of Religious Dissent 1560-1662 (Stanford, 1970), p.178; Kalu, 'The Jacobean Church and the Essex Puritans', pp.419-31.

23. Thomas Myriell, The Christians Comfort. In a Sermon appointed for the Crosse, but preached in S.Pauls Church on Candlemas Day, 1623 (1623), pp.21,31.

24. GL, MSS 9531/14 fo.188r, 9537/11 fo.76r; Lancelot Langhorne, Mary sitting at Christs Feet. A Sermon preached at the Funerall of Mris Mary Swaine, the wife of Mr William Swaine, at Saint Buttolphs without Aldersgate (1611); S.T.C.15198-15200.

25. GL, MSS 9531/14 fos.177v,183v,190r,204r, 9535/2 fo.181r; Wood, Athenae Oxonienses, iii. p.220; Henry Mason, The New Art of Lying, covered by Iesuites under the Vaile of Equivocation, discovered and disproved (1624), sig.(b)v. See also Mason, The Tribunall of the Conscience: or a Treatise of Examination shewing why and how a Christian should examine his Conscience and take account of his Life (1626), sig.Bv.

26. GL, MSS 9535/2 fos.183r,199r, 9531/14 fos.175v,205v; John Prince, Danmonii Orientales Illustres: or the Worthies of Devon (1810), p.42; LPL, MS 1730 fo.8; BL, Add.MS 39533 fo.124v.

27. Mason, The New Art of Lying, sig.A3i,b(3)iir; LPL, 1730 fo.8; DNB, xxxvi. p.418.

28. See above pp.193-6.

29. Bernard, Two Twinnes, pp.1-23.

30. BL, Stowe MS 76 fo.245r; B(addeley), Life of Dr Thomas Morton, pp.89-90. Morton's biographer also noted that the Bishop catechised his own family week by week. Ibid., pp.75-6.

31. Lake, Sermons, sig.Sr,S2iir, iii. pp.236-8; SRO, D/D/Ca 299 fo.56v; J. Collinson, The History and Antiquities of the County of Somerset, i. (Bath, 1791), B p.66.

32. O'Day, The English Clergy, pp.152-3; B(addeley), Life of Dr Thomas Morton, p.75.

33. See above pp.116-8 and appendix XII.

34. See, for example, WSRO, Ep.IV/4/5 fos.14,45,57; Bodl., Rawl.MS D 818 fo.72r. Abbot and King spent much time trying to control the flow of Roman Catholic priests into the country through London. See BL, Add.MS 4274 fo.60; Bodl., Ashmole MS 826 p.226 and CSPD 1611-1618 (1858), pp.148,178-9,199, 221,227,285,303,315,320-1,458,585,495.

35. Hacket, Scrinia Reserata, i. p.97; see appendix VIII.

36. At Lake's primary visitation of 1617, for example, only seven ministers were presented for nonconformist offences: SRO, D/D/Ca 204 (unfoliated), 206 pp.186-7,211,223,283,309. See also J.M. Potter, 'The Ecclesiastical Courts in the diocese of Canterbury, 1603-1665' (London M.Phil. thesis, 1973), p.125; Kalu, 'The Jacobean Church and Essex Puritans', pp.261-99; LJRO, B/V/1/38, 45, 48.

37. Andrewes, Ely (1610 & 1613), sig.A2v; idem, Winchester (1619), sig.A2v; idem, Winchester (1625), sig.A3v-A3ir; Chaderton, Lincoln (1604), sig. A3iv,BIr; idem, Lincoln (1607), sig.A3ir,BIv; Davenant, Salisbury (1622), sig.A3iv; Dove, Peterborough (Cambridge, 1605), p.1; idem, Peterborough (Cambridge, 1608), sig.A2v; idem, Peterborough (1611), sig.A2v; idem, Peterborough (Cambridge, 1626), sig.A2r; Harsnett, Norwich (1620), sig.A2i; Howson, Oxford (1619), sig.A2r,A2iv; Neile, Lincoln (1614), sig.A2r; idem, Durham (1624), sig.A2iii; Overall, Norwich (1619), pp.2,6; Thornborough, Bristol (Oxford, 1603), p.3; Tounson, Salisbury (1620), pp.2,6.

38. Abbot, Gloucester [1612], sig.A2r-3; idem, Norwich [1618], sig.A2v; King, London (1612 & 1615), sig.A2r-3v; Morton, Chester (1617), sig.A3v-A3ir; idem, Coventry & Lichfield (1620), sig.A2. However, in his visitation articles for Nottingham archdeaconry in 1599-1605, King had specifically asked if the surplice were ever omitted: [King, Nottingham Archdeaconry (Oxford, 1599 & 1605), sig.A3r.] No

visitation articles survive for Lake's time at Bath & Wells.

39. SRO, D/D/Ca 204 (unfoliated: 19 September 1617). My argument conflicts with Roger Morrice's claim that Lake indulged Bernard merely at the request of Bishop James Mountagu (DWL, Morrice MS J p.42). For Bernard's ministry in Somerset, see above pp.194-5.

40. Materials for the Life of Thomas Morton, Bishop of Durham, ed. J.E.B. Mayor (Cambridge Antiquarian Society Communications, iii. 1864), pp.12-3,17; and see below pp.286,290.

41. Bodl., Ashmole MS 1153 fos.54r-8r.

42. PRO, SP 14/67/58, 77/90; HMC, 78 Hastings, ii. p.55.

43. Only three clergy are known to have been deprived for nonconformity by the Ecclesiastical Commission under Abbot's presidency between 1611 and 1625. See below pp.288-90 and appendix VIII.

44. Morton, A Defence of the Innocencie of the Three Ceremonies of the Church of England (1618), sig.A2r.

45. B(addeley), Life of Dr Thomas Morton, p.57.

46. Tyacke, 'Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter-Revolution', p.125; P. Milward, Religious Controversies of the Jacobean Age: a Survey of Printed Sources (1978), pp.24-7.

47. Barwick, The Fight, Victory and Triumph of S.Paul, pp.74,80-1; Materials for the Life of Thomas Morton, p.17.

48. A Transcript of Registers of the Company of Stationers, 1544-1640, ed. E. Arber iii. (1876), p.293; Chamberlain, Letters, ii. p.113; [Ames], A Reply to Dr Mortons Generall Defence, sig.A3v.

49. P. Lake, 'Matthew Hutton - a Puritan Bishop?', History, lxiv. (1979), pp.182-204.

50. Lake, Ten Sermons, pp.1-24; Sclater, A Threefold Preservative, p.29; SRO, D/D/Ca 148 (unfoliated: 20 November 1606), 204 (unfoliated: 19 September 1617).

51. Sclater, A Threefold Preservative, pp.10,24-5,31; idem, A Key to the Key of Scripture: or an Exposition with Notes upon the Epistle to the Romanes, begun at Walsall in Stafford-shire, continued at Pitminster in Somerset (1629), pp.194,205,244; Lake, Sermons, i. pp.167,546, iii. pp.161-76,228,234, iv. pp.138,141. Morton also advocated the use of auricular confession: The Abbe Gaume's Manual for Confessors, ed. E.B. Pusey (1878), p.lxviii.

52. Morton, A Defence, sig.Ar, p.166.

53. Joseph Hall, Noah's Dove, bringing an Olive of Peace to the tossed Ark of Christ's Church (1850), p.16. Hooker had expressed very similar sentiments in the 1590s: Works, iii. I. pp.387-8. This paragraph owes a considerable debt to Professor Collinson's 'Popular Prelates'.

54. Hill, Economic Problems of the Church, pp.40-1.

55. Lake, Sermons, sig. 3ii; B(addeley), Life of Dr Thomas Morton, p.121.

56. Bernard, A Key to Knowledge, sig.A2v-A3r.

57. See above pp.224-5.

58. Bernard, The Faithfull Shepherd, sig.A3v; idem, Christian See to thy Conscience, or a Treatise of the nature, the kinds and manifold differences of Conscience, all very briefly, and yet more fully laid open then hitherto (1631), sig. 2r; idem, A Threefold Treatise of the Sabbath distinctly divided into the Patriarchall, the Mosiacall, and the Christian Sabbath (1641), pp.115-6.

59. Edward Kellet, Miscellanies of Divinitie (Cambridge, 1633), i. p.151.

60. Bodl., MS Eng.th. f. 65. Huish's lectures duly appeared in 1626, without a dedication (S.T.C.13927).

61. GL, MS 9535/2 fo.179v; John Glanville, Articuli Christianae Fidei (Oxford, 1613), sig.A2r.

62. Hull, The Third Worke of Mercy, sig.A4; Thomas Baughe, A Summons to Iudgement: or a Sermon appointed for the Crosse, but delivered

upon occasion in the Cathedrall Church of S.Paul London, the 6 day of Iune 1613 (1614), sig.A3ir; and see above p.149. William Hull was beneficed at Ticehurst, Sussex, between 1605 and 1613, a preferment omitted in Alumni Cantabrigienses, I. ii. p.428. (WSRO, Ep.I/1/8 fos.54v,66r). For King's preaching, see also Samuel Gibson, Ecclesiasticall Benediction. A Sermon of the Power and Prerogative belonging to the publike Ministers to blesse the People. Preached by S.G. at a Visitation at Oundle Ap 14 1619 (1620), pp.31-2.

63. Richard Chambers, Sarahs Sepulture: or a Funerall Sermon, preached for the Right Honourable and Vertuous Lady, Dorothie Countesse of Northumberland, at Petworth in Sussex (1620), p.18.

64. Bodl., MS Top.Oxon c.378 p.228; BL, Stowe MS 76 fo.245r.

65. Hall, Noah's Dove, p.26.

66. Collinson, 'Popular Prelates', pp.11,24.

67. Downame, Consolations for the Afflicted, sig.*3i; idem, A Guide to Godlynesse, sig.A4; Barrell, The Spirituall Architecture, sig.A2i.

68. Corpus Christi College, Oxford, MS 288 fo.109.

69. Bodl., Ballard MS 44 p.233; PRO, Prob.11/137/35.

70. Barwick, The Fight, Victory and Triumph of S.Paul, p.71; B(addeley), Life of Dr Thomas Morton, p.43; HMC, 9 Hatfield House, xv. pp.306-7.

71. Hacket, Scrinia Reserata, ii. p.70; see above pp.30,57-8.

72. Bodl., Tanner MS 141 fo.2r. Alumni Cantabrigienses, I. ii. p.129 incorrectly states that Felton resigned the living of St. Antholin's, Budge Row, in 1595. In fact, he remained rector there until his consecration as Bishop of Bristol in 1617, as the churchwardens' accounts reveal, and he was buried there on 6 October 1626: GL, MS 1046/1, passim.

73. Bodl., Tanner MS 141 fo.2r; PRO, Prob.11/150/134. Brownrig received two livings and a canonry from Felton, and after his death became

chaplain to Thomas Morton: Alumni Cantabrigienses, I. i. p.241; B(addeley), Life of Dr Thomas Morton, pp.76-7.

74. PRO, SP 14/170/58; see also I. Morgan, Prince Charles's Puritan Chaplain (1957), pp.117-24.

75. GL, MS 9531/14 fo.213r; Lake, Sermons, sig.+2iir; PRO, Prob. 11/149/99; Henry King, A Sermon preached at Pauls Crosse, pp.64-6,72. This corrects the statements in DNB, xxi. p.408 that it was Andrewes, and in 'Gesta Britannica' (BL, Stowe MS 76 fo.246r) that it was Buckeridge, who heard Lake's last confession.

76. Collinson, The Religion of Protestants, pp.48-9.

77. Matthew collated Favour to a prebendal stall at York and selected him to be his domestic chaplain: Marchant, Puritans and the Church Courts, pp.246-7.

78. Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, iii. p.195; Marchant, op.cit., p.296; Bernard, Plaine Evidences: the Church of England is Apostolicall, the Seperation Schismaticall. Directed against Mr Ainsworth the Separatist and Mr Smith the Se-Baptist (1610), sig.A2r; idem, The Faithfull Shepheard (1621), sig.A3r.

79. Bernard, Two Twinnes, pp.2,14; Phillips, The Fisher-Man, sig.A3iv; Thomas Ireland, The Oath of Allegeance defended in a Sermon preached at a Synode in the Metropoliticall Church of Yorke (1610), sig.A3v.

80. Marchant, op.cit., pp.38-9,166,240-1,246-7.

81. Thomas Bell, The Catholique Triumph: conteyning a Reply to the pretensed Answere of B.C. (a masked Iesuite) lately published against The Tryall of the New Religion (1610), sig.A3r.

82. Henry Swinburne, Briefe Treatise of Testaments and last Willes (1611), sig.A4iv.

83. John Dove, An Advertisement to the English Seminaries and Iesuites

(1610), sig.A3v; Thomas Ingmethorpe, A Sermon upon the Words of Saint Paul, 'Let everie Soul be subiect unto the Higher Powers' (1619), sig.A3iv. In 1603 Thomas Bell had referred to 'the redolent harmonie of Christian divinitie which continually floweth most pleasantly from his (Matthew's) mouth': The Anatomie of Popish Tyrannie (1603), sig.Ar.

84. Nicholas Gibbens, Questions and Disputations concerning the Holy Scripture; wherein are contained briefe, faithfull and sound Expositions of the most difficult and hardest Places (1601), sig.a2r.

85. John Favour, Antiquitie triumphing over Noveltie (1619), sig.A2v-3r.

86. Alexander Cooke, Pope Joane: A Dialogue betweene a Protestant and a Papist (1610), sig.A3r. Matthew continued to add to his extensive library of over 3000 volumes until the end of his life, annotating many of these books in his own hand: G.E. Aylmer & R. Cant ed. A History of York Minster (Oxford, 1977), p.501.

87. Bodl., MS Eng.poet. e.97 pp.50-3.

88. Other sources attest to Matthew's fine style of preaching: see Clark, 'Dr Plume's Notebook', p.23.

89. Bodl., Rawl.MS D 47 fo.51v.

90. Bodl., Bodley MS 124 p.177.

91. Babington, Workes, sig.A3v,A3iii; idem, 'Comfortable Notes upon the Bookes of Numbers and Deuteronomie' attached to Workes, p.195; and see above pp.150,153.

92. HWRO, 794.011-BA.2513/6 pp.90,437,477,541; J.W. Willis Bund, 'Religious Life in Worcestershire in the Seventeenth Century, shown by the Sessions Records', AASRP, xxiv. (1898), pp.575-80. No liber cleri survives for the period 1597-1610, although one source states that Babington did personally visit Worcester chapter in 1598 and 1607: see above pp.58-9.

93. Robert Abbot, The Exaltation of the Kingdome and Priesthood of Christ. In certaine Sermons upon the 110 Psalme: preached in the Cathedrall Church and City of Worcester in the time of Christmasse: Anno Domini 1596 (1601), sig.A2r,A2ir; S.J., Certaine Godlie and Learned Sermons, sig.¶¶3r-¶¶4iiv.

94. Bodl., Rawl.MS D 47 fos.39v-40r,41v,165r.

95. Fuller, Abel Redevivus, sig.A3v, pp.548-9.

96. Abbot, The Exaltation of the Kingdome, sig.A2r; WRO, Reg. Abbot fos.2r-4r; see Diocese of Salisbury: Guide to the Records of the Bishop, the Archdeacons of Salisbury and Wiltshire and other Archidiaconal and Peculiar Jurisdictions, and to the Records from the Bishop of Bristol's Sub-Registry for Dorset (Bradford-on-Avon, 1973), pp.1-56.

97. DNB, xliii. p.375; and see above pp.148-9.

98. See above pp.108,110,133, fn.91.

99. See above pp.41-2,169,190,194-5.

100. Collinson, The Religion of Protestants, pp.78-9; Bownd, Sabbatum Veteris et Novi Testamenti, sig.A2v.

101. See above p.183.

102. F. Blomefield, An Essay towards a Topographical History of the County of Norfolk, iii. (1806), p.562; Bodl., Tanner MS 228 fos.85v-6r; Two Biographies of William Bedell, Bishop of Kilmore, p.16.

103. NNRO, ORR/1b fos.70v-86v; CUL, Dd 12.43 pp.226-9.

104. Babington, Certaine...Notes upon Everie Chapter of Genesis, sig.A2r-A2iiv; Smith, Sermons, sig.¶¶v.

105. Smith, Sermons, sig.¶ iv,¶¶¶r,pp3iv,Qqr.

106. See above p.151; Smith occasionally held ordination services in the Cathedral after 1617: GDR, 27A pp.452-3,465. See also B. Taylor, 'William Laud, Dean of Gloucester 1616-1621', TBGAS, lxxvii.

(Gloucester, 1959), pp.86-92.

107. See above pp.108,112; GDR, 115 p.543, 120 (unfoliated: 29 September 1613).

108. PRO, SP 14/109/157, 84/90/113.

109. See above pp.58,100-2,110,119-23,196-8; Vicars, The Sword Bearer, p.25. There is only one recorded occasion when Carleton had the opportunity to preach, and he delegated the task to a chaplain: WSRO, Cap.I/12/2 pp.348-9.

110. Bodl., Rawl.MS D 47 fos.59r,194r-209v; and see above pp.224-5.

111. Proceedings in Parliament 1610, i. p.78; Corpus Christi College, Oxford, MS 288 fo.111v.

112. Tyacke, 'Puritanism, Arminianism, and Counter-Revolution', pp.130-2,140; idem, 'Arminianism in England', p.21; Memorials of Affairs of State in the reigns of Queen Elizabeth and King James I. Collected (chiefly) from the original Papers of Sir R.Winwood, ed. E. Sawyer (3 vols., 1725), iii. pp.459-60; Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus, pp.74-5.

113. John Cosin, Works, ed. J. Sansom (5 vols., Oxford, 1843-55), i. pp.85-107.

114. Featley, Clavis Mystica, pp.122-44; Marshe, A Sermon preached at the Consecration of...Richard Senhouse, pp.9,27-8,32; Potter, A Sermon preached at the Consecration of...Barnaby Potter, pp.49-56.

115. Cosin, Works, i. pp.95-7.

116. Laud, Works, vi. I. pp.188,191,193-4.

117. Lake, Sermons, iii. pp.189,237-8; see also his comments on the royal Directions on Preaching in 1622, in SRO, D/D/O ii. (unfoliated: Lake to Wells Dean and Chapter, 30 September 1622.)

118. See above pp.187-92.

119. See above pp.42-3,58.

120. See above pp.198-201.

121. BL, Sloane MS 118 fo.46, Add.MS 39354 fo.87r.

122. See above pp.39-40,199,209 fn.76; Tyacke, 'Arminianism in England', pp.48,62-3, also notes that Andrewes patronised other Arminians, including Richard Thomson and John Richardson. My findings therefore contradict Hacket's claim that in his patronage Andrewes was among 'the great observers of unity': Scrinia Reserata, ii. p.42.

123. See above pp.182-3,200.

124. Andrewes, Works, ix. pp.29-51.

125. Andrewes, Works, i. pp.62,83-4,99-101,151-2,301,427-9, iii. pp.22, 318-21, iv. p.378-82, v. pp.68-9,190-206,331,358-9.

126. Andrewes, Works, ix. pp.48-9.

127. John, xx. 17.

128. Andrewes, Works, i. pp.263-4, iii. pp.33-4, iv. pp.378-82, vi. pp.132-9. See also Bodl., Tanner MS 314 fo.151v.

129. Andrewes, Works, i. pp.285-303.

130. Lake, Sermons, i. pp.450-1, iv. pp.126,129,132; idem, Ten Sermons, p.157.

131. LPL, MS 943 p.97.

132. Andrewes, Ely (1610 & 1613), sig.A2v; idem, Winchester (1619), sig.A2v; idem, Winchester (1625), sig.A3v.

133. Babbage, Puritanism and Richard Babbage, pp.200-3, incorrectly implies that Andrewes deprived three Chichester clergy for nonconformity. In fact, Ringe was deprived for drunkenness, Packe for simony and non-residence; and there is no extant evidence to explain Robinson's removal: WSRO, Ep.I/15/1 Box 128, 1609 folder, fo.17; BL, Stowe MS 424 fo.161v-2r; PRO, CP 40/1181 (Mich.6 Jas.I) m.2651. Andrewes did oust Thomas Hooker from Esher curacy in c. 1622-5, presumably for nonconformity, but this was on the express instructions of James I: HRO, B/I/A/29 (unfoliated: 6 June 1622); PRO,

SP 16/151/12; and see below p.290. Welsby's claim that Andrewes 'carried on an unrelating pressure against Puritan practices in Winchester diocese' is contradicted by the low volume of presentments for these offences as well as the mild punishment handed out by the consistory: Welsby, Lancelot Andrewes, p.117; HRO, C 92, 94, 96.

134. See above pp.40,71,176-7.

123. Many sources support this interpretation of Andrewes's character. In 1608, Andrewes was unwilling to write against Bellarmine; in 1618 he tried to avoid a debate with Pierre du Moulin on the origins of the episcopate by suggesting that there was enough common ground between them to make a discussion superfluous, and he also admitted he was addicted to peace 'both by nature and choice'. Other correspondence shows that Andrewes regarded du Moulin as a polemicist, ready to provoke trouble by propounding novel doctrines. The eminent Hebraist Hugh Broughton failed to draw Andrewes into an argument on Christ's descent into Hell, and he commented in despair, 'to Dr Andrewes seven times I wrote to try whether he could resist one word. Still he is silent'. Silence was also the dominant characteristic of Andrewes's role at the Hampton Court conference in 1604, on the commission for the Essex divorce case in 1613, and on the Privy Council after his appointment in 1616: PRO, SP 14/37/25; Bodl., Tanner MS 290 fo.57; Andrewes, Works, v. p.300, ix. pp.179,188, xi. pp.lii-v; HMC, 9 Hatfield House, xvi. p.344; Barlow, Summe and Substance, p.69; State Trials, ii. pp.806-7; Lloyd, State-Worthies, p.1024. See also Harington, A Briefe View, p.146.

136. See below pp.295-7.

137. Andrewes, Works, ix. p.48.

138. Three Sermons preached by the reverend and learned Dr Richard

Stuart...to which is added a Fourth Sermon, preached by the right reverend father in God, Samuel Harsnett, Lord Arch-Bishop of York (1656), pp.121-61; PRO, SP 105/95/9v.

139. Harsnett, A Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures, sig.Air, pp.10,15,29; and S.T.C.12883. See also the description of Harsnett as 'so potent, crafty and violent an adversary' by Matthew Wren during the struggle to remove the Bishop from the Mastership of Pembroke Hall in 1616: BL, Harl.MS 7048 p.153.

140. See above pp.150-1,196.

141. HMC, 45 Buccleuch, iii. p.338.

142. WSRO, Ep.I/51/3 fo.92r.

143. Harison, Registrum Vagum, i. pp.96-103. Jegon did inquire at Fakenham whether there was 'any iust exception' to a combination lecture, and was reassured that there were no local preachers 'of any adverse spirit to the established government'.

144. Harsnett, Norwich (1620), sig.Aiiv-Br.

145. Collinson, Godly People, p.489; J.T. Evans, Seventeenth Century Norwich: Politics, Religion and Government 1620-1690 (Oxford, 1979), p.86; BL, Harl.MS 159 fo.136v. For further discussion of this episode, see below pp.295-7.

146. See above pp.73-8,118-9.

147. WSRO, Ep.I/17/13 fo.202v; Lake, Sermons, sig.S2iiv.

148. Harsnett's survey took place during his primary visitation of 1610: WSRO, Ep.I/26/1, I/17/13 fos.86r-115r; Fletcher, Sussex 1600-1660, p.85.

149. PRO, SP 16/154/94; Harsnett, York (1629), p.13.

150. I owe this point to Professor Collinson. See A. Hills, 'Samuel Harsnett (1561-1631)', Essex Review, li. (Colchester, 1942), pp.9-10.

151. PRO, Prob.11/160/78.

152. Collinson, Godly People, pp.489-90; and see below pp.294-5. For much of this paragraph, I am indebted to the work of Dr Andrew Foster.

153. Foster, 'Archbishop Richard Neile', pp.35-6; Richard Meredeth, Two Sermons preached before his Maiestie in his Chappell at Whitehall, the one, the xi of Februarie, the other the xxv of the same month (1606), pp.40-4; and see above pp.249-50.

154. Foster, 'Archbishop Richard Neile', p.74. This accusation may be taken to refer to Neile's time at Rochester and Coventry & Lichfield, since he was translated to Lincoln in February 1614 and did not visit the see until the following August: Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, ii. p.25.

155. Edward Vaughan, A plaine and perfect Method for the easie Understanding of the whole Bible (1617), sig.A4r.

156. Foster, 'Archbishop Richard Neile', pp.57,95,172,209-20,230.

157. Namely at Aylesbury, Huntingdon, Leicester and Sleaford: Primary Visitation...of Bishop Neile', p.44. See also Collinson, Godly People, pp. 483,557 fn.77.

158. One notable exception to this statement is Barlow's indulgence to the nonconformist Arthur Hildersham, his fellow collegian and friend ('in truth I love him', declared Barlow). See below pp.291-2.

159. Collinson, 'The Jacobean Religious Settlement', pp.29-51.

160. LAO, Add.Reg.I fos.225r-6r, LC/III fos.1r,2r,35r,71r,79v,98v; DWL, Morrice MS I p.697(10).

161. Barlow, Rochester (1605), sig.A3v; Richardson, A Workeman, p.29.

162. Francis White, The Orthodox Faith and Way to the Church Explained and Iustified (1617), sig.**2v; William Guild, Moses Unvailed (1620), sig.A4iiir; Thomas Jackson, Christs Answer unto Iohns Question: or, an Introduction to the Knowledge of Iesus Christ and him Crucified (1625), sig.A3.

163. See, for example, Andrewes, Works, ix. p.39; Lake, Sermons, sig.ϽϽ3iir-

S2v.

164. Usher, Reconstruction, ii. pp.346-7.

165. See below Chapter Eight.

166. SRO, D/D/Ca 100-1, 104, 112, 133-4, 146.

167. See above pp.57-8,108,110-1, and below pp.281-2.

168. See above pp.102,184-5.

169. See above p.72.

170. Hajzyk, 'The Church in Lincolnshire', pp.7-60; and see above p.58.

171. Hajzyk, op.cit., p.56.

172. See above pp.68-70,108-10,184, and below pp.282-3.

173. Usher, Reconstruction, ii. pp.20-49; Fincham, 'Ramifications of the Hampton Court Conference', passim.

174. Hacket, Scrinia Reserata, i. p.86, ii. pp.31-61.

175. Caleb Dalechamp, Christian Hospitalitie, handled common-place-wise in the Chappel of Trinity Colledge in Cambridge (Cambridge, 1632), sig.A3v; Anthony Cade, A Sermon necessary for these Times (Cambridge, 1636), sig.¶ 2r-3r.

176. Laud, Works, v. II. p.333.

177. Thomas, 'Archbishop John Williams', pp.5,206,222.

178. See above pp.30,48 fn.23,98,182. For Montaigne, see Hajzyk, 'The Church in Lincolnshire', pp.97-8 and Kalu, 'The Jacobean Church and Essex Puritans', pp.300-21.

Chapter Eight

The Supreme Governor, the Episcopate and Jacobean Nonconformity

At the funeral of James I at Westminster Abbey on 7 May 1625, the Dean, John Williams, claimed that his late sovereign 'of all Christian Kings that ever I read of, was the most constant patron of churches and church-men', citing as evidence the King's care of doctrine, discipline and endowments. It seems unlikely that James I would have dissented from Williams's view. Years earlier, the King had scribbled in the margin of a presbyterian pamphlet that 'my care for the Lordis spirituall kingdome is so well knowin, both at hoame and abroade, as well by my dailie actions as by my printed bookes'.[1] James' voluminous writings are certainly a familar monument to his abiding interest in ecclesiastical politics,[2] but his 'dailie actions' as supreme governor of the English Church are relatively obscure. This chapter seeks to redress the balance. Together with Dr Peter Lake, I have argued elsewhere that James I was dedicated to the principle of peace and unity within the national church, which was jeopardised by puritan nonconformity and catholic recusancy. Towards both groups the King adopted the policy of detaching 'moderate' opinion from a 'radical' core who would then suffer the full legal penalties. For puritan nonconformists, the Crown's concessions at the Hampton Court conference were intended to woo 'moderate' puritans away from a 'radical' minority who defied royal authority over ceremonial conformity, a strategy which several prelates were happy to follow. In short, the treatment of nonconformists owed as much to official policy as to the sympathies of the local bishop, and it resulted in a settled and stable Church in the dioceses.[3] The purpose of this chapter is to conduct a more thorough and rigorous investigation of royal control over episcopal government in the dioceses, with particular reference to clerical nonconformity. It is suggested that the King

kept a supervisory eye on diocesan affairs, so that throughout his reign official policy on nonconformity was observed in the dioceses. Moreover, in view of James' effective control over recruitment to the episcopate, it may be no accident that his desire to accommodate moderate nonconformists and his professed support for the preaching ministry coincided with the personal preferences of many Calvinist bishops. Although Arminians were promoted to the episcopal bench alongside Calvinists, their stated antipathy to occasional conformity and to excessive evangelism was, in practice, largely restrained by the King. For these reasons, it is proposed that the stability of the Jacobean Church owed something to the views and actions of its supreme governor, James I. The notion that James kept a close control over the domestic affairs of the Church of England undermines, therefore, the traditional emphasis on the contrasting churchmanship of Archbishops Bancroft and Abbot as the key to understanding the period.

\+ + + + +

James I's most celebrated action as supreme governor of the Church of England was to stage the Hampton Court conference in January 1604, yet his interest did not evaporate once the meeting had ended. Dr Quintrell has demonstrated that the King, rather than Archbishop Bancroft, directed the drive for conformity in the winter of 1604-5, an argument which can be usefully extrapolated well beyond this date.[4] James' belief that the peace and prosperity of the Church depended heavily on the episcopate[5] took practical shape in the series of instructions and requests for information that he regularly despatched to his bishops throughout the reign. Sometimes these concentrated on a single problem, such as the detection of recusants in 1605, Sabbath recreations in 1618, the observance of correct titles in prayers for the King and bishops in 1619 or the supervision of diocesan preaching in 1622.[6] On

other occasions, as in 1610 and 1611, they covered a number of related topics. In July 1610, in response to grievances presented by the House of Commons, James issued a circular of thirteen points to the episcopate, on the supervision of pluralist clergy, the provision of preaching curates, the suppression of recusancy, and clerical outdoor attire. More instructions followed a mere ten months later. They began with the request for a certificate to show what had been achieved under the orders of 1610, and went on to stipulate the appropriate punishment for recusants, nonconformists and scandalous laity.[7] Individual bishops also received specific orders. James I's zest for statistical information on pluralities and impropriations may be adduced from royal circulars of 1605 and 1610,[8] and the same interest must have prompted the survey that he commissioned of the wealth of one thousand parishes in Norwich diocese in 1612, although it is unclear to what use he put this acculumated evidence.[9] James' general oversight of the domestic affairs of the Church was matched by a particular concern with the problem of conformity.

In the preface to the King's Works of 1616, Bishop James Mountagu noted that James I had settled the internal disputes of the Church at the Hampton Court conference with such success that 'the harmony hath bene the better ever since'.[10] Royal strategy on nonconformity centred on a fundamental division between 'moderate' and 'radical' puritans. To James, moderates were divines who might have misgivings about certain ceremonies yet who remained discreet and obedient, in contrast to those radical spirits whose scruples led them to challenge the Crown's authority to impose ceremonial conformity. He expressed respect for the former as 'learned and grave men', but the latter he denounced as 'seditiouse schismatikes'. The concessions granted at Hampton Court were intended to entice moderate puritans to remain within the national church, while their radical brethren would be identified and ejected by the imposition of conformity in 1604-5.[11]

Royal policy on conformity was brought into the dioceses by Archbishop Bancroft's letter of 22 December 1604, which advised the bishops how to proceed with the deprivation of nonconformist ministers. Bancroft followed James' distinction between moderates and radicals with his suggestion that bishops should not hesitate to oust those clergy who refused either to conform or to subscribe, but they should spare any minister who might, in time, be won round to subscription.[12] Dr Babbage has calculated that the enforcement of conformity and subscription resulted in the deprivation of some eighty to ninety beneficed ministers.[13] His conclusion is right, but for the wrong reasons. Babbage's estimate includes many clergy who were removed for misconduct, not nonconformity,[14] but it omits an equal number deprived during the subscription campaign, so that the net result is much the same.[15] Several bishops seem to have followed Bancroft's advice in carrying through these deprivations. Throughout 1605 and 1606, private discussions were held with nonconformist ministers who had retained their livings by their willingness to confer on the ceremonies. Ravis of Gloucester, for example, suspended the curate of Forthampton in his primary visitation of October 1605 for failing to conform and subscribe. After conferring with Ravis, the minister eventually subscribed in August 1606 and was restored to his cure.[16] Similar episodes are recorded in Bath & Wells, Ely, Lincoln, Norwich and Peterborough dioceses, and in many cases the clergy did agree to subscribe, although Babbage has shown that several ministers escaped without subscribing in the godly diocese of Lincoln.[17]

The discretion left to bishops to judge which clergy were, and which were not, incorrigible nonconformists may have been used to minimise the number of deprivations, for prelates such as Hutton and Rudd had openly questioned the expediency of imposing full conformity, a polemical point which puritan pamphleteers did not fail to exploit.[18] Indeed, a full explanation of the pattern of deprivations needs to take stock not merely of

James' stated policy and his physical proximity to a number of consistories in the winter of 1604-5,[19] but also of the strength of nonconformity in each diocese, the sympathies of the local bishop and the theological standpoint of the deprived ministers themselves. Certain 'radical' nonconformists survived the purge of 1604-5, as the example of Samuel Hieron illustrates. Hieron was one of the organisers of the Millenary Petition of 1603 in the west country, and temporarily lost his living at the hands of Bishop Cotton of Exeter in 1605. He was restored to his benefice almost immediately by the mediation of 'his potent friends' and proceeded to write a series of anonymous tracts against the ceremonies, while enjoying the protection of William, Earl of Pembroke.[20] On balance, though, royal policy may have been modified by local circumstances, but it was never eclipsed. Among the clergy ousted in 1604-5 were many 'radicals' that James wished to exclude from his newly settled church on account of their public defiance of his authority to settle matters of polity and ceremony, and also because of their entrenched commitment to further reform: ministers such as Arthur Hildersham or John Burgess, with whom the King had crossed swords in 1604,[21] or the ten ejected clergy of Chichester diocese, each of whom had also been implicated in the 'seditious and dangerous' petitioning campaign in the autumn of 1603.[22]

The prominent lead that the Crown had given to the episcopate during the subscription campaign was not sustained once the deprivations had ended. The King, however, always remained faithful to the broad principles of his policy on nonconformity. In 1607 he publicly defended the decisions on subscription and conformity reached at Hampton Court, and in 1611 instructed the bishops to win over 'anie unconformable ministers that disturbe the peace of the Church' or else remove them 'and that with convenient speede'. However, James implied elsewhere that he would be lenient towards those moderate nonconformists who were willing to confer on the ceremonies.[23] His expectation was that the episcopate would uphold this strategy in the dioceses,

but he left open the practical form this should take. The solution favoured by his bishops was to enforce subscription to the three Articles of 1583, while playing down minor infringements of the canons. The history of diocesan nonconformity after 1606 is the subject to which we now turn.

+ + + + +

Dr Babbage's assumption that nonconformists were harried by the episcopate until Bancroft's death in November 1610 is supported neither by the volume of presentments nor by the treatment of nonconformists. On both accounts, 1605-6, and not 1610, was the turning-point. The high number of presentments against nonconformists during the summer of 1605 rapidly dropped off after 1606 and remained low throughout the rest of the reign. In Chichester diocese Bishop Watson had removed ten ministers from their livings in April 1605, and a further thirteen were presented for nonconformist offences during the metropolitical visitation of the diocese that summer.[24] This large number was not matched again. Between 1607 and 1609 only six ministers were reported for nonconformity, and during the twenty years after 1609 there was an average of one presentment for nonconformity each year. Indeed, in Lewes archdeaconry, only two nonconformist ministers were detected between 1609 and 1628.[25] The same pattern may be traced in the consistory records for Bath & Wells. Bancroft's metropolitical visitation of 1605 revealed eleven cases of nonconformity, but even this small number was not maintained.[26] Only three nonconformists were presented at James Mountagu's first visitation of 1609, five at his second visitation of 1612, and seven at Arthur Lake's primary visitation in 1617, in a diocese of some four hundred parishes.[27] Bishop Bilson of Winchester had deprived three ministers for nonconformity in 1605, but his attention soon shifted to the problem of combatting catholic recusancy. In 1606-8 his local Ecclesiastical Commission

heard only two cases against nonconformists and at Bancroft's metropolitical visitation of Winchester archdeaconry in 1607, three out of 659 presentments concerned clerical nonconformity. The detection of nonconformity remained consistently low after 1616, under Bilson's successors.[28] The court books for Ely,[29] Gloucester,[30] Lincoln,[31] and Peterborough[32] dioceses tell a very similar story.

Slack detection of nonconformists was followed by lenient correction. Only a handful of nonconformists exposed in the subscription campaign of 1604-5 were still being pursued after 1606. An exasperated Bilson of Winchester finally suspended George Widley from his lectureship at Portsmouth in 1607, while Bancroft's commissary Samuel Harsnett prosecuted Paul Baynes for non-subscription during the metropolitical visitation of Ely diocese in 1608.[33] Elsewhere, whenever nonconformist ministers were cited before their consistories after 1606, they were habitually warned to observe the Book of Common Prayer and then were dismissed.[34] No beneficed minister lost his living for nonconformity in the dioceses of Bath & Wells, Chichester, Ely and Winchester between 1606 and 1625.[35] The incomplete records of the Ecclesiastical Commission in London suggest that the experience of these sees was representative of the wider church. Only three of the fourteen ministers deprived of their benefices between 1609 and 1624 were ousted for nonconformity.[36] Similarly, Ronald Marchant's work on York diocese during Matthew's long archiepiscopate indicates official lenience to nonconformists throughout the period 1606 to 1628.[37] London and Lincoln dioceses provide two exceptions to this general picture of quiescence after 1606.

London was the only diocese in which the deprivation of nonconformist clergy continued well beyond 1606, which may be explained by the contrasting rule of Bishops Vaughan and Ravis. Richard Vaughan, Bishop of London 1604-7, found the imposition of conformity to be an uncongenial task and he

deprived no more than four intransigent clergy. Vaughan's mild government won praise from a local puritan, who noted that the Bishop 'permitted the godly ministers to live peaceably and enjoy their liberty'.[38] His successor, Thomas Ravis, was an energetic disciplinarian who had reduced the Gloucestershire ministry to conformity after a vigorous visitation in 1605,[39] and it may well have been these abilities that won him the see of London on Vaughan's death in 1607. Ravis' primary visitation identified the nonconformist clergy in the diocese and he referred the more obstinate of them to the Ecclesiastical Commission. By the spring of 1609, five nonconformist lecturers had been suspended and a further four beneficed clergy had lost their livings. This campaign ended on Ravis' premature death in December 1609 and was not revived until after the advent of Bishop Laud in 1628.[40]

In 1611, during his second visitation of Lincoln diocese, Bishop William Barlow prosecuted six veteran nonconformists, one of whom was threatened with deprivation. Several reasons account for this action. Barlow's predecessor Chaderton had spared all six ministers during the subscription campaign of 1604-6 in the hope that they would eventually conform or subscribe. Long after 1606 these ministers continued to resist ceremonial conformity, so that their behaviour precisely matched the image of the intransigent nonconformist condemned in the royal orders of May 1611. In enforcing conformity on these six clergy, Barlow was observing James' instructions to the letter, but his action also reflected his own private disapproval of puritan nonconformity.[41] After Barlow's death in 1613, nonconformists in the diocese enjoyed peace for the remainder of the reign. Although Bishop Neile conducted a survey of nonconformist preachers at his primary visitation in 1614, no lecturers were suspended nor exercises suppressed.[42]

The issue of ceremonial conformity rarely surfaced in visitations in other

dioceses after 1606. To be sure, enquiries about nonconformity were a standard feature of all visitation articles of the time, but the episcopate invariably concentrated on other issues in the charges[43] they delivered to the churchwardens. At Gloucester in 1610, Bishop Parry implemented the royal instructions drawn up that July, while the theme of Andrewes's visitation of Winchester in 1619 was the proper furnishing of parochial communion tables.[44] Thus the warning given to the ministers of London diocese in 1615 to observe the ceremonies of the Church was most unusual, and in the event it did not prompt a large number of presentments for nonconformity.[45] Similarly, very few visitation sermons did more than touch on the question of clerical nonconformity. One exception was the sermon at Cirencester during the visitation of Gloucester in 1616 when the local minister 'did preach a most notable sermon for conformitie', according to the registrar.[46] The only prolonged printed attack on nonconformist practices from the visitation pulpit was preached at an archidiaconal visitation at Boston in 1619 by Robert Sanderson, who castigated the ceremonial irregularities permitted by the local incumbent, John Cotton. Sanderson took the orthodox line that ceremonies should be performed as matters indifferent and added that the ministers silenced in 1605 suffered not for their refusal to conform but for their contempt of authority.[47] Elsewhere, the perennial targets of visitation preachers were scandalous and insufficient clergy or the pastoral problems of leading a refractory flock.[48] In short, in most dioceses after 1606 presentments for nonconformity were scarce, and deprivation of nonconformist clergy was still more rare. This did not imply, however, that the episcopate ceased to address the problem of nonconformity.

Subscription was the device chosen by the episcopate to check flagrant nonconformity. Canons 36 and 37 of 1604 stipulated that all candidates for the diaconate and priesthood and all clergy receiving institution, collation or licences to preach or serve cures were to subscribe 'willing and ex animo' to

the three Articles of 1583. The first acknowledged the King's supremacy in matters temporal and spiritual, the second and third, the scriptural authority for the Book of Common Prayer, the three degrees of the ministry and the Articles of Religion in 1562. The vigorous enforcement of subscription by the episcopate continued long after the deprivation of nonconformists had ended in 1605-6. A small number of episcopal registers record the subscription of ministers seeking institution to livings, as at Canterbury, Lincoln, Norwich and Worcester.[49] The prime source, however, is the subscription books which survive for seventeen bishops in nine dioceses between 1603 and 1625.[50] They show that subscription to all three Articles was demanded throughout James I's reign by all shades of episcopal opinion, whether Evangelical or Arminian. Limited subscription was available from diocesan officials in only one or two sees, without the knowledge of the local bishop. While Richard Neile was exacting full subscription from Lincolnshire clergy who had come to London to be instituted at his hands, his officials at Lincoln were permitting local curates to evade subscription to the third clause of the second Article, which demanded that the public liturgy be observed in all its detail.[51] Such partial subscription respected the scruples of clergy who regarded certain ceremonies as offensive. Curates in East Sussex enjoyed a similar liberty throughout the period 1604 to 1641 from the semi-autonomous consistory at Lewes. The earliest subscription book for Chichester archdeaconry, under the direct eye of the bishop, only dates from 1635, and records that full subsciption was demanded from every clergyman.[52] John Overall of Coventry & Lichfield is the only Jacobean bishop known to have permitted this limited subsciption, which he allowed on two occasions in 1617.[53]

Moreover, there is little evidence to support Sir Benjamin Rudyard's suggestion in the Parliament of 1625 that 'moderate' bishops eased the rigours of full subscription.[54] Literary and archival sources indicate that only in very exceptional circumstances was the requirement to subscribe disregarded.

According to his son, the nonconformist John Carter was instituted to Belstead rectory by Bishop Jegon of Norwich without having to subscribe, a claim which is contradicted by the entry in Jegon's register of institutions. It is quite possible that Carter was in fact required to subscribe, since two years previously Jegon had turned away another nonconformist who had refused subscription.[55] Similarly, literary evidence that Morton of Coventry & Lichfield allowed John Shaw to evade subscription is also contradicted by documentary evidence from the diocesan subscription book.[56] Samuel Clarke relates that Bishop Harsnett waived subscription at the institution of Samuel Fairclough to Barnardiston rectory in 1623 on the presentation of Sir Nathaniel Barnardiston. The Bishop's register is missing for that year, although it is striking that the surviving portions of the register clearly specify that all ministers receiving institution first subscribed to 'omnia et singula' of the three Articles.[57] A fourth example concerns Bishop Lewes Bayley of Bangor. In the course of a spirited defence of his government of Bangor in 1630, Bayley denied that ordinands had escaped without subscription. He did concede, however, that three or four ministers, residing outside the diocese, had recently evaded subscription through the negligence of his chaplains 'which I never knew of till now'. Bayley promised to be more vigilant in future. The Bishop's testimony is suspect, however, for another source relates that the Bishop ordained the nonconformist John Angier in 1628 without demanding subscription, through the influence of John Cotton of Boston.[58] The sole undisputed example of a bishop waiving subscription occurred in 1615, at the collation of Alexander Cooke to Leeds vicarage by Archbishop Tobie Matthew. Dr Marchant adds that such leniency by Matthew was 'very rare'.[59] When weighed against the evidence contained in the subscription books, these scattered episodes do not really substantiate Rudyard's claim.

It is not easy, however, to assess the regularity with which bishops refused ordination, institution or licences to clergy who were unwilling to

subscribe. In part, this was because the registrar had no legal obligation to note down such proceedings, so that only isolated examples survive. Thus Cotton of Exeter, Chaderton of Lincoln and Jegon of Norwich are all recorded as having turned away non-subscribing ordinands and ministers.[60] It may also be true that comparatively few refused to subscribe. One strong inducement for any nonconformist to subscribe was the knowledge that after his subscription, the local consistory would demand only occasional conformity. The price of subscription was necessarily reduced by the slack surveillance of nonconformity in the dioceses after 1606. Nevertheless, subscription was the hurdle that the ejected clergy of 1605-6 had to face before their readmission to the ministry, and limited evidence suggests that some did eventually swear the oaths in order to be restored to a cure. John Burgess is the best known of these prodigal sons, but he was not alone. Another was John Cowper of Gloucester diocese, who eventually subscribed seven years after his deprivation and was immediately restored to his pastoral function.[61]

\+ + + + +

It has been contended that nonconformity after 1606 was regulated by the enforcement of subscription rather than of ceremonial conformity. It was a strategy that mirrored the King's own thinking. Every clergyman was obliged to accept the structural framework of the Church which James I had fashioned at Hampton Court: a Church governed by the supreme governor and his adjutants, the episcopate, whose discipline and liturgy were sanctioned by royal authority. The requirement to subscribe excluded both presbyterians and rigid nonconformists who disputed the Crown's decisions on hierarchy and ceremony. Clergy who did subscribe were left to practise occasional conformity and, provided their conduct was unobtrusive, it was not interpreted as being contemptuous of ecclesiastical authority. James' stated respect for

'the learned and grave' puritans who disliked certain ceremonies was here incorporated into the government of his dioceses. Symbolic of the Jacobean religious polity was the career of Richard Bernard, who was deprived for nonconformity in 1605 and restored to his vicarage of Worksop after subscribing in 1608. Befriended by Archbishop Matthew, and indulged by Bishops Mountagu and Lake, Bernard wrote a score of edifying tracts and became a pillar of the godly clergy in eastern Somerset.[62]

If the Crown never urged the whole episcopate to impose complete ceremonial conformity on clergy who had subscribed to the three Articles, neither did it explicitly sanction limited conformity. In his later writings, James berated the godly for their refusal to kneel at the communion and their omission of the set prayers of the Church; and just before his journey to Scotland in 1617, he told Bishop Overall of Coventry & Lichfield that 'he would see Coventrie in his returne and make ye puritans receave ye comunion upon their knees'.[63] The King may have preferred liturgical uniformity, but his desire for unity was the greater. When John Cotton of Boston was reported to him in 1621 for failing to kneel at the communion, the King was persuaded that he might conform to the ceremony in time and referred Cotton to the care of Bishop Williams. Four years later, Cotton was writing to Williams that through conference, study and prayer, he was beginning to see 'the weaknesse of some of those groundes against kneelinge, which before seemed too stronge for me to dissolve'.[64] In short, the logic of the King's belief in unity implied a measure of tolerance towards minor cases of nonconformity.

One indication that royal policy was heeded by the episcopate is the fact that those clergy who lost their livings after 1606 matched the King's image of the radical nonconformist. None of the three nonconformist ministers deprived by the Ecclesiastical Commission between 1606 and 1625 displayed the discretion and obedience that James I valued so highly. Each chose, instead, to ignore repeated canonical warnings to conform. One was John

Newton, curate of Stock in Essex, who was presented at an episcopal visitation in 1615 for ridiculing ceremonies such as holy day observance in his weekly sermons. In February 1623 the Commission deprived him of his cure and degraded him from the ministry for his contempt of the public liturgy of the Church.[65] John Eaton, incumbent of Wickham Market, Suffolk, was removed for doctrinal nonconformity in 1619. Eaton had been suspended by his local consistory in 1614 for a synodal sermon in which he claimed that the regenerate were not stained by sin and remained 'perfectly holy in the sight of God'. Eaton continued to maintain this doctrine in his parish pulpit and was eventually prosecuted by the Commission ex officio mero.[66]

Another dogged nonconformist who could not be happily accommodated within the Jacobean Church was Anthony Lapthorne. His biographer was not exaggerating when he wrote that Lapthorne 'had that hard portion from ye bishops to be ejected for his inconformity out of one half of ye diocesses of England'. Lapthorne's travels began in 1605, when he lost a royal chaplaincy and his benefice at Landrake in Exeter diocese for nonconformity, and he moved across the county border to North Petherton in Somerset, where his brother-in-law lived. There, he was presented in 1606 for preaching in the parish church without licence and was promptly inhibited from exercising any ministerial function in Bath & Wells diocese.[67] Lapthorne was not to be silenced so easily. In the summer of 1608, on his first visit to Bath & Wells, Bishop Mountagu wrote to Bancroft to inform him that the diocesan clergy were conformable 'for of 450 I can not learne but thy have every one subscribed'. He added, however, that he had already admonished Lapthorne 'and if he doe not mend his manners (which I fear he can not) I will ridd the country of him'. Lapthorne was before the consistory at Taunton the following year for receiving communion in another parish, a contravention of canon 28, and Mountagu seems to have had him removed from the diocese for after 1609 Lapthorne disappears from the Bath & Wells court books.[68] In 1613 he was

instituted to Minchinhampton rectory in Gloucester diocese, having presumably taken the oaths of subscription. At the same time he was before the Ecclesiastical Commission for nonconformity, and in 1618 he was deprived of the rectory and degraded from the priesthood for his intransigent behaviour.[69] Despite this sentence, Lapthorne resumed his peregrinations of the dioceses of England. He next became a lecturer at Lewes in Sussex, until his suspension by Bishop Carleton in May 1623 for contentious preaching in contempt of the royal Directions on Preaching of 1622. Lapthorne then moved on to Coventry & Lichfield, where, once he had been 'reduced...to conformity', he was found a parochial cure by Bishop Morton.[70] Lapthorne's constant conflict with authority was primarily the result of his nonconformity, but it was compounded by his aggressive and truculent character. Morton wrote later that he could never forget the occasion 'when hee, being suspended by me in Litchfeild diocess, did threaten me to my face to bee even with me att Parliament'.[71]

One other minister to be silenced was Thomas Hooker, curate at Esher, Surrey, who was suspended in about 1622-5 on the express instructions of James I. Doubtless his offence was the same brand of fiery preaching that characterised his ministry at Chelmsford after 1626.[72] Thus archival evidence supports the claims of Thomas Morton, made in the course of his published defence of the ceremonies in 1618, that no one was deprived for minor infringements of the liturgy. Morton challenged his nonconformist audience to name a single minister:[73]

> that hath beene so grievously punished for the bare omission of a rite, without his persisting opinionatively, refractarily, and that publickly, in flat contradiction against the Church.

Morton's tract was aimed not at the moderate nonconformist, but at a group of Cheshire ministers who refused subscription. This gesture of defiance, Morton wrote, brought scandal to the Church, encouraged the growth of separatism

and popery and stood in contempt of divinely-ordained authority.[74] It was an argument that echoed James I's own public pronouncements on the evil consequences of disobedience in the Church. In Parliament in 1607, the King had warned against 'a confusion to the quhole state of the Church' if discipline were not observed.[75] Published in the same year was John Sprint's Cassander Anglicanus, a pamphlet also addressed to rigid nonconformists. The author urged conformity in preference to deprivation on the grounds of expediency, a line which he hoped would entice back into the ministry those silenced for nonconformity and non-subscription, as well as encourage others to swallow their scruples and take holy orders.[76] Sprint was an informed writer for he himself had narrowly escaped deprivation in 1605 and had later been indicted at the Gloucester quarter sessions for nonconformity.[77] How persuasive Sprint's work was remains unclear, although it cut little ice with one neighbouring minister, Anthony Lapthorne, who was deprived a matter of weeks after the book was published.

One major reason why royal policy on nonconformity could not be safely ignored by the episcopate was that their diocesan rule continued to be monitored by an active and informed supreme governor. Several bishops found themselves checked for attempting either to soften or toughen the strategy laid down by the King. On the one hand, prelates such as Barlow, Dove and Morton were all sharply reprimanded for disregarding the King's implacable hostility to intransigent nonconformists. In his instructions of May 1611, James had reminded the bishops to prosecute incorrigible nonconformists and therefore he was 'much offended' that autumn to learn that Arthur Hildersham had been licensed to preach by Barlow of Lincoln in 1608 and still retained his licence. Barlow was rebuked for his indulgence, which was ironical in view of the fact that he, almost alone among the bishops, had already followed the King's instructions and proceeded against unyielding nonconformists.[78] Hildersham himself was subsequently prosecuted by the Ecclesiastical

Commission. In April 1613 he was admonished not to execute any ministerial function until he had subscribed, and for his unyielding attitude he was later censured as a schismatic and degraded from the priesthood. While Hildersham was under investigation by the Commission, Archbishop Abbot warned the Earl of Huntington that his support for Hildersham and other deprived ministers would not prevail with the King. Abbot's remarks encapsulate perfectly the distinction drawn between radical and moderate nonconformists, judged in the light of subscription to the three Articles:[79]

> I see no hope or expectation that any of them will be tolerated to preach upon any pretence whatsoever, unless they do subscribe as by the canon they are directed. And therefore if Mr Hildersham be resolved to maintain the peace of the Church and to testify it by his subscription, we shall be most glad to receive him; but if he still refuse, he is assured to sustain the indignation of his Majesty, if he offer to preach; for he is a person whom his Highness hath particularly in observation...

In November 1611, news reached Abbot that three other deprived clergy were preaching 'at their pleasure' in Northamptonshire and Rutland. He wrote to alert the local bishop, Dove of Peterborough, warning him to observe the royal instructions that Abbot had circulated recently, and he quoted the King's fury with Bishop Barlow. 'I pray your Lordship have an eye to these things', Abbot concluded, 'lest more offences grow than your Lordship conceives'.[80] Dove did not heed this advice. Three years later Abbot wrote again to say that the King had complained to him that Robert Cleaver and John Dod, those patriarchs of puritanism who had lost their livings for nonconformity in 1605, were preaching regularly in Peterborough diocese:

> his Majesties strict chardge is that your Lordship should withall the speede you can informe your selfe, what is the truthe concerninge the preachinge of these or any other silenced ministers within your diocesse...and that you advertise me so thereof, as I may yield an accompte to his Majestie.

Abbot went on to add that the King had ordered that Robert Catelin, minister of All Saints, Northampton, should be forced to use perpetual conformity.

Catelin had been suspended for nonconformity in 1605, but had managed to retain his living. Although he protested that he conformed to the liturgy, in fact he rarely did so, if the information which had reached the King was correct. James was anxious both to investigate Catelin's alleged duplicity and to teach his godly congregation at Northampton that their 'refractory disposicon' would no longer be tolerated.[81] Bishop Morton's standing with the King also suffered as a result of his apparent disregard of royal policy. After his arrival in Chester in 1616, Morton had repeatedly tried to persuade a group of Cheshire ministers to subscribe to the Articles. In 1617 his patience was misrepresented to the King by unknown enemies as unwarranted indulgence, and Morton forfeited promotion to Lincoln. He was obliged to write a pamphlet defending the ceremonies of the Church in order to regain royal favour.[82] As long as bishops were answerable to an alert supreme governor, tolerance of occasional conformity could not be mistaken for connivence at rigid nonconformity.

The King also restrained those Arminian bishops who deplored both occasional conformity and the central role accorded to preaching in the Jacobean religious polity, as analysed above.[83] Both Samuel Harsnett and William Laud criticised those 'conformable puritans' who observed the ceremonies in order to avoid deprivation, while privately holding them to be unlawful.[84] In his numerous sermons before the King, Lancelot Andrewes put forward a damning indictment of the Jacobean Church. An obsession with preaching had led to the neglect of the sacraments, of prayer and of ceremonial conformity, and the remedy that Andrewes offered was the enforcement of stricter discipline.[85] In other court sermons, Buckeridge and Laud joined Andrewes in stressing the importance of kneeling to take communion.[86] These criticisms were voiced more stridently in the latter years of the reign, a fact which reflected the growing strength and confidence of the Arminian court party.[87] Nevertheless, the King would not be drawn

from his stated policy of accommodating moderate nonconformists.

Nor did Arminian antipathy to the shibboleth of preaching lie easily with the public support that the King gave to the evangelical mission of the Church. At the Hampton Court conference, James had affirmed the importance of placing a preaching minister in every parish. The following year he told Bancroft that there was 'no one thing in the whole world which he more wisheth from his heart than his people should be instructed in the fear of God.'[88] There existed, however, an opportunity to manipulate James' wariness of disorderly preaching. The King never forgot the public criticism he had suffered from Scottish preachers before 1603, and in his writings condemned those 'braine-sicke and headie preachers' who 'thinke it their honour to contend with kings and perturbe whole kingdomes' on both spiritual and temporal matters. James' ambivalence to preaching is caught well in his charge to the Assize judges at the end of Hilary term 1618. He suggested that the best remedy for recusancy was to encourage 'good preaching and preachers', but he warned the judges to guard against 'such as are factious and turbulent'.[89] When Arminian bishops sought to curb the number of diocesan lectureships, quite naturally they tapped this professed suspicion of contentious preaching. Although even sympathetic prelates such as Morton were obliged to regulate lectureships,[90] the only sustained attack on the institution came from Bishops Neile and Harsnett, and, in all probability, also from Bishop Barlow. Very little detail survives with which to analyse Barlow's reasons for suppressing or suspending four lectures in Lincoln diocese. What is clear is that his suspension of the Leicester exercise took place in the summer of 1611 for 'some received disgrace in a conference' held after the lecture had ended;[91] and it is quite possible that the suspension represented one aspect of Barlow's drive for conformity in the wake of the King's instructions of May 1611.[92] The association of royal authority with moves against lectureships by Neile and Harsnett is less conjectural. In 1611 Neile had drawn James' attention to

the links between Arthur Hildersham, the heretic Edward Wightman and the Burton upon Trent and Repton lectures, so that Neile's suppression of both exercises was carried out with the King's active support.[93] In the summer of 1614 Neile ordered a survey of the lectureships of his new diocese of Lincoln. Although it suggested that factious lecturers were best countered by orthodox preachers, the report contained enough evidence of disorderly preaching to justify an extensive reorganisation of the Lincolnshire lectureships.[94] It is intriguing to speculate why nothing was done as a result of the survey. One explanation is that Neile could not secure royal approbation for a move against the lectures, and it may be that his standing with the King had temporarily been damaged by the acrimonious dispute that the Bishop had caused in the Parliament of 1614 by his ill-advised speech against the Lower House. Certainly, in contrast to his usual brief visits to his dioceses, Neile stayed at Lincoln, away from court, for six months following the dissolution of Parliament. Alternatively, Neile may have shunned further controversy following the bitter criticism he had faced in Parliament, which had included a denunciation of his hostility to lectureships in his late see of Coventry & Lichfield, and had ended with his abject apology to the Commons.[95]

It was not Neile but Harsnett who, in Norwich diocese after 1619, undertook the most spectacular drive against excessive levels of preaching, and again the King's assistance was invoked to forestall criticism. Professor Collinson has pointed out that Harsnett's vendetta against lecturing won the commendation of James I, who in 1622 instructed the Bishop to substitute beneficed ministers for stipendiary preachers and also to terminate Samuel Ward's lectureship at Ipswich.[96] A close analysis of this episode suggests that Harsnett exploited the King's growing concern with ill-disciplined preaching to launch a direct attack on urban lectureships. In the years after 1618, the proposed match with Spain in conjunction with the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War moved many zealous English Calvinists to urge the King to

intervene in the European conflict and, as the natural corollary, to abandon a dynastic alliance with catholic Spain. James' foreign policy came under attack from press and pulpit alike, so that from 1618 a stream of indiscreet preachers were sent to prison to cool their protestant fervour. In 1621 the King toyed with the idea of tighter controls over preaching and the following year drew up the Directions on Preaching to curb the number of contentious and seditious preachers.[97]

Among the clergy who suffered imprisonment was Samuel Ward, corporation lecturer at Ipswich. Ward was placed under house-arrest in February 1621 for publishing an inflammatory print depicting the Pope, the Devil and the King of Spain in collusion, flanked by the flight of the Armada in 1588 and Guy Fawkes beneath the Parliament House in November 1605. Ward claimed that the composition was five years old so that any contemporary message was inadverent, a plea that won him temporary release after a fortnight's confinement; but he remained suspended from preaching.[98] About the same time, Ward was prosecuted for nonconformity by Bishop Harsnett, and having appealed to the King, he was freed from the charge through the good offices of Bishop Williams of Lincoln. These two incidents so blackened Ward's reputation as a potentially factious and nonconformist preacher that the King turned down his request to be reinstated as lecturer in Ipswich. In July 1622, James ordered Harsnett to release Ward 'provided yt he conforme himselfe to peace, order and moderation', but went on to instruct the Bishop to nominate six beneficed clergy to fill Ward's lectureship, to be financed by the bailiffs and burgesses of Ipswich.[99] It seems plausible to argue that Harsnett had a hand in drawing up these instructions, in the light of his enmity towards unregulated preaching as well as the fact that he had travelled from Norwich to London earlier that month as Ward's case was being discussed at court.[100]

In early August, the King issued the Directions on Preaching to both provinces of Canterbury and York. Harsnett made full use of this opportunity

to restrain preaching in his diocese with the King's authority. Sometime after September 1622 he prohibited all Sunday morning sermons in the thirty-two parish churches in Norwich on the grounds that they were 'needlesse and there was preaching enough', suggesting instead that the entire population of some 35,000 people should attend the Cathedral sermon.[101] The diocesan clergy were ordered to preach on the Catechism in their Sunday afternoon sermons, as stipulated by second article of the royal Directions, so that Sunday preaching in Norwich city was confined to expositions of elementary Christian doctrines.[102] Harsnett also suppressed stipendiary lectureships and at some stage between 1619 and 1629 changed the exercise at St. Andrews Norwich into a combination lecture and drew up strict regulations for the lecture at Bury St. Edmunds.[103] Harsnett's vigorous moves against lectureships were not matched by Neile at Durham, in part, perhaps, because he presided over a less godly diocese.[104]

Neither the suppression of Sunday morning sermons nor Harsnett's justification for this measure was sanctioned by the royal Directions, but the Bishop must have felt confident of James' support. The King's anger at contentious preaching remained undiminished throughout 1623 as clergy continued to criticise his foreign policy, so that when Harsnett was attacked in the Parliament of 1624 for his government of Norwich, the King defended his suppression of 'populare lectures'. Nevertheless, James reiterated his commitment to evangelism with the remark that were the Bishop to put down ministers 'that are conformittants', he would be punished.[105] Harsnett continued to brief the King on diocesan affairs after the Parliament had been dissolved. In July 1624 he reported to the King the existence of conventicles at Great Yarmouth and it was on his information in December of that year that James instructed the Dean and Chapter of Norwich to reassert their right to nominate the town minister of Yarmouth in order to place a conformable cleric there.[106]

The tactic of shielding controversial actions behind royal authority, used so effectively by Neile and Harsnett in their moves against lectureships, was also adopted by William Laud as Dean of Gloucester in 1617. Laud's first action as Dean was to remove the communion table from the middle of the choir to the east end of the Cathedral, in order, he explained, that it might conform with the position of the altar in royal chapels and 'all other cathedral churches in the kingdom which I have seen'. He also obliged the prebendaries to bow towards the east end during divine service, as was the practice in royal chapels. Both orders were designed to secure greater reverence for the communion table and mirrored Laud's elevated notions of sacramental grace, but almost immediately they were denounced as popish and innovatory.[107] Laud must have been aware that his action would be bitterly criticised. Not only did his justification for the orders conceal the fact that there was a wide variety of practice both on the siting of cathedral communion tables[108] and the gesture of bowing towards the east end,[109] but he also regarded Gloucester as a stronghold of puritanism.[110] Laud's attempt to associate James I with his action should be read, therefore, as a device to dampen the anticipated outcry. Before moving the communion table, Laud had announced to the prebendaries that the King had instructed him to reform the Cathedral:

> His Majestie was graciouslye pleased to tell mee, hee was informed that there was scarce ever a Church in England so ill governed and so much out of order; and withall required mee in generall to reforme and sett in order what I there found amiss.

Nevertheless, the resiting of the communion table did provoke strong criticism and Laud turned to the king for assistance. It seems that his action was vindicated by James, with the support of his patron Neile. To judge from correspondence, it is likely that Laud played on James' fears of popular and 'turbulent spirits' whom, he claimed, were opposing him at Gloucester.[111]

\+ + + + +

It has been suggested that the broad thrust of royal policy on nonconformity was observed by the episcopate, not least because the King maintained a watchful eye over their government. James derived his knowledge of diocesan affairs from a number of sources. One formal channel was the information sent up from the dioceses in response to royal instructions; another was the omnicompetent jurisdiction of the Privy Council. In February 1620, for example, the Council heard one of the interminable rows between Lewis Bayley of Bangor and his clergy. On this occasion, Bayley had accused the Dean of Bangor of incorrectly administering the Oath of Allegiance to a recusant, but the Council judged the complaint to be malicious and warned Bayley in future to maintain better relations with his Dean.[112] Privy councillors such as Cecil corresponded regularly with a number of former family protégés, including Bishops Babington, Barlow, Bennet and James.[113] Periodically, individual bishops also wrote directly to the King, as exemplified by Harsnett's letters describing the separatist cells at Great Yarmouth in July 1624.[114] Yet it was the court bishops enjoying constant contact with the King who supplied the regular flow of information. James I learnt of Hildersham's preaching in Lincoln diocese from Neile in 1611, and of John Preston's alleged nonconformity from Andrewes in about 1618-9. Similarly in 1622 Abbot complained that the churchwardens of Manchester College were failing to present nonconformists, and added that 'his Majesty will be much offended when he shall hear therof'.[115] James also gathered information in the course of his annual progresses and in the field following the chase each autumn and spring. Dr Quintrell has suggested that James' hunting expeditions during the winter of 1604-5 in the heartlands of nonconformist England brought him into contact with local Calvinist sentiment which broadened his understanding of the loyalties and complexities of English protestantism.[116] Long after 1605 James continued to profit from his incessant peregrinations. Travelling through Northamptonshire in 1614 he

discovered that several deprived ministers were active in Peterborough diocese, and five years later, in the wake of another progress, he ordered the entire clergy to observe the correct prayers for their sovereign and bishops. On his return from Scotland in 1617, the King drew up the Lancashire Book of Sports in response to complaints against Bishop Morton's suppression of Sunday recreations, and this may also have been the occasion when he learnt of Morton's lenience to nonconformists, which cost him the vacant see of Lincoln.[117]

Despite these channels of communication, it still remained possible for a bishop periodically to evade royal policy without detection. There is little doubt, for example, that James would have opposed Tobie Matthew's decision to waive subscription for Alexander Cooke in 1615. Cooke had lost his benefice for nonconformity in 1605 and, like Hildersham, should have been welcomed back into the Church at the price of subscription. Another transgression which never came to light was Bishop Overton's grant of preaching licences to a pair of suspended nonconformists, Bradshaw and Hildersham.[118]

The official connivence at occasional conformity, however, was a policy welcomed by many bishops for a variety of reasons. Several prelates had conducted the subscription campaign of 1604-5 with a heavy heart. Both Rudd and Hutton suggested that papists would be the chief beneficiaries of the ejection of nonconformist clergy, while Chaderton and Vaughan were reported to be lukewarm supporters of the ceremonies. One puritan pamphlet claimed that several bishops never consented to the canons on discipline drawn up by convocation in 1604, which were the work of only two or three prelates; another alleged that Bilson of Winchester had said that he himself would not subscribe to everything contained in the Prayer Book.[119] As indicated above, these bishops may have deprived only the most refractory of their clergy, and once they had exacted promises of conformity or subscription from the rest,

they turned their attention to other matters. The dozen evangelical bishops dedicated themselves to the spread of the Gospel, which could only be impeded by the suspension or ejection of nonconformist preachers. Bishop George Carleton, for example, showed no desire to combat occasional conformity, patronised at least one nonconformist minister, Anthony Hilton, and devoted his energies to the problem of lax moral behaviour in Chichester diocese.[120] As befitted the Master of the godly seminary of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, James Mountagu had expressed genuine sympathy for the plight of the clergy silenced in 1605. He connived at the limited nonconformity of one Somerset minister, Richard Bernard, and helped to arrange the restoration of John Burgess, ousted in 1605, on his subscription in 1617.[121] Williams of Lincoln used his authority to reconcile nonconformists to Church discipline, as may be adduced from the favour he showed to ministers accused of nonconformity, such as John Cotton in 1621 and Samuel Ward in 1622. Williams also employed the services of the godly doctors Gough and Sibbes to win over such nonconformists.[122] Other bishops saw in royal policy the opportunity to mend their fences with puritan neighbours. Bishop Dove's lax enforcement of the ceremonies after 1605 was intended to avoid further offence to the local puritan gentry who had vociferously opposed the removal of nonconformists in 1604-5. Dove's indifference stretched to silenced clergy, which earned him several reproofs from Archbishop Abbot.[123] Only the Arminian prelates remained dissatisfied with the prevalence of occasional conformity.[124] It is among these divines that the origin of the expression 'puritan bishop' should be located. As early as 1607-10, John Williams complained of its application to his patron Bishop Vaughan for his indulgence to nonconformists, and the same label was attached to Williams himself after his elevation to Lincoln in 1621. Richard Mountagu used the phrase against bishops such as Senhouse of Carlisle, and its currency bears witness to the disdain felt by Arminians for the predominant style of churchmanship among

the episcopate, which incorporated a measure of lenience to nonconformists.[125]

+ + + + +

The fact that James I's policy on nonconformity coincided with the personal preferences of many of his bishops may imply that the King assembled an episcopate that shared many of his own attitudes to conformity and unity in the Church. Standard accounts of the selection of Jacobean bishops have suggested otherwise. The King, it is argued, was the hapless victim of the intense scramble for episcopal office led by powerful patrons, such as Cecil or Villiers, who exploited their monarch's susceptibility to pressure in order to win bishoprics for their clients.[126] This argument has a certain validity. Patronage and preferment were inextricably entwined and bishops did sometimes publicly attribute their promotion to the influence of a patron.[127] Court gossips also tried to identify factional interests behind certain preferments,[128] a habit only encouraged by James I's admission in 1611 that he had chosen George Abbot for the primatial see of Canterbury at the request of the Earl of Dunbar. Nor was the King unaware of the unsavoury atmosphere that surrounded the selection of bishops. Having translated Abbot to Canterbury, he required the Archbishop-elect to take an oath that he had not promised 'to give any person dead or living anie mony as gratuty for this preferment, directly or indirectly'.[129] This evidence need not be incompatible with the notion that James I exercised a personal and informed control over the selection of bishops. Dr Kautz has noted that the Jacobean clergy elevated to the episcopal bench shared certain characteristics. All were doctors of divinity, and many were also prominent in university life or of proven administrative experience as deans of Cathedral churches.[130] One reason why George Carleton was passed over for Carlisle in 1616 was that he

had never held a position of authority.[131] It is equally significant that all the divines promoted to the episcopate after 1603 were well-known to the King. Many had served an apprenticeship as royal chaplains, as Table Four indicates overleaf. Although their names must be garnered from miscellaneous sources, at least twenty-one of the forty-one bishops consecrated between March 1603 and March 1625 were royal chaplains prior to their preferment, and the true figure is likely to be much higher.

The King had plenty of opportunity to assess the character and learning of his chaplains, for not merely did they conduct divine service and preach before him in the chapel royal for a month each year, but they were also drawn into the constant theological debates that James so relished. The biographer of Richard Field records, for example, that as a royal chaplain Field engaged in endless discussions with his sovereign 'about points of divinitie'.[132] Other royal chaplains displayed their theological mettle to the King by writing tracts against the pretensions of the papacy, as illustrated by the polemical work of Thomas Morton and Robert Abbot on the Oath of Allegiance controversy.[133] Future bishops, who may well have been royal chaplains themselves, also performed similar services. Among the deans attending the Hampton Court conference in January 1604 were Lancelot Andrewes, Thomas Ravis, John Overall and Giles Thompson. At least seven prospective bishops contributed to the Authorised Version of the Bible and the laborious task of editing the final revisions fell to one of them, Miles Smith, together with Bilson of Winchester.[134] The apparent paradox of Arminian bishops enjoying patronage from a Calvinist King does not imply that James was ignorant of their theology. The Arminian Andrewes, for example, was warned by the King to maintain a discreet silence on the doctrine of grace. Andrewes observed this injunction, confining himself to biting asides against Calvinist teaching in his sermons before James, and grew to great influence as

Table Four: Royal Chaplains among the Episcopate, 1603-1625

Name	Date of Appointment	Date of Consecration
John King[1]	1603	1611
Richard Neile[2]	1603	1608
James Mountagu[3]	1603	1608
Robert Abbot[4]	in or before 1606	1615
William Barlow[5]	in or before 1606	1605
Thomas Morton[6]	1606	1616
Lewis Bayley[7]	in or before 1607 (chaplain to Prince Henry)	1616
Martin Fotherby[8]	in or before 1608	1618
George Montaigne[9]	1608	1617
Valentine Carey[10]	in or before 1609	1621
Richard Milbourne[11]	c.1610 (chaplain to Prince Henry)	1615
George Abbot[12]	before 1611	1609
William Laud[13]	1611	1621
Richard Snowden[14]	c.1612-3	1616
George Carleton[15]	1615 (chaplain to Prince Charles)	1618
John Bridgeman[16]	c.1615	1619
Godfrey Goodman[17]	in or before 1616 (chaplain to Queen Anne)	1625
Robert Tounson[18]	in or before 1617	1620
Robert Wright[19]	in or before 1617	1623
John Williams[20]	1617	1621
Theophilus Field[21]	in or before 1619	1619
John Davenant[22]	in or before 1621	1621
Richard Senhouse[23]	in or before 1624	1624

John Buckeridge,[24] Nicholas Felton,[25] John Hanmer,[26] and John Howson[27] were all royal chaplains at some unspecified period in their careers.

Footnotes to Table Four:

1. Henry King, A Sermon preached at Pauls Crosse, sig.A3r.
2. PRO, LC 13/168 p.97.
3. Ibid., p.109.
4. 'The Life of Robert Abbot, Bishop of Salisbury' in The Life of Dr George Abbot, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury (Guildford, 1777), p.148.
5. Barlow, One of the Foure Sermons, sig.A2r.
6. Barwick, The Fight, Victory and Triumph of S.Paul, p.71.
7. E.A.B. Barnard, 'Lewis Bayly, Bishop of Bangor (d.1631) and Thomas Bayly (d.1657) his son', Transactions of the honourable Society of Cymmrodorion (vol. for 1928-9; 1930), p.103.
8. Fotherby, Foure Sermons, titlepage.
9. DNB, xxxviii. p.276.
10. PRO, SP 14/48/100.
11. Thomas Birch, The Life of Henry Prince of Wales, eldest Son of King James I (1760), pp.444-5.
12. BL, Add.MS 32092 fo.216v. I owe this reference to Susan Holland.
13. Laud, Works, iii. p.135.
14. Birch, op.cit., ibid; HMC, 29 Portland, ix. p.24.
15. PRO, SP 14/80/27.
16. DNB, vi. p.317.
17. Godfrey Goodman, The Fall of Man or the Corruption of Nature, proved by the Light of our naturall Reason (1616), sig.(a4)v.
18. Chamberlain, Letters, ii. p.105.
19. Acts of the Privy Council 1616-1617, p.366.
20. Hacket, Scrinia Reserata, i. p.31.
21. Camden, 'Annals', p.652.
22. PRO, SP 84/86/89v.
23. CSPD 1623-1625, p.304.
24. DNB, vii. p.200.
25. Bodl., Tanner MS 141 fo.2r.
26. DNB, xxiv. p.294.
27. DNB, xxviii. p.130.

.

a result of his rare abilities as scholar and preacher.[135] It may be proposed, therefore, that no Jacobean divine earned a bishopric without already enjoying the King's good opinion.

It remains true, however, that the actual pattern of appointments cannot be divorced from the vagaries of court politics. Robert Abbot missed consecration as Bishop of Lincoln in the autumn of 1613 as a result of his brother's defiant stand on the Essex Divorce case and had to wait until 1615 for his elevation to Salisbury.[136] The shifting sands of court favour also meant that a number of eligible candidates for the office never received preferment, as is apparent from the fortunes of three royal chaplains - Theodore Price, sub-Dean of Westminster,[137] Anthony Maxey, Dean of Westminster,[138] and John Young, Dean of Winchester. Like George Abbot before him, Youmg proved his abilities on royal business in Scotland in 1618, and became a powerful clerical figure at court in the last years of James' reign. Although Young actively sought a bishopric, the prize ultimately eluded him.[139] Kautz overplays his hand with the suggestion that episcopal promotions were controlled by Cecil and Bancroft between 1603 and 1611 and by Villiers between 1619 and 1625.[140] Throughout the reign, a number of prelates were promoted through their independent standing with the King without their having the backing of a powerful patron. Lancelot Andrewes and James Mountagu are two clear examples, and a third was probably Richard Neile, initially associated with the Cecil interest, whose successive translations after 1608 reflected his high favour with James.[141] Moreover, on two occasions at least, policy rather than patronage determined episcopal promotions in the southern province. Although Tobie Matthew was tipped to succeed John Whitgift at Canterbury in May 1604, the King changed his mind in view of the strident demands for reform voiced in Parliament during that summer, selecting instead Richard Bancroft 'as a man more exercised in affaires of state'.[142] The choice of Thomas Ravis as Bishop of London in 1607

may also indicate official dissatisfaction with the lenient policy of his predecessor Richard Vaughan, for it is striking that Ravis alone continued to enforce full conformity and subscription well beyond 1606.[143]

On other occasions, James may have fostered the impression that favourites swayed his choice of bishops as a deliberate ploy to gratify courtiers, who won credit for their apparent influence with the King, and to placate disappointed candidates, who might console themselves that there was no principled policy behind the selection. This tactic seems to have been deployed on two well-documented promotions: those of Abbot to Canterbury in 1611 and of Carleton to Chichester in 1619.

On the death of Archbishop Bancroft in November 1610, five bishops - Abbot, Andrewes, Bilson, Matthew and Mountagu - were regarded as serious candidates for the vacant see. In February 1611 the most junior of the five, Abbot of London, won the post. James maintained that he had chosen Abbot merely on the recommendation of his favourite, the Earl of Dunbar, who had died before James had reached a decision. As he explained:[144]

> for the affection he bore to him living he wold performe his request that the world might see that such as he did finde good servants, he did love them dead as well as living.

In fact, Abbot was a favourite candidate to succeed Bancroft. Enjoying royal esteem after his service in Scotland in 1608, Abbot ingratiated himself with Archbishop Bancroft, with the assistance of Ravis of London.[145] Abbot's elevation to the episcopate in 1609 seems to have been accomplished with Bancroft's support,[146] and following his translation to London early in 1610, he was cast as heir-presumptive to the ailing Archbishiop by both Bancroft and nonconformist opponents. In his funeral sermon for the Archbishop in November 1610, Abbot made an overt bid for the vacant see by praising Bancroft's suppression of presbyterianism and his restoration of Cheapside Cross. In view of his former objections to the repair of the Cross, Abbot's

remarks may be interpreted as a renunciation of his puritan past and as a calculated gesture of his eligibility for the post.[147] Moreover, Abbot faced few serious rivals. In his remarks over his choice of Abbot, James had observed that Abbot was 'yong, able of body to take paynes and industrious of spirite, and so very fitt for an active place as that was'.[148] None of Abbot's competitors quite met these requirements. Thomas Bilson had not been prominent at court since James's accession, and at the age of sixty-four, he resided in his diocese, suffering indifferent health. Another sexagenarian was Tobie Matthew, who had been promoted to York in 1606 as a 'zealous, painful and preaching' prelate, capable of combating the tide of apostacy through his long experience of the northern province, and was therefore too valuable to be moved to Canterbury.[149] Lancelot Andrewes's scholarship outran that of his contemporaries, but his timid personality hardly made him a suitable candidate. Perhaps the most powerful rival to Abbot was James Mountagu. Alone among the court bishops, Mountagu was in constant attendance on the King in the field as well as at Whitehall, an intimacy which could not easily be combined with the responsibilities of the archbishopric.[150] Thus the choice of Abbot seems perfectly logical, which implies that Dunbar's influence with the King was not the most prominent factor behind the appointment.

Similarly the word of a favourite ostensibly secured George Carleton's translation from Llandaff to Chichester in May 1619. In a letter to his cousin Dudley, Carleton related how the Marquis of Buckingham had supported his cause without ever having having met him:

> yt semth he went unto the King and after a small while went foothe again, he said it is don.

Carleton dutifully thanked Buckingham for his favour and the Marquis airily assured him that he would not forget him. Carleton's explanation evidently did not impress his cousin, who was more versed in the ways of court life, and when Carleton wrote again two months later, he conceded that preferment had

come as a result of his diligent service at the Synod of Dort.[151] While most other episcopal preferments are poorly documented in comparison to these two promotions, it seems plausible to argue that James may have been equally discriminating in his choice of bishops on these unrecorded occasions.

If the King maintained some control over the selection of bishops, it may follow that their composition reflected certain royal preferences. James' desire for unity explains the breadth of theological opinion and practice on his episcopal bench as mutually antagonistic groups received royal patronage. The views of evangelicals such as Abbot differed from those of Arminians such as Andrewes on the theology of grace, the priorities of the national Church and the role of the episcopate.[152] In number and influence, however, the Arminians remained a minority. In the light of James' informed selection of bishops, it is surely no coincidence that most Calvinist bishops shared his view on nonconformity and his commitment to preaching. Their indulgence towards moderate nonconformists and their preaching practice helped to stabilise the Church in the dioceses after 1606;[153] and to a certain extent, through his choice and supervision of the episcopate, this was also the achievement of their supreme governor, James I.

\+ + + + +

The continuity of royal policy on nonconformity exposes the weakness of the familiar argument that 1610-1611 marked a watershed in the fortunes of the nonconformists with the replacement of the vigilant Bancroft by the supine Abbot. This view, first propagated by Peter Heylyn in 1668 and repeated as recently as 1970, was succinctly rehearsed by Paul Welsby in 1962:154

> The result of Abbot's translation marked a complete reversal of Bancroft's policy. A great administrator, a

> reformer of abuses and a restorer of discipline was succeeded by a negligent, lax and secular prelate.

This argument can be challenged on any number of grounds. The evidence adduced above demonstrates that the formulation of policy towards nonconformity lay with the supreme governor and not with his archbishops, both of whom were careful to oversee its application in the dioceses. The years 1605-6 and not 1610-1 saw a real change at diocesan level as the ejection of intransigent nonconformists was followed by the less contentious strategy of enforcing subscription but not full conformity. Although this is not the place for a detailed comparison of the archiepiscopal rule of Bancroft and Abbot, certain important similarities can be identified. Bancroft's thorough metropolitical visitations were matched by Abbot's imaginative attempts to investigate capitular abuses and, in at least one diocese, to improve clerical learning. Bancroft's reputation as a disciplinarian can be matched by Abbot's stringent treatment of scandalous clergy in the Ecclesiastical Commission.[155] Both were concerned at the growth of popery, especially around the court, and each denounced crypto-catholic Privy Councillors.[156] Roland Usher's claim that the administrative reconstruction carried through by Bancroft did not progress further under Abbot is also problematic. I have argued elsewhere that Usher consistently overestimated the control that Bancroft enjoyed over diocesan affairs, and although a new vigour is discernible among some episcopal administrations in the wake of the Hampton Court conference, it was not generally sustained beyond 1606.[157] Usher also persistently ignored the role of James I. Bancroft's struggles to augment clerical stipends by Parliamentary statute, for example, must be seen as part of a wider attempt by James I to realise the reforms promised at Hampton Court.[158] Important differences do remain between the churchmanship of the two Archbishops. Bancroft's suspicion of excessive preaching may be contrasted with the evangelical fervour of George Abbot, himself a city lecturer in the 1590s.[159]

Nevertheless Bancroft was a much less isolated figure than is sometimes proposed.[160] Perhaps more than any other Jacobean bishop, he followed James' lead in patronising divines of very different theological persuasions. Among his close associates were the Calvinists Ravis and Morton, and the proto-Arminians Harsnett and Barlow. Both Abbot brothers received his patronage, and it was fitting that the two overseers of his will in 1610 were George Abbot and Samuel Harsnett, who were divided by personal and theological differences.[161]

\+ + + + +

The theme of this chapter has been the sustained interest of James I in the problem of nonconformity and the response that he elicited from the episcopate. The flexible religious polity that evolved after 1603 differed from the Elizabethan Church at diocesan and national level.

An analysis of the treatment of nonconformists in the 1590s is hampered by the loss of subscription books for the dioceses under investigation.[162] Later literary evidence does not fill this lacuna. Predictably the critics of the canons of 1604 maintained that subscription had not hitherto been uniformly imposed, a claim vehemently denied by the apologists for conformity.[163] Nevetheless it appears that the prosecution of nonconformists in the 1590s varied more widely between bishops and between dioceses than occurred after 1603. In Chichester archdeaconry, for example, Bishop Bickley harried local nonconformists from 1589 to his death in 1596, a policy which was not continued by his absentee successor, Anthony Watson.[164] Similarly nonconformists in Gloucester diocese were presented more regularly under Bishop Bullingham than under his successor, Godfrey Goldsborough.[165] John Still enforced conformity and subscription fairly rigorously at his primary visitation of Bath & Wells in 1594, which may explain why he was not obliged

to deprive any nonconformist in the subscription campaign a decade later.[166] In contrast neither conformity nor subscription were regularly demanded in the dioceses of Peterborough and Lincoln.[167] Certainly the deprivations of 1604-5 did remove some, though not all, of the most intractable opponents of the liturgy, who had defied the discipline of their local consistories throughout the 1590s. One such nonconformist was the Sussex minister Beda Goodacres, who was regularly prosecuted by Chichester consistory and the Ecclesiastical Commission from at least 1589 for his flagrant neglect of the ordinances of the Church, and eventually lost his living in April 1605.[168] His nonconformist confrères Daniel Hanson and Anthony Hilton, however, survived the subscription campaign of 1604-5 to benefit from official lenience in the years that followed.[169]

The other departure from the 1590s lay in the leadership of the Church. James was the first supreme governor to attempt to solve the issue of nonconformity and his consistent intervention in diocesan affairs is in stark contrast to the spasmodic interest of his predecessor, who execised her authority only in the face of a major problem, such as the prophesying movement in the 1570s or the theological disputes of 1595-6. Both monarchs wished for a stable Church to underpin their temporal authority, but James also pursued the objectives of evangelism and religious unity.

* * * * *

The stability of the Jacobean Church at diocesan level was, to an extent, the achievement of the Crown. In one sense, James was doing no more than formally endorsing certain strong impulses within the reformed Church of England. Royal support for preaching and the official tolerance of occasional conformity echoed both the powerful proselytising tendency within the Church and the prevalent desire for a united protestant front against Rome,

undistracted by the issue of ceremonial conformity. Conversely, however, the King's refusal to underwrite the Arminian vision of the Church was an effective guarantee of stability. Despite their sermons at court and their personal standing with James, the Arminians could do no more than patronise sympathetic divines and suppress isolated lectureships, for the King always remained faithful to his policy on nonconformity.

Footnotes to Chapter Eight

1. John Williams, Great Britains Salomon. A Sermon preached at the magnificent Funeral of the most high and mighty King Iames, the late King of Great Brittaine, France and Ireland, Defender of the Faith (1625), pp.46-52; 'King James and the English Puritans: an unpublished Document', Blackwoods Magazine, clxxxviii. (1910), p.404.

2. See, for example, The Political Works of James I, ed. C.H. McIlwain (Cambridge, Mass., 1918); Willson, 'James I and his Literary Assistants', pp.35-57.

3. Fincham & Lake, 'The Ecclesiastical Policy of James I', passim.

4. Quintrell, 'The Royal Hunt', pp.41-58.

5. See, for example, his remarks at the opening of the Parliament of 1621: Commons Debates 1621, vi. p.367.

6. Concilia, iv. pp.410-2,460-1,465-7; Constitutional Documents of the Reign of James I, ed. J.R. Tanner (Cambridge, 1952), pp.54-6.

7. Concilia, iv. pp.440-2; LAO, Add.Reg.I fos.225r-6r.

8. Concilia, iv. pp.413-4,440-2.

9. NNRO, ANW/17/1; Harison, Registrum Vagum, ii. pp.291-321.

10. James I, Workes (1616), sig.er.

11. Fincham & Lake, 'The Ecclesiastical Policy of James I', passim; Babbage, Puritanism and Richard Bancroft, pp.252-3.

12. Concilia, pp.413-4,440-2.

13. Babbage, Puritanism and Richard Bancroft, pp.147-219.

14. Such as Ringe, Packe and Robinson from Chichester, Baker and Johnson from London, and Martyn and Jones from Bath & Wells dioceses. Babbage, op.cit., pp.151,162,200-3,216-7; see above p.271 fn.133; PRO, SP 14/47/24; Quintrell, 'The Royal Hunt', p.56 fn.41; SRO, D/D/Ca 146 fos.256v-7v,271r,297r, 149 (unfoliated: 9 October

1606), 155 fo.109r & passim, 158 fos.137v,324r, D/D/B/Reg.43 fos.14r,18r.

15. Such as Rowles and Cowper of Gloucester diocese, deprived for nonconformity on 28 October 1605; other likely candidates are Salisbury, Leigh and Lancaster of Oxford diocese, Atkins of Salisbury diocese and Bachiler of Winchester diocese, all of whom lost their livings in the course of the subscription campaign of 1605: GDR, 97 fo.91v, 27A p.354; OCRO, MS.Oxf.Dioc.Papers c.264 fo.19; WRO, Reg. Cotton fo.19v; HRO, A/I/29 fo.18v. I hope to publish elsewhere a catalogue raisonne of the deprived ministers of 1604-5.

16. GDR, 97 fo.118r.

17. SRO, D/D/Ca 141 (partially unfoliated: 29 May 1605) & fos.192r,219r, 146 fo.83r; LPL, Fairhurst MS 2004 fo.90v; EDR, D/2/23 fos.132r,159r, D/2/25 fos.2r,37v, D/2/26 fos.2v,72r; Hajzyk, 'The Church in Lincolnshire', p.56; Babbage, Puritanism and Richard Bancroft, pp.220-3; Foster, The State of the Church, pp.368-9; NNRO, Vis/4 fos.1r,4v & (partially unfoliated: 22-3 May 1606); Sheils, The Puritans in the Diocese of Peterborough, pp.82-4.

18. Babbage, Puritanism and Richard Bancroft, pp.80-4,113-5; A Survey of the Book of Common Prayer (1606), pp.6,163; [Bradshaw], A Myld and Iust Defence of Certeyne Arguments at the last session of Parliament directed to that most Honorable Court, p.8.

19. Quintrell, 'The Royal Hunt', p.57.

20. DWL, RNC 38.34 pp.60-2,80-3,88; S.T.C. 6814, 13395.

21. Babbage, Puritanism and Richard Bancroft, pp.164,166-73,183-4; Quintrell, 'The Royal Hunt', pp.47-8.

22. The phrase is Lord Buckhurst's, in a letter to Archbishop Whitgift. BL, Add.MS 28571 fo.179; HMC, 9 Hatfield House, xv. pp.262-3; Manning, Religion and Society in Elizabethan Sussex, pp.207-10; Babbage,

Puritanism and Richard Bancroft, pp.191-200.

23. BL, Cotton MS Titus F.IV fo.169; LAO, Add.Reg.I fos.225r-6r; Lords' Journals, ii. p.658a.

24. WSRO, Ep.I/1/8 fo.56r, I/17/11 fos.166r,176r,183v,213v, II/9/9 fos.272v, 277r, II/9/10 fos.11v,12v,14v,30r,35v.

25. WSRO, Ep.I/17/11 fo.236r, I/17/12 fos.182r,227r, I/15/3/16 fo.45, I/17/13 fos.88v,159v,195r, I/17/15 fos.91v,101v,109v,142v, I/17/17 fo.99r, I/17/20 fo.259r, I/17/22 fo.77r, II/9/11 fo.106r, II/9/16 fo.1v, II/9/18 fo.58r; Churchwardens' Presentments: Archdeaconry of Chichester, pp.15,57,75,85,92-3.

26. SRO, D/D/Ca 140 pp.3,66,109,235,380,401,449, 142 pp.30,45,150.

27. SRO, D/D/Ca 160, 162, 173 (all unfoliated), 177 (partially unfoliated), fos.11v,21r, 204 (unfoliated), 206 pp.186-7,211,223,283,309.

28. HRO, A/I/29 fos.18v,20r,21r, C 73, passim, C 92 (unfoliated: 19 November & 3 December 1619), C 96 fos.6r,34v,56r: 'Metropolitical Visitation of the Archdeaconry of Winchester 1607-1608' in A Hampshire Miscellany, i. ed. A.J. Willis (Folkestone, 1963), pp.12, 17,42; PRO, SP 14/13/73, 26/20.I.

29. In 1605 there were 12, in 1608 4, and in 1614-8 4 more presentments for nonconformity. EDR, B/2/25 fos.1r,7r,8r,10r, D/2/25 fos.2r,37v, 42v,132r,159r-60r,171r, B/2/26 fo.44r, B/2/29 fos.67r,92v,108v,121v, B/2/34 fo.101r, B/2/35 fo.10r, D/2/35 fo.145v, B/2/36.fo.157v.

30. Over 30 nonconformist ministers were presented in 1605, dropping to 4 in 1610 and 1613: GDR, 97, 111, 113.

31. Hajzyk, 'The Church in Lincolnshire', pp.249-50.

32. Sheils, The Puritans in the Diocese of Peterborough, p.87.

33. George Widley, The Doctrine of the Sabbath handled in Foure Severall Bookes or Treatises (1604), sig.A3; HRO, C 73 fo.26v; EDR, B/2/29 fos.5r,19v, D/2/29 fos.7v-9r; Baynes, The Diocesans Tryall, sig.A2v-3r.

34. See, for example, WSRO, Ep.I/17/20 fos.259v,264v, I/17/22 fo.77r; EDR, B/2/29 fo.108r.

35. Thomas Hooker, curate of Esher in Winchester diocese, was suspended in about 1622-5, probably for contentious preaching: see above p.290.

36. Namely John Newton, John Eaton and Anthony Lapthorne. See above pp.288-90 and appendix VIII.

37. Marchant, Puritans and the Church Courts, pp.44,166.

38. Kalu, 'The Jacobean Church and Essex Puritans', pp.180-209; Babbage, Puritanism and Richard Bancroft, pp.149-56; see above fn.14.

39. GDR, 96-7; see above pp.68-70.

40. Kalu, 'The Jacobean Church and Essex Puritans', pp.210-43; idem, 'Continuity in Change', pp.28-45. Kalu does note, however, a short-lived drive for conformity in 1618, which he associates with Bishop King's new Chancellor, Sir Henry Marten.

41. Foster, The State of the Church, pp.cii-cxv,368-9; LAO, Add.Reg.I fos.225r-6r, LC/III fos.1r,2r,35r,71r,79v,98v; and see above p. 255.

42. See above p.295.

43. See above pp.67-8.

44. GDR, 110; and see above pp.68,71.

45. GL, MS 9537/11 fos.133r,138r,144v,154r,161r; Kalu, 'Continuity in Change', p.33.

46. GDR, 115 p.391.

47. Robert Sanderson, Two Sermons: preached at two severall visitations, at Boston, in the diocesse and county of Lincolne (1622), pp.1-19,92; C. Holmes, Seventeenth-Century Lincolnshire (Lincoln, 1980), pp.95-6.

48. See above pp.63-4.

49. For Archbishops Bancroft and Abbot, and Bishops Chaderton, Harsnett, Babington and Parry: LPL, Reg.Bancroft fos.179v-80r and passim, Reg.

Abbot i. fos.236r,239r-42,258v and passim; LAO, Reg.XXX fos.234r-328v; NNRO, Reg/16/22 ii. fos.1r-33r; HWRO, b.716.093-BA.2648/10(I) pp.175-98,202,208-9,212.

50. For Bridges and Howson at Oxford (1604-25), Heton and Andrewes at Ely (1604-7,1617), Neile at Rochester, Coventry & Lichfield and Lincoln (1608-17), Neile, Montaigne and Williams at Lincoln (1614-25), Overall and Morton at Coventry & Lichfield (1614-25), Searchfield and Wright at Bristol (1619-25), Still at Bath & Wells (1602-5), Tounson and Davenant at Salisbury (1620-5) and Watson, Andrewes, Harsnett and Carleton at Chichester (1605-25). OCRO, MS.Oxf.Dioc.Papers e.9 fo.1r-169r, e.12 pp.3-67; EDR, B/2/6 pp.241-59; BIHR, R IV Be 2 fos.10v-67v; LAO, Sub.I fos.118r-55v; LJRO, B/A/4/17-8; BRO, EP/A/10/1/1 pp.6-15,91-5, EP/A/10/1/2 fos.15r-24r; SRO, D/D/Vc 68; Subscription Book of Bishops Tounson and Davenant 1620-1640, ed. B. Williams (Wiltshire Record Society, xxxii. Devizes, 1977), pp.13-22; WSRO, Ep.II/1/1 fos.1r-24v.

51. BIHR, R IV Be 2 fos.22-67v; LAO, Sub.I fos.118r-32v. Dr Hajzyk appears not to have known about Neile's own subscription book and therefore assumes that the Bishop sanctioned this limited subscription: 'The Church in Lincolnshire', p.96.

52. WSRO, Ep.II/1/1, I/3/1 fos.1-10v.

53. LJRO, B/A/4/17 (unfoliated: 6 January and 22 September 1617).

54. Debates in the House of Commons in 1625, ed. S.R. Gardiner (Camden Society, 2nd series, vi. 1873), p.26. Perez Zagorin suggests that Rudyard's view was 'certainly correct' and quotes as supporting evidence the remark of the Gloucestershire minister John Sprint in 1618 that 'it is well knowen, that for these later 5 or 6 yeares, subscription hath not been urged to incumbents or settled ministers, but meere conformity'. A reading of the passage in context makes

clear that Sprint is in fact referring to the current view that the bishops' action in enforcing subscription in 1604-5 on clergy already beneficed in their dioceses was an unwarranted interpretation of canon 36, as Bancroft himself conceded in a conference with the House of Commons in April 1606. Sprint nowhere implies that ordinands or newly-instituted ministers are being excused subscription. P. Zagorin, The Court and the Country: the Beginning of the English Revolution of the mid-Seventeenth Century (New York, 1970), pp.164-8, and p.168 fn.7; John Sprint, Cassander Anglicanus: shewing the necessitie of Conformitie to the prescribed Ceremonies of our Church, in case of Deprivation (1618), p.237; Babbage, Puritanism and Richard Bancroft, pp.249-50.

55. Clarke, Ten Eminent Divines, p.6; NNRO, Reg/16/22 i. fo.59r; Acts of the Privy Council 1615-1616, pp.195-6.

56. Materials for the Life of Thomas Morton, pp.12-3; O'Day, The English Clergy, pp.251-2 fn.22. Morton's subscription book also records that in 1621 Arthur Rickards refused to subscribe. He may have been petitioning for a preaching or curate's licence, and seems to have been turned away. Four years later, on his institution to Hartshorne rectory, Rickards did subscribe to the Articles: LJRO, B/A/1/18 (unfoliated: 28 August 1621 and 13 January 1625). I am grateful to Richard Clark for his help with this point.

57. Clarke, The Lives of Sundry Eminent Persons, p.163; NNRO, Reg/16/22 ii. fos.1-33v.

58. PRO, SP 16/164/23, transcribed in Barnard, 'Lewis Bayly, Bishop of Bangor', pp.121-3; Oliver Heywood's Life of John Angier of Denton, ed. E. Axon (Chetham Society, new series, xcvii. 1937), pp.56-7.

59. Marchant, Puritans and the Church Courts, pp.34 fn.2,240-1.

60. Hajzyk, 'The Church in Lincolnshire', p.48; Cassidy, 'The Episcopate of

William Cotton, Bishop of Exeter 1598-1621', p.83; Acts of the Privy Council 1615-1616, pp.195-6.

61. Babbage, Puritanism and Richard Bancroft, p.173; GDR, 27A p.354, 97 fo.91v.

62. The Political Works of James I, pp.6-8,23-4; Marchant, Puritans and the Church Courts, p.296; and see above pp.194-5,234-5,238,301.

63. James I, A Meditation upon the Lord's Prayer, pp.5,7,9; Idem, A Meditation upon the 27,28,29 verses of the XXVII Chapter of St Matthew. Or a Paterne for a Kings Inauguration (1620), p.12; PRO, SP 14/90/20. In his biography of Laud, Trevor-Roper states that Williams of Lincoln advised his diocesan officials 'to proceed gently with the Puritans as King James had it in mind to indulge their foibles for political reasons'. [Archbishop Laud, 1573-1645 (1962), p.183, followed by Holmes, Seventeenth-Century Lincolnshire, p.119]. In fact Williams was referring not to James I, but to Charles I: see Hacket, Scrinia Reserata, ii. pp.111-2; Thomas, 'Archbishop John Williams', pp.255-6.

64. Holmes, Seventeenth-Century Lincolnshire, pp.95-6; BL, Add.MS 6394 fo.29.

65. Kalu, 'Continuity in Change', p.34; PRO, SP 14/108/31.

66. NNRO, Act/45b (unfoliated: 11 October 1614); PRO, SP 14/108/14.

67. DWL, RNC 38.34 pp.386-8; Cassidy, 'The Episcopate of William Cotton, Bishop of Exeter 1598-1621', pp.103,144; SRO, D/D/Ca 151 (unfoliated: 2 October 1606).

68. LPL, Fairhurst MS 2004 fo.90v; SRO, D/D/Ca 160 (unfoliated: 19 October 1609).

69. GDR, 27A pp.359,435-7; LPL, MS 691 fos.24r-5v; PRO, SP 16/261/83-4.

70. WSRO, Ep.II/9/17 fo.36v; PRO, SP 16/412/58.

71. PRO, SP 16/436/22.

72. HRO, B/1/A/29 (unfoliated: 6 June 1622); PRO, SP 16/151/12; DNB, ix. p.1189; F. Shuffleton, Thomas Hooker 1586-1647 (Princeton, 1977), pp.121-33.

73. Morton, A Defence, pp.43-4.

74. Ibid., sig.A2r, pp.44,166-94.

75. BL, Cotton MS Titus F.IV fo.169, partially transcribed in Babbage, Puritanism and Richard Bancroft, pp.252-3.

76. Sprint, Cassander Anglicanus, sig.*3r, p.238.

77. Ibid., sig.*v-*2r; GDR, 97 fo.91v.

78. LAO, Add.Reg.I fos.225r-6r, LC/III fos.1r,2r,35r,71r,79v,98v; HMC, 78 Hastings, ii. p.54; PRO, SP 14/67/58, printed in G.A. Poole, Diocesan Histories: Peterborough [1882], pp.206-7. Barlow's move against nonconformists was not prompted by the desire to regain royal favour, for his visitation was held in September 1611 and his lenience to Hildersham came to light sometime that November: LAO, Add.Reg.3 fos.2r-3r; DWL, Morrice MS J p.10.

79. Clarke, The Lives of Thirty-Two English Divines, pp.118-20; HMC, 78 Hastings, ii. p.55.

80. PRO, SP 14/67/58.

81. PRO, SP 14/77/90; Sheils, The Puritans in the Diocese of Peterborough, p.80.

82. See above p.232.

83. See above p.246-56.

84. Fuller, Church History, vi. p.88; Babbage, Puritanism and Richard Bancroft, p.225.

85. See above pp.249-51.

86. John Buckeridge, A Sermon preached before his Maiestie at Whitehall, March 22 1617 being Passion Sunday, touching Protrastion and Kneeling in the Worship of God. To which is added a Discourse

concerning Kneeling at the Communion (1618); King James his Apopthegmes or Table Talke, ed. B.A., (1643), p.3.

87. Andrewes's most sustained attacks on ceremonial nonconformity and excessive preaching were in sermons delivered in 1607, 1617, 1618, 1622, 1623 and 1624; Laud's sermon on kneeling was preached in about 1617, Buckeridge's in 1618. For the growing influence of Arminians at court during these years, see Tyacke, 'Arminianism in England', p.233 ff.

88. Usher, Reconstruction, ii. pp.346-7; Concilia, iv. pp.413-4.

89. The Political Works of James I, pp.6-7; King James his Apopthegmes, pp.8-9; Bacon, Letters and Life, vi. pp.305-6.

90. Morton apparently withheld his approval for an exercise at Downham, Lancashire, in 1617, although his reason for doing so is unclear: The Journal of Nicholas Assheton, p.28.

91. See above p.255; 'Primary Visitation of...Bishop Neile', p.44; Records of the Borough of Leicester, ed. H. Stocks & W.H. Stevenson (Cambridge, 1923), p.115.

92. See above p.283.

93. Collinson, Godly People, p.490; Clarke, The Lives of Thirty-Two English Divines, pp.117-8.

94. 'Primary Visitation of...Bishop Neile', pp.46-7.

95. Foster, 'Archbishop Richard Neile', pp.116-27; see above p.254; I have benefitted from discussing this problem with Andrew Foster.

96. Collinson, Godly People, pp.488-9.

97. Fincham & Lake, 'The Ecclesiastical Policy of James I', passim; see also the penetrating analysis in Hacket, Scrinia Reserata, i. pp.86-90.

98. The Court and Times of James the First, ii. pp.226,228,232; PRO, SP 15/42/76; DNB, lix. p.333.

99. Hacket, Scrinia Reserata, i. p.95; PRO, SP 14/130/127; Bodl., Tanner

MS 265 fo.28r.

100. See above pp.252-3; Harsnett was at Ludham manor, near Norwich, on 30 June and 31 July, and was in London on 8 July; the royal letter on stipendiary lecturers is dated 26 July 1622: Bodl., Tanner MS 265 fo.28r; NNRO, PRE/16 (unfoliated: 30 June & 31 July 1622); PRO, DEL 4/9 fo.35r.

101. Concilia, iv. pp.465-7; Lords' Journals, iii. p.388; BL, Harl.MS 159 fo.118r, Add.MS 18597 fos.167v-8r.

102. Concilia, iv. p.467; NNRO, ANW/21/1 fo.8r.

103. BL, Add.MS 18597 fo.167r; Bodl., Tanner MSS 137 fo.3, 314 fo.155v.

104. The same point applies to Andrewes at Winchester who, in characteristic fashion, merely sent the Directions on to his archdeacon. Howson of Oxford ordered the clergy to read them out in church and required the churchwardens to report any transgressions to him in person and to submit a quarterly presentment on their observance: Andrewes, Works, xi. pp.xlix-l; John Howson, To the Minister, Churchwardens and Parishioners of the diocesse of Oxon [1622], sig.*iiir.

105. PRO, SP 14/142/8,22, 153/20,38; Hacket, Scrinia Reserata, i. p.90; BL, Harl.MS 159 fo.136v.

106. Henry Swinden, The History and Antiquities of the Ancient Burgh of Great Yarmouth in the County of Norfolk (Norwich, 1773), pp.830-1,840; Bodl., Tanner MS 134 fo.189; Minute Books of the Dean and Chapter of Norwich Cathedral, p.61; Shipps, 'Lay Patronage of East Anglican Clerics', pp.216-42.

107. Taylor, 'William Laud, Dean of Gloucester', pp.87-90; Laud, Works, vi. pp.56-7,239-41; Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus, pp.69-71.

108. The cathedral communion tables at Wells and Durham were moved to the east end in 1593 and 1617, that of Winchester remaining in the

middle of the choir until after 1625: HMC, 12 Wells Cathedral MSS, ii. p.325; Tyacke, 'Arminianism in England', pp.227,262. Laud, in fact, half-conceded this point. In a letter to Neile he stated that communion tables were sited at the east end 'in all well-ordered Cathedrals' and the Chapter Act itself states that the table was removed to conform with 'all or moste pte of the Cathedral Churches': Laud, Works, iv. p.233 fn.2, vi. p.240.

109. In 1635 Dean Young of Winchester confessed that in the royal chapels and in Wells Cathedral he bowed towards the altar, but at Winchester he did so only at the celebration of the Eucharist, adding that 'I did not disalow those that dide practise it'. John Young, The Diary of John Young S.T.P., Dean of Winchester 1616 to the Commonwealth, ed. F.R. Goodman (1928), p.135. Bowing towards the altar was not a canonical requirement, and no Jacobean visitation articles enquired if the practice were observed.

110. Laud, Works, vi. p.241.

111. PRO, SP 14/90/95; Laud, Works, vi. p.241.

112. Acts of the Privy Council 1619-1621, pp.139-40.

113. See, for example, CSPD 1603-1610, pp.225,392,461,506,554,573,587, 601; HMC, 9 Hatfield House, xxi. pp.73-4,88,118-9,132,134,136,140, 190,196.

114. See above p.297.

115. Clarke, The Lives of Thirty-Two English Divines, p.117; Ball, The Life of the Renowned Doctor Preston, pp.42-58; Life of Humphrey Chetham, Volume I, ed. F.R. Raines (Chetham Society, new series, xlix. Manchester, 1903), p.37.

116. Quintrell, 'The Royal Hunt', pp.41-58.

117. PRO, SP 14/77/90; Concilia, iv. pp.460-1; Barwick, The Fight, Victory and Triumph of S.Paul, pp.80-2; Materials for the Life of Thomas

Morton, p.17.

118. See above pp.280,291-2; DNB, vi. pp.182-3, xxvi. p.383.

119. Babbage, Puritanism and Richard Bancroft, pp.80-4,113-5; An Abridgement of that Booke which the Ministers of Lincoln diocess delivered to his Maiestie upon the first of December last, being the first part of an Apologie for themselves and their Bretheren that refuse the Subscription and Conformitie which is required (1605), p.53; [Samuel Hieron], A Short Dialogue proving that the Ceremonyes and some other Coruptions now in question, are defended, by none other arguments than such as the Papists have here tofore used (1605), pp.56-7; A Survey of the Booke of Common Prayer, p.163.

120. See above pp.119-23,198.

121. Tyacke, 'Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter-Revolution', pp.126-7; HMC, 9 Hatfield House, xvii. pp.28-9; DWL, Morrice MS J p.42; Bacon, Letters and Life, v. pp.372-3; Babbage, Puritanism and Richard Bancroft, pp.166-73,383-6.

122. Hacket, Scrinia Reserata, i. p.95; Clarke, The Lives of Thirty-Two English Divines, p.220; see above pp.288,296.

123. Sheils, The Puritans in the Diocese of Peterborough, pp.86-8,110-2; PRO, SP 14/67/58, 77/90.

124. See above pp.246-56.

125. BL, Harl.MS 6495 fos. 102v,108v; Hacket, Scrinia Reserata, i. p.95; Cosin, Correspondence, i. pp.21-2.

126. Trevor-Roper, 'James I and his Bishops'; Kautz, 'The Selection of Jacobean Bishops'. Kautz does suggest (p.176) that James chose 'most of the men elevated and translated in the period 1611-1619', but adduces no evidence to demonstrate this.

127. Smith believed that he owed his consecration to Gloucester see in 1612 to Archbishop Abbot, Thornborough his translation to Worcester in

1617 to the Earl of Pembroke: Smith, Sermons, sig. ¶¶ ¶¶ v; John Thornborough, The Last Will and Testament of Iesus Christ touching the blessed Sacrament of his Body and Blood (Oxford, 1630), sig.A2v-3r.

128. Chamberlain, Letters, ii. p.47; Court and Times of James the First, ii. p.275.

129. PRO, SP 14/61/107.

130. Kautz, 'The Selection of Jacobean Bishops', pp.156-7,166-7; and see above p.107.

131. PRO, SP 14/88/136.

132. Field, Some Short Memorials, pp.8,13-6.

133. S.T.C. 45, 48, 18174-6, 18183-5.

134. Barlow, Summe and Substance, p.1; Fuller, Church History, v. pp.370-4; Smith, Sermons, sig. ¶¶ ¶¶ v.

135. Memorials of Affairs of State, iii. p.459; Andrewes, Works, iii. pp.32,328; and see above pp.31,38.

136. Howell, State Trials, ii. pp.829-30; Chamberlain, Letters, i. p.478.

137. DNB, xlvi. pp.338-9.

138. DNB, xxxvii. p.112.

139. CSPD 1611-1618, pp.555,592; Ball, The Life of the Renowned Doctor Preston, pp.53,64; Richard Neile, M.Ant.De.Dnis. Arch-Bishop of Spalato, his Shiftings in Religion (1624), passim; Young, Diary, p.76.

140. Kautz, 'The Selection of Jacobean Bishops', pp.169-171,174.

141. Isaacson, The Life and Death of Lancelot Andrewes, p.32; Bodl., Carte MS 74 fo.361; HMC, 9 Hatfield House, xx. pp.86-7; Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicanus, p.60.

142. Matthew Hutton, Correspondence, ed. J. Raine (Surtees Society, xvii. 1843), p.195; Harington, A Briefe View, pp.10-1; Babbage, Puritanism and Richard Bancroft, pp.233-45.

143. See above pp.282-3.

144. PRO, SP 14/61/107; Court and Times of James the First, i. p.110.

145. PRO, SP 14/80/113.

146. PRO, SP 14/44/68, Bancroft to Cecil, 17 April 1609. In view of Abbot's apparently uncontested candidature for Coventry & Lichfield, I have assumed that the reference to 'a very worthy man' is to him.

147. Welsby, George Abbot, pp.19-20,39; Babbage, Puritanism and Richard Bancroft, p.389; David Calderwood, History of the Kirk in Scotland, ed. T. Thomson vii. (Edinburgh, 1845), p.152.

148. PRO, SP 14/61/107.

149. See above p.57 and appendix I; HMC, 9 Hatfield House, xviii. pp.21-2,37-8.

150. See above pp.32-3 and appendix IV.

151. PRO, SP 14/109/60,144.

152. See above pp.227-38,249-51.

153. See above pp.227-46.

154. Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus, pp.62-4; Edward Hyde, The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England i. (Oxford, 1702), p.68; Trevor-Roper, 'James I and his Bishops', pp.135-6; Welsby, George Abbot, p.38; Kautz, 'The Selection of Jacobean Bishops', pp.178-9.

155. Fincham, 'Ramifications of the Hampton Court Conference', passim; and see above pp.34-5.

156. Spain and the Jacobean Catholics i. 1603-1612, ed. A.J. Loomie (Catholic Record Society, lxiv. 1973), p.157; L.L. Peck, Northampton: Patronage and Policy at the Court of James I (1982), p.82; PRO, SP 105/95/43v.

157. Fincham, 'Ramifications of the Hampton Court Conference', passim.

158. Usher, Reconstruction, ii. pp.246-58,332-3,346; Proceedings in Parliament 1610, i. pp.234-5.

159. Usher, Reconstruction, ii. p.347; Barlow, Summe and Substance, pp.53-4; and see above pp.148,227-9.

160. See, for example, Tyacke, 'Puritanism, Arminianism, and Counter-Revolution', pp.125-6.

161. PRO, SP 14/80/113, 105/95/9v; B(addeley), The Life of Dr Thomas Morton, pp.20-6; DNB, i. p.24, iii. p.232, xxv. pp.52-3; Babbage, Puritanism and Richard Bancroft, pp.388-9; BL, Add.MS 39948 fo.184r.

162. The exception is London, where Bancroft enforced full subscription after 1598: Usher, Reconstruction, i. p.116.

163. [Hieron], A Short Dialogue, p.55; Sparke, A Brotherly Perswasion, p.66; Morton, A Defence, pp.159-60.

164. WSRO, Ep.I/17/7 fos.26r,32r,37r,42v,45r,52r,83v,100v,128v,129v,133v, 147v,154v-5r,182r,183v,199,203r,212r,213, I/17/8 fos.2r,26r,41v-2v,49r, 59,65r,78r,91v,97v,134r,137v,152v,189-90v,213r,232v-4v,247r,274r,281r, 298r,299v,318r,337v,350r, I/17/9 fos.4r,22r,34v-5r,145v,160v, I/17/10 fos.16r,33v,48r,79r,96v,121r,165r,195v,203r,222v,232r.

165. GDR 76 fos.112r,113r,126r,127r,165v,199v,200v,204v,252r,253r,270r, 276r,281r,285r,287r, 81 (unfoliated: four deaneries only), 87 fos.153r, 206r,221v,298r,349r,351r, 91 (incomplete), fos.8v,50v,55r,60r,89v-90r.

166. SRO, D/D/Ca 101 fos.42,48,94v, 102 fos.3v-4r,5v,13v-4v,19v-20r, 23r,61r, 104 fos.6v,22r-3r; LPL, Fairhurst MS 2004 fo.90v.

167. Hajzyk, 'The Church in Lincolnshire', p.247.

168. WSRO, Ep.I/17/7 fo.37r, I/17/8 fos.41v,59r,65r,152v,189r-90v, 200r,281r,318r,350r, I/17/9 fo.22r, I/17/10 fos.121r,203r, I/1/8 fo.56r.

169. WSRO, Ep.I/17/7 fos.26r,42v,52r,83v,100v,147v,154v,182r,199,213r, I/17/8 fos.2r,42v,78r,91v,134r,189v-90v,213r,232v,234v,337v, I/17/10 fos.33v,79r, I/17/11 fo.236r, I/17/12 fo.182r, I/17/13 fos.106v,116v, I/15/3/24 fo.165.

Chapter Nine: Conclusion

This thesis has proposed that many Jacobean bishops managed to adapt the model of the apostolic bishop to the realities of seventeenth century diocesan administration. Most prelates resided in their sees, conducted visitations in person, took an active role in consistory affairs, preached fairly regularly, and supervised the conduct of their diocesan clergy. An attitude of humility and courtesy by the bishop to his clergy helped narrow the gap between the social and political power of the episcopal office and the model of the preaching pastor. The vitality of the Pastoral ideal was strengthened further by the absence of internal disputes over ceremonial conformity and ecclesiastical hierarchy for most of James I's reign.

A comparison with the practice of sixteenth century prelates suggests that the Pastoral ideal had not always been imitated so widely. Dr Thompson's work on the episcopate between 1500 and 1558 reveals that many bishops took little part in routine diocesan administration and rarely preached in their sees.[1] He does detect, however, the beginnings of a revival of the Pastoral ideal among the Edwardine and Marian bishops.[2] While there is no comparable study of the Elizabethan episcopate to trace this development after 1559, some outstanding biographical and diocesan studies have shown the commitment and resourcefulness of the first generation of Elizabethan bishops, led by Jewel and Grindal.[3] The re-invigoration of the Pastoral ideal was prompted in part by Christian humanist writings early in the century on the model of the apostolic bishop,[4] in part also by the prominent role assigned to the episcopate, on both sides of the confessional divide, as the active agents of religious change. In England, to the bishop fell the responsibility of recruiting and supervising a protestant clergy capable to winning souls through the dissemination of the gospel. The formidable obstacles that the

the Elizabethan episcopate had to overcome in pursuit of these aims have been outlined many times.[5] The churchmanship of that generation of bishops appointed in the 1580s still awaits research. In view of the presbyterian threat, it may be that priority was given to conformity and internal order rather to the pastoral work.[6] The extent to which the Pastoral ideal was not observed by several of these bishops may be judged from the damning criticism of their government written in the early 1590s by Richard Hooker, a divine renowned for his sympathy and respect for the episcopal office.[7] The relative tranquillity of that decade, however, saw the resumption of pastoral roles by bishops such as Matthew and Babington.[8] The flowering of this churchmanship, as with other aspirations of Elizabethan protestantism, occurred in the more stable conditions of the Jacobean Church. Backed by a benevolent Crown, the episcopate could supervise regular parochial preaching by a increasingly graduate ministry, in an atmosphere largely free from the divisive issue of ceremonial conformity. Just as the reformed church of England was coming to maturity under James I, so too, it appears, was the Pastoral ideal among the episcopate.

At the same time, there was emerging a rival view of the episcopal office, associated with churchmen who opposed liturgical nonconformity and the centrality accorded to preaching for salvation. Consequently, they emphasised the bishop's role as governor and disciplinarian as much as preaching pastor. The Laudian drive for uniformity of worship in the 1630s was an attempt to translate these views into action.

* * * * *

One theme of this thesis has been the daunting responsibilities of the episcopal office, of which contemporaries were only too aware.[9] The problem of the multifarious roles that the episcopate were expected to

perform was compounded by the sheer size of many English dioceses, which often made the bishop a somewhat remote figure in his own see. In the Elizabethan Church, reformers addressed this problem by proposing that certain episcopal powers might be shared with leading diocesan clergy, but they received no encouragement from the Crown, and were firmly rejected by James I at the Hampton Court conference.[10] An alternative solution - the appointment of suffragan bishops - already lay enshrined in parliamentary statute. The act of 26 Henry VIII c.14 had listed twenty-six suffragan sees to replace those medieval bishops ex partibus infidelium who had assisted English diocesans before 1534. Accordingly eighteen suffragan bishops were consecrated in the course of the century, the last of whom was John Sterne, Bishop of Colchester from 1592 to his death in 1608.[11] Not until 1870 was the next suffragan appointed, so that the extinction of the species in 1608 has rightly been described as 'one of the baffling mysteries of Anglican history'.[12] Nor was its disappearance commented on at the time. No mention was made of the current contraction of the suffragan office, or of its potential expansion, in the numerous reform proposals aired before and after the Hampton Court conference. However, one can suggest some likely reasons for its demise. Elizabeth was no warm supporter of the office and only three suffragans were appointed after 1559, which reflects her suspicion of devolving any authority from the episcopate.[13] Moreover in the debate over ecclesiastical hierarchy, the office of suffragan found few allies. Critics of the episcopal order evidently condemned suffragans as no better than any other bishop, while apologists for the iure divino standing of episcopacy may have felt the office did not enjoy scriptural sanction, so that its continuing presence in the reformed Church of England, even at a theoretical level, therefore compromised their case. The dubious conduct of Bishop Sterne of Colchester may have further discredited the office. Sterne was threatened 'to

have his seal taken from him (he ordered so many)...', presumably for profit.[14] As Bishop of London between 1597 and 1604, Richard Bancroft had been in a position to monitor Sterne's government, and it may have been he, who, as Archbishop of Canterbury on Sterne's death in 1608, advised that the suffragan office be finally suppressed.

Footnotes to Chapter Nine

1. Thompson, 'The Pastoral Work of the English and Welsh Bishops 1500-1558', pp.16-9,79,94-5,117-8,165-6.

2. Ibid., p.171.

3. See, for example, F.M. Heal, 'The Bishops of Ely and their diocese during the Reformation period, c.1515-1600' (Cambridge. Ph.D. thesis, 1972), passim; P. Collinson, Archbishop Grindal 1519-1583: the struggle for a reformed Church (1979); more generally, Houlbrooke, 'The Protestant Episcopate 1547-1603', pp.78-98; Collinson, The Religion of Protestants, pp.39-91.

4. Ibid., pp.22-3.

5. Perhaps most concisely and cogently by Collinson, Godly People, pp.166-8.

6. Houlbrooke, 'The Protestant Episcopate 1547-1603', pp.83-4,86.

7. Hooker, Works, iii. pp.379-92. On the disputed authenticity of Book 7 of The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, in which this passage appears, see op. cit., i. p.xxxiii; C. Sydney Carter, Richard Hooker (1947), p.21, contra, DNB, xxvii. p.294.

8. See above pp.150,153,238-42.

9. See, for example, Isaacson, The Life and Death of Lancelot Andrewes, p.50; Henry Burton, A Censure of Simonie (1624), p.73.

10. Collinson, Godly People, pp.154-89.

11. T. Brett, Suffragan Bishops and Rural Deans, ed. J. Fendall (Cambridge, 1858), pp.47-66; E. Marshall, On Suffragan Bishops in England (Oxford, 1892), pp.5-18. One may add to this total the name of William Souch. Stow's Annals contains the following entry: 'In Waymouth and Melcombe Regis in yeere 1605 there was a new Church builded and was consecrated the following yeere 1606 by Doctor

Zowch, suffragan to the L Byshop of Bristoll, who named it Christ Church', a claim confirmed by the parish register. 'Doctor Zowch' was almost certainly William Souch DD, precentor of Salisbury, who died in c.1608. His date of consecration is unknown, but his appointment to Bristol may not be unconnected with the fact that Bishop Thornborough of Bristol resided at York between 1606 and 1609. (John Stow, The Annales or General Chronicle of England (1615), p.910; Hutchins, History and Antiquities...of Dorset, ii. pp.456-8).

12. Sykes, From Sheldon to Secker, p.193.

13. Collinson, Godly People, pp.154-89.

14. Two Biographies of William Bedell, Bishop of Kilmore, p.81. Sterne's numerous ordination certificates are to be found in GL, MS 9535/2, passim.

List of Appendices

I.	The itinerary of Thomas Bilson, Bishop of Winchester, for 1603-1616	pp.336-8
II.	The itinerary of William Barlow, Bishop of Rochester (1605-1608) and of Lincoln (1608-1613)	pp.339-40
III.	The itinerary of Lancelot Andrewes, Bishop of Chichester (1605-1609), of Ely (1609-1619) and of Winchester (1619-1626)	pp.341-50
IV.	The itinerary of James Mountagu, Bishop of Bath & & Wells (1608-1616) and of Winchester (1616-1618)	pp.351-3
V.	The itinerary of John Overall, Bishop of Coventry & Lichfield (1614-1618) and of Norwich (1618-1619)	pp.354-5
VI.	The itinerary of George Montaigne, Bishop of Lincoln, 1617-1621	p.356
VII.	The itinerary of Nicholas Felton, Bishop of Ely, 1619-1626	pp.357-8
VIII.	The composition and acta of Ecclesiastical Commissions in London, 1604-1624	pp.359-61
IX.	'Orders to be observed', issued in Chichester diocese, 1606	p.362
X.	Clerical attendance at visitations and synods in Chichester Archdeaconry 1606-1625	p.363
XI.	Diocesan Administration in Bath & Wells, 1623-1628	pp.364-7
XII.	Bishop Arthur Lake's participation in office jurisdiction, 1617-1625	p.368
XIII.	Bishop Samuel Harsnett's attendance in Chichester consistory, 1610-1619	p.369
XIV.	Bishop George Carleton's attendance in Chichester consistory, 1620-1627	p.370
XV.	Table One. Tabulation of presentments from Wisbech deanery, December 1600 -July 1604 and December 1614 - July 1618.	pp.371-2
	Table Two. Breakdown of presentments for absence from church and profanation of the Sabbath in Wisbech deanery, 1600-1604 and 1614-1618.	p.373

Note: A bishop's itinerary can be usually reconstructed from his episcopal register. For certain bishops, either the register is missing or else it does not disclose where the bishop performed the acts of institution and ordination. Appendices I - VII tries to supply this deficiency. For other episcopal itineraries, see above pp.28,46 fn.15.

Appendix I: The itinerary of Thomas Bilson, Bishop of Winchester, for 1603-1616.

Date	Place	Occasion
1603[1]		
July 25	Westminster Abbey	Coronation of James I
Aug. 13-6	Farnham Castle	Host to James I
Dec. 4, 6	Winchester Castle	Examination of the Main Plotters.
1604[2]		
Jan. 14-6	Hampton Court	The conference
Mar. 19 - July 7	Westminster	Parliament
July 31	Bishop's Waltham	
1605[3]		
Jan. 4	Bishop's Waltham	
April 16, 19	Bishop's Waltham	
Aug. 8	Farnham Castle	Host to James I
Nov. 5-9	Westminster	Parliament
1606[4]		
Jan. 21 - May 27	Westminster	Parliament
Sept. 11-2	Bishop's Waltham	Diocesan High Commission
Oct. 14	Bishop's Waltham	Ibid.
Nov. 6	Bishop's Waltham	Ibid.
Nov. 18 - Dec. 18	Westminster	Parliament
1607[5]		
Jan. 20	Bishop's Waltham	Diocesan High Commission
Feb. 5, 22	Bishop's Waltham	
April 20 - July 4	Westminster	Parliament
July 21	Bishop's Waltham	Diocesan High Commission
Aug. 6	Bishop's Waltham	Ibid.
Aug. 19, 20	Wolvesley	Ibid.
Sept. 8	Winchester Cathedral	Ibid.
Oct. 8	Bishop's Waltham	Ibid.
Nov. 10	Bishop's Waltham	Ibid.
Dec. 8	Bishop's Waltham	Ibid.
1608[6]		
Jan. 14	Bishop's Waltham	Ibid.
Feb. 9	Bishop's Waltham	
Feb. 18	Bishop's Waltham	Diocesan High Commission
1609[7]		
Jan. 16	Bishop's Waltham	
June 16	Bishop's Waltham	
Nov. 29	Bishop's Waltham	
Dec. 27	Bishop's Waltham	
1610[8]		
Mar. 18	Bishop's Waltham	
July 1	Bishop's Waltham	
Aug. 12	Bishop's Waltham	

Date	Place	Occasion
Nov. 2, 13, 29	Bishop's Waltham	
Dec. 24	Bishop's Waltham	
1611[9]		
April 30	Lambeth	High Commission
June 28	Bishop's Waltham	
Aug. 30	Bishop's Waltham	
1612[10]		
July 12	Farnham	On visitation
Dec. 2, 10	Bishop's Waltham	
1613[11]		
May 11, 14	Bishop's Waltham	
Sept. 14	London	
Sept. 18,22-3,25	Lambeth	Court of Delegates
Oct. 25	Bishop's Waltham	
1614[12]		
April 5 - June 7	Westminster	Parliament
1615[13]		
Aug. 21	Farnham Castle	Sworn in as a Privy Councillor.
Sept. 26	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
Oct. 23-4,29,31	Whitehall	Ibid.
Nov. 2,5,12,19,21-2,26,30	Whitehall	Ibid.
Dec. 6,9,17-20,24,31	Whitehall	Ibid.
1616[14]		
Jan. 3,7,16,18,28	Whitehall	Ibid.
Feb. 7,9,15,19-20,22,24-5, 27-8	Whitehall	Ibid.
March 7,11-2,17,19,26,31	Whitehall	Ibid.
April 3,9,12-3,17, 21,26-7,29-30	Whitehall	Ibid.
May 1,7,10,20-4,28	Whitehall & Greewich	Ibid.
June 2,4-7,9,11,15-7	Whitehall & Greenwich	Ibid.
June 18	Westminster	Bilson's death

Footnotes:

1. Progresses of King James, i. p.231,250; HMC, 9 Hatfield House, xv. pp.305-9.
2. Progresses of King James, i. p.311; Lords' Journals, ii. pp.264-344; HMC, 9 Hatfield House, xvi. p.194.
3. HMC, 9 Hatfield House, xvii. pp.5,141; Progresses of King James, ii. p.95; Lords' Journals, ii. pp.355-9.
4. Lords' Journals, ii. pp.360-445,449-68; HRO, C 73 fos. 1r-14v.
5. HRO, C 73 fos. 19r-43v; PRO, SP 14/26/20; Lords' Journals, ii. pp.499-539.
6. HRO, C 73 fos. 47r-51v; HMC, 9 Hatfield House, xx. pp.58-60.
7. PRO, SP 14/43/25, 49/71, 50/91; New College MS 984 pp.37-8.
8. New College MSS 957 p.32 & (from back), p.20, 984 pp.39-46; Bodl., Ballard MS 44 pp.220-1; HRO, A/1/29 fo.32r.
9. PRO, SP 14/63/53; LPL, MS 943 p.55,57.
10. PRO, Stac 8/212/31; New College MS 957 (from back), pp.34-5.
11. HMC, 66 Ancaster, pp.359-60; Howell, State Trials, ii. pp.819,822-9; LPL, MS 943 p.153.
12. Lords' Journals, ii. pp.687-717.
13. Acts of the Privy Council 1615-1616, pp.283,291-363.
14. Acts of the Privy Council 1615-1616, pp.364-618; John Le Neve's Fasti, iii. p.81.

Appendix II: The itinerary of William Barlow, Bishop of Rochester (1605-8) and of Lincoln (1608-13)

Date	Place	Occasion
1605[1]		
June 30	Lambeth Palace	Barlow's consecration as Bishop of Rochester
July 24	Westminster College	
Sept. 26	Rochester	
Sept. 27	West Malling, Kent	On visitation
Nov. 3	Lambeth	Episcopal consecration
Nov. 5-9	Westminster	Parliament
1606[2]		
Jan. 16	Westminster College	
Jan. 21 - May 27	Westminster	Parliament
June 26	Westminster Abbey	Funeral of Princess Sophia
July 20	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
August 9-10	Rochester	Host to James I & Christian IV of Denmark
Sept. 7	Lambeth	Episcopal consecration
Sept. 21	Hampton Court	Preaching to James I & Scottish Presbyterians
Nov. 18 - Dec. 18	Westminster	Parliament
1607[3]		
Feb. 10 - Mar. 31	Westminster	Ibid.
April 24 - July 4	Westminster	Ibid.
July 12	Lambeth	Episcopal consecration.
July 26	Beckenham, Kent	Consecration of Langley chapel
Sept.	Canterbury diocese	On visitation as Bancroft's commissary
1608[4]		
June 27		Barlow's translation to Lincoln
Sept. 1	Lincoln Cathedral	Enthronement
Sept. 30	Buckden Palace, Lincs.	
Nov. 5	Buckden	
1609[5]		
April 1, 24	Buckden	
May 6, 28	Westminster College	
Sept. 19, 25	Buckden	
Nov. 18	Buckden	
1610[6]		
Jan. 22	Buckden	
Feb. 9 - Mar. 29	Westminster	Parliament
May 11	Westminster College	
May 31 - July 23	Westminster	Parliament
August 10	Buckden	
Oct. 22-30	Westminster	Parliament

Date	Place	Occasion
Nov. 1	Fulmer, Bucks.	Consecration of the parish church
Nov. 5 - Dec. 6	Westminster	Parliament
Dec. 9	Westminster College	
1611[7]		
March	London	
April 3	Buckden	
June 7	Buckden	
July 16, 24	Buckden	
Aug. 28 - Sept. 14	Lincoln diocese	On visitation
Sept. 16	Buckden	
Sept. 30	Huntingdon	On visitation
1612[8]		
March 31	Lincoln	
April 1	Buckden	
June 12	Huntingdon	
1613[9]		
Feb. 11	Buckden	
June 13	Buckden	
Sept. 7	Buckden	Barlow's death.

Footnotes:

1. Perceval, An Apology, p.181; PRO, SP 14/15/18; KAO, DRc/R8 fo.197v, DRb/Pwr 19 i. fo.446v; Lords' Journals, ii. pp.355-9.
2. BL, Add.MS 4274 fo.214; Lords' Journals, ii. pp.360-145,449-68; Progresses of King James, ii. pp.52,60,82-93,97; Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum, ed. W. Stubbs (Oxford, 1897), p.113.
3. Lords' Journals, ii. pp.468-539; Perceval, An Apology, p.181; LPL, Reg.Bancroft, fos.223v,226r, VG 4/6 fos.1r-23r; English Orders for Consecrating Churches, pp.1-8.
4. Fasti, ii. p.24; HMC, 78 Hastings, iv. p.196; LAO, Corr/B/2 fo.56.
5. LAO, Add.Reg.3 fos.33r,35r-6v; PRO, SP 14/45/18, 77; HMC, 9 Hatfield House, xxi. p.134; BL, Cotton MS Julius C. III fo.19.
6. HMC, 9 Hatfield House, xxi. p.196; Lords' Journals, ii. pp.548-662, 668-82; PRO, SP 14/54/39; LAO, Add.Reg.I fo.225r; English Orders for Consecrating Churches, pp.9-20; LPL, Tenison MS 663 fo.57r.
7. Letters of Sir Thomas Bodley to Thomas James, ed. G.W. Wheeler (1926), p.207; LAO, Add.Reg.3 fos.1r,2r-3v,8; PRO, SP 14/64/16; LPL, Tenison MS 663 fos.62r,74r.
8. LAO, Add.Reg.3 fo.16v; HMC, 78 Hastings, ii. p.54; BL, Cotton MS Julius C. III fo.20.
9. LAO, Add.Reg.I fos.219v-20r, Add.Reg.2 fo.191v, Add.Reg.3 fo.74v.

Appendix III: The itinerary of Lancelot Andrewes, Bishop of Chichester (1605-09), of Ely (1609-1619) and of Winchester (1619-26)

Date	Place	Occasion
1605[1]		
Nov. 3	Lambeth Palace	Andrewes's consecration as Bishop of Chichester
Nov. 5,9	Westminster	Parliament
Dec. 25	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
1606[2]		
Jan. 21 - Feb. 12	Westminster	Parliament
Feb. 24 - April 14	Westminster	Ibid.
March 21	Creed Lane, London	Diocesan business
April 20	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
April 28 - May 27	Westminster	Parliament
June 6	Creed Lane	Diocesan business
June 8	Greenwich	Preaching to James I
July 19	Greenwich	Diocesan business
July 25	Stepney	Ibid.
Aug. 5	Greenwich	Preaching to James I
Sept. 7	Lambeth	Episcopal Consecration
Sept. 28	Hampton Court	Preaching to James I & Scottish presbyterians
Oct. 26	Hampton Court	Diocesan business
Nov. 5	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
Nov. 9	Whitehall	Diocesan business
Nov. 18 - Dec. 18	Westminster	Parliament
Dec. 25	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
1607[3]		
Feb. 10 - March 30	Westminster	Parliament
March 24	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
April 5	Whitehall	Ibid.
April 6	Creed Lane	Diocesan business
April 20 - May 11	Westminster	Parliament
May 16,20	Westminster	Ibid.
May 24	Greenwich	Preaching to James I
June 9	Creed Lane	Diocesan business
June 11,13,15,18,22,25, 27,30	Westminster	Parliament
July 1-4	Westminster	Ibid.
July 11	Creed Lane	Diocesan business
July 12	Lambeth	Episcopal consecration
Aug. 5	Romsey	Preaching to James I
Oct. 14	Creed Lane	Diocesan business
Oct. 19	Mortlake, Surrey	Ordination
Nov. 5	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
Nov. 17	Creed Lane	Diocesan business
Dec. 25	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
1608[4]		
Feb. 1	Lambeth	High Commission
March 27	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
April 17	Lambeth	Episcopal consecration

Date	Place	Occasion
May 1	Whitehall	Diocesan business
May 5	Greenwich	Ibid.
July 16	Creed Lane	Ibid.
August 5	Holdenby, Northants.	Preaching to James I
August	Oxford	
Oct. 9	Lambeth	Episcopal consecration
Oct. 10,16	Creed Lane	Diocesan business
Nov. 3,17	Creed Lane	Ibid.
1609[5]		
Feb. 2	Creed Lane	Ibid.
April 16	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
May 7	Whitehall	Diocesan business
July 16	Creed Lane	Ibid.
July 28	Rye, Sussex	On visitation
July 29	Hastings	Ibid.
August 1	Lewes	Ibid.
August 21,25	Aldingbourne manor	Diocesan business
Sept. 12	Creed Lane	Ordination
Oct. 2	Mortlake	Diocesan business
Nov. 5	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
Nov. 6		Andrewes's translation to Ely
Dec. 3	Lambeth	Episcopal consecration
Dec. 25	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
1610[6]		
Feb. 9	Westminster	Parliament
March 26	Westminster	Ibid.
April 8	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
May 27	Whitehall	Ibid.
June 4	Westminster	Parliament
July 23	Westminster	Ibid.
August 5	Holdenby	Preaching to James I
Oct. 16	Westminster	Parliament
Oct. 21	London House	Consecration of three Scottish bishops
Oct. 25,30	Westminster	Parliament
Nov. 5-6,13,17,20	Westminster	Ibid.
Dec. 6	Westminster	Ibid.
Dec. 25	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
1611[7]		
March 24	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
May 12	Windsor	Ibid.
May 23	Whitehall	Legal Conference
June 9	Lambeth	Episcopal consecration
July 3	London	
July 17-8	Cambridge	Visit of Isaac Casaubon
July 18 - August 6	Ely	
August 6-7	Downham	
August 7-10	Wisbech	
August 10-29	Downham	
Sept. 22	Downham	Ordination
Oct. 19-21	Royston	To confer with James I

Date	Place	Occasion
Nov. 14-5	Royston	Ibid.
Dec. 2-3	Royston	Ibid.
Dec. 25	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
1612[8]		
April 12	Whitehall	Ibid.
May 28	Christ Church, Newgate Street	Funeral of Sir Thomas Sutton
May 31	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
July 12	Creed Lane	Court of Delegates
July 27	Downham	
August 23	Downham	
Sept. 8	Downham	
Sept. 20	Downham	Ordination
Nov. 5	Whitehall	Preaching
Dec. 7	Westminster Abbey	Funeral of Prince Henry
Dec. 25	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
1613[9]		
Feb. 24	Ely House, Holborn	
April 13	Greenwich	Preaching to James I
April 18	Whitehall	Ibid.
May 23	Whitehall	Ibid.
June - July	Lambeth	Court of Delegates
June 18	Lambeth	High Commission
June 26	Lambeth	Overseer of Sutton's will
July 30	Charterhouse Hospital	Meeting of Governors
Sept. 19	Downham	Ordination
Sept. 22-3,25	Lambeth	Court of Delegates
Nov. 5	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
Dec. 25	Whitehall	Ibid.
1614[10]		
March 20	Ely House	Ordination
April 5-8	Westminster	Parliament
April 24	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
May 3,5	Westminster	Parliament
May 9 - June 7	Westminster	Ibid.
June 12	Greenwich	Preaching to James I
June 31	Lambeth	High Commission
July 7	Lambeth	Ibid.
August 5	Burley, Leics.	Preaching to James I
Sept. 25	Downham	Ordination
Nov. 5	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
Nov. 29	Ely House	Diocesan business
Dec. 18	Ely House	Ordination
Dec. 19	Lambeth	High Commission
Dec. 25	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
1615[11]		
March	Cambridge	Royal visit
April 9	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
May 24	Ely House	
May 28	Greenwich	Preaching to James I
June 3,12	Ely House	Diocesan business

Date	Place	Occasion
July 9	Lambeth	Episcopal consecration
July 13	Ely House	
August 5	Salisbury Cathedral	Preaching to James I
Oct. 24	Ely	Diocesan business
Nov. 5	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
Dec. 3	Lambeth	Episcopal consecration
Dec. 25	Whitehall	Preaching
1616[12]		
Feb. 25	Ely House	Ordination
March 31	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
May 19	Greenwich	Ibid.
June 6	Lambeth	High Commission
August 5	Burley	Preaching to James I
Sept. 2	Downham	Ordination
Sept. 29	Whitehall	Sworn in as a Privy Councillor
Sept. 30	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
Oct 1,2,4,6-7,11,13-4,16, 18	Whitehall	Ibid.
Oct. 20	Ely House	
Oct. 23-5,30-1	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
Nov. 3	Whitehall	Ibid.
Nov. 5	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
Nov. 6,8,10-3,15,18,20,22	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
Nov. 24	Lambeth	High Commission
Nov. 26-7,30	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
Dec. 8	Lambeth	Episcopal consecration
Dec. 9,13,15-8,22	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
Dec. 25	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
Dec. 29-30	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
1617[13]		
Jan. 3-4,9-10,12,15,22-3, 26-9,31	Whitehall	Ibid.
Feb. 2,4,9-12,14-6,18,20-3	Whitehall	Ibid.
Feb. 24	Greenwich	Attended the consecration of East Greenwich Chapel
Feb. 25-7,29	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
March 5,7,9,11-4	Whitehall	Ibid.
March 16	Theobalds	Ibid.
March 20,24,31	Whitehall	Ibid.
April - Sept.	To Scotland	Royal Progress
Sept. 24,28-30	Hampton Court	Privy Council meeting
Oct. 8,10,12,14-5,17,19, 22,29-31	Whitehall	Ibid.
Nov. 2	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
Nov. 5	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
Nov. 10,14,16,19-21,23-4, 26-7,30	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
Dec. 4-5,7,10	Whitehall	Ibid.
Dec. 14	Lambeth	Episcopal consecration
Dec. 15,27	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting

Date	Place	Occasion
1618[14]		
Jan. 7,8,11,13	Whitehall	Ibid.
Jan. 13	Lambeth	High Commission
Jan. 14-5,18,24-5,28,30-1	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
Feb. 1,6,8,11-2,	Whitehall	Ibid.
Feb. 13	Westminster	Ibid.
Feb. 15,18,20,22-3,27	Whitehall	Ibid.
March 1	Ely House	Ordination
March 4-5,8,13,15,17,20-2, 27,29,31	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
April 5	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
April 7,13,19,25-6	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
May 1,6,8,10,13,15,17	Whitehall	Ibid.
May 24	Greenwich	Preaching to James I
May 25	Greenwich	Privy Council meeting
May 26,28	Whitehall	Ibid.
May 31	Greenwich	Ibid.
June 4	Whitehall	Ibid.
June 7	Greenwich	Ibid.
June 8,10,12	Whitehall	Ibid.
June 14	Greenwich	Ibid.
June 15,17	Whitehall	Ibid.
June 18	Lambeth	High Commission
June 19	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
June 21,24	Greenwich	Ibid.
June 26	Whitehall	Ibid.
June 28	Greenwich	Ibid.
July 10,13,17,19-20,23	Whitehall	Ibid.
Sept. 5	Whitehall	Ibid.
Sept. 6	Windsor	Ibid.
Sept. 16	Ely House	Diocesan business
Sept. 24-5,27-9	Hampton Court	Privy Council meeting
Oct. 5-6,11,14,16	Whitehall	Ibid.
Oct. 16	Ely House	Diocesan business
Oct. 18,21,23,27,31	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
Nov. 5	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
Nov. 8,11,13,15,18,20,22, 24-8,30	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
Dec. 6,10,13-4,20-1	Whitehall	Ibid.
Dec. 25	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
Dec. 27,31	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
1619[15]		
Jan. 1	Whitehall	Sworn in as Dean of Chapel Royal
Jan. 5-6,9-11,14-5,20,25, 27,29,31	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
Feb. 7	Whitehall	Ibid.
Feb. 10	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
Feb. 14-6,23,25	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
Feb. 25		Andrewes's translation to Winchester
Feb. 28	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
March 5,7,9-10,12,14,16-7, 21,23	Whitehall	Ibid.

Date	Place	Occasion
March 26-7	Royston	
March 28	Royston	Preaching to James I
April 10	Royston	
April 18,21-3	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
April 25	Theobalds	Ibid.
April 28,30	Whitehall	Ibid.
May 5,7	Whitehall	Ibid.
May 9	Theobalds	Ibid.
May 13	Westminster Abbey	Funeral of Queen Anne
May 16	Greenwich	Preaching to James I
May 17-8,23	Greenwich	Privy Council meeting
May 25	Whitehall	Ibid.
June 24,27	Greenwich	Ibid.
June 29-30	Whitehall	Ibid.
July 2,16,18-9,21-2,25, 27,31	Whitehall	Ibid.
August 2,5-6,11,24,30	Whitehall	Ibid.
Sept. 24	Whitehall	Ibid.
Sept. 27	Hampton Court	Ibid.
Sept. 28,30	Whitehall	Ibid.
Oct. 8,10,13,15,20,22,25, 27,31	Whitehall	Ibid.
Nov. 2,4,6,10,12,17,19,24, 26,29	Whitehall	Ibid.
Dec. 1-2,6	Whitehall	Ibid.
Dec. 25	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
Dec. 29	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
1620[16]		
Jan. 4,7,10	Whitehall	Ibid.
Jan. 13	Winchester House, Southwark	Court of Delegates
Jan. 18,26,28	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
Feb. 4,11	Whitehall	Ibid.
March 5,7,14,18,21-2	Whitehall	Ibid.
March 26	St Paul's Cathedral	
April 4,11	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
April 16	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
May 10,12-3,15,17,29,31	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
June 4	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
June 10	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
July 1	Durham House, London	Court of Delegates
July 10,12-3,17,20-1,23	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
August 20	Whitehall	Ibid.
August 31	Farnham	Host to James I
Sept. 17	Southampton	Consecrating Jesus Chapel
Oct. 13,25,27,31	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
Nov. 3,10,15-7	Whitehall	Ibid.
Nov. 21	Winchester House	
Nov. 22	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
Dec. 1	Winchester House	Court of Delegates
Dec. 25	Whitehall	Preaching to James I

Date	Place	Occasion
1621[17]		
Jan. 30	Westminster	Preaching at the opening of Parliament
Feb. 3-6	Westminster	Parliament
Feb. 7	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
Feb. 12,14	Westminster	Parliament
Feb. 14	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
Feb. 16 - March 5	Westminster	Parliament
March 5	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
March 6 - 22	Westminster	Parliament
April 1	Whitehall	Preaching to the King
April 2	Whitehall	
April 17 - 30	Westminster	Parliament
April 30	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
May 2 - May 15	Westminster	Parliament
May 15	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
May 16-7	Westminster	Parliament
May 20	Greenwich	Preaching to James I
May 24 - June 4	Westminster	Parliament
June 13,16,30	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
July 10,16	Whitehall	Ibid.
July 12	Lambeth	High Commission
July 17	Theobalds	Privy Council meeting
July 18,20,23-4	Whitehall	Ibid.
July 27	to Farnham	
Sept. 26-9	Hampton Court	Privy Council meeting
Oct. 10	Whitehall	Ibid.
Oct. 15	Winchester House	Court of Delegates
Oct. 22	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
Oct. 30	Winchester House	Court of Delegates
Nov. 20-8	Westminster	Parliament
Dec. 5	Westminster	Ibid.
1622[18]		
March 6	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
March 15,18-9,26,29	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
March 30	Lambeth	High Commission
March 31	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
April 5-6,12,16,19,20	Whitehall	Ibid.
April 21	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
April 23	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
May 22	Lambeth	
May 27-9,31	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
June 6-7,13,22,24,26-8	Whitehall	Ibid.
June 30	Nonsuch	Ibid.
July 3,5,11,15-7,23	Whitehall	Ibid.
August 5	Windsor	Preaching to James I
August 10-5	Farnham	Host to James I
Sept. 30	Hampton Court	Privy Council meeting
Nov. 7	Theobalds	Ibid.
Dec. 18,21	Whitehall	Ibid.
Dec. 25	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
1623[19]		
Jan. 29	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting

Date	Place	Occasion
Feb. 13	Lambeth	High Commission
Feb. 26	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
March 22	Lambeth	Episcopal consecration
April 8	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
April 13	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
April 28-30	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
May 16	Whitehall	Ibid.
June 11	Whitehall	Ibid.
June 26-7	Winchester House	Diocesan business
July 1	Winchester House	Ibid.
July 20	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
Nov. 3,29	Whitehall	Ibid.
Dec. 11	Winchester House	Diocesan business
Dec. 25	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
Dec. 29-30	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
1624[20]		
Jan. 3	Whitehall	Ibid.
Feb. 11	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
Feb. 19 - 28	Westminster	Parliament
March 8 - 17,22-5	Westminster	Ibid.
March 28	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
April 1-2,5-12,15-22	Westminster	Parliament
June 2	Winchester House	Diocesan business
June 13	Greenwich	Privy Council meeting
July 26	Bishop's Waltham	Diocesan business
August 6	Bishop's Waltham	
Oct. 24	London	
Dec. 25	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
1625[21]		
Feb. 18,23	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
April 8-9,29	Whitehall	Ibid.
May 1,5	Whitehall	Ibid.
May 14	Winchester House	Diocesan business
May 31	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
June 6	Winchester House	Diocesan business
June 6	Bromley	Visiting the Bishop of Rochester
June 8	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
June 18 - 28	Westminster	Parliament
June 29	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
June 30 - July 11	Westminster	Parliament
July 11	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
Oct. 21	Bishop's Waltham	Diocesan business
Nov. 4	Bishop's Waltham	
Dec. 8	Bishop's Waltham	
Dec. 24	Hampton Court	Privy Council meeting
1626[22]		
Jan. 16	Winchester House	
Jan. 31	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
Feb. 2	Westminster Abbey	Coronation of Charles I
Feb. 6-9	Westminster	Parliament
March 31	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting

Date	Place	Occasion
April 10	Whitehall	Ibid.
April 17-25	Westminster	Parliament
June 13	Westminster	Ibid.
Sept. 25	Winchester House	Andrewes's death

Footnotes:

1. Perceval, An Apology, p.181; Lords' Journals, ii. pp.355-7; Andrewes, Works, xi. p.lxiii.
2. Lords' Journals, ii. pp.360-72,379-413,417-444,449-67; WSRO, Ep.I/1/8 fos.46,53r; Andrewes, Works, xi. pp.lxiii-iv; Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum, p.113.
3. Lords' Journals, ii. pp.468-97,499-508,510,522-4,526,528-30,532,534-8; Andrewes, Works, xi. pp.lxiv-v; WSRO, Ep.I/1/8 fos.46v-8r,54r; Perceval, An Apology, p.181.
4. George Blackwell, A Large Examination taken at Lambeth according to his Maiesties direction, point by point, of Mr. George Blackwell made Arch-priest of England by Pope Clement 8 (1607/8), sig.a2iiv; Andrewes, Works, xi. p.lxv; Perceval, An Apology, p.181; WSRO, Ep.I/1/8 fos.48r-9r,53; Letters of Sir Thomas Bodley, p.180.
5. WSRO, Ep.I/1/8 fos.49-50,53v-4r, Ep.II/11/2 fos.18v,21r,23v, Cap.I/27/2 fo.59r; Andrewes, Works, xi. p.lxv; Perceval, An Apology, p.181.
6. Lords' Journals, ii. pp.548,572,607,657,666,670,672-4,677,679,682; Andrewes, Works, xi. pp.lxv-vi; Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum, p.114.
7. Andrewes, Works, xi. p.lxvi; BL, Add.MS 28843 fo.329r; Perceval, An Apology, p.182; Casaubon, Ephemerides, ii. pp.850,854-77,895-7,902; CUL, MS Mm 1.39 p.146.
8. Andrewes, Works, xi. pp.xliv-v,lxvii; Philip Bearcroft, An Historical Account of Thomas Sutton Esq., and of his Foundation in Charter-house (1737), pp.111-3; PRO, DEL 4/5 fo.228v, SP 14/70/15; CUL, MS Mm 1.39 p.146; Progresses of King James, ii. p.498.
9. PRO, SP 14/72/42; Andrewes, Works, xi. pp.lxvii-viii; Howell, State Trials, ii. pp.822-9; HMC, 66 Ancaster, p.367; Bearcroft, op.cit., pp.120,155; CUL, MS Mm 1.39 p.146.
10. Lords' Journals, ii. pp.687-8,697-8,700-16; Borth., Precedent Book ii. pp.24,217-8; Andrewes, Works, xi. p.lxviii; PRO, Stac 8/209/26, SP 14/78/78; CUL, MS Mm 1.39 p.146.
11. Progresses of King James, iii. p.56; Andrewes, Works, xi. p.lxviii; PRO, SP 14/80/107; Borth., Precedent Book ii. pp.22-3; Perceval, An Apology, p.182; BL, Harl.MS 5011 fo.18; CUL, EDC 2/6/1 fos.200r-1r.
12. CUL, MS Mm 1.39 pp.146-7; Andrewes, Works, xi. pp.lxviii-ix; PRO, SP 14/87/47, 88/137; Acts of the Privy Council 1616-1617, pp.29-107; Borth., Precedent Book ii. pp.76-9; Perceval, An Apology, p.183.
13. Acts of the Privy Council 1616-1617, pp.108-202,329-416; Borth., Precedent Book ii. p.349; Progresses of King James, iii. pp.254,257,389-90; Andrewes, Works, xi. p.lxx; Perceval, An Apology, p.183.
14. Acts of the Privy Council 1617-1619, pp.3-220,248-338; Bodl., Ashmole MS 826 p.226; CUL, MS Mm 1.39 p.147, EDC 2/6/1 fo.213v; Andrewes, Works, xi. p.lxx; LPL, MS 691 fos.24v-5r; GDR 27A pp.435-7.
15. The Old Cheque Book, p.126; Acts of the Privy Council 1617-1619, pp.339-409,421-60,482-93; Andrewes, Works, xi. pp.lxx-xxi; LPL, Reg.Abbot i. fo.385r; Chamberlain, Letters, ii. pp.225,227; Progresses of King James,

iii. p.538; Acts of the Privy Council 1619-1621, pp.2-88,97.

16. Acts of the Privy Council 1619-1621, pp.102-28,149-214,220,245-64, 276, 288-316; PRO, DEL 4/8 fos.78v,150v,194v, SP 84/98/71; Progresses of King James, iv. p.600,616; Andrewes, Works, xi. pp.lv,lxxi.
17. Andrewes, Works, xi. p.lxxi; Lords' Journals, iii. pp.8-11,15-6,19-60,74-125,129-55,162-73,181; Acts of the Privy Council 1619-1621, pp.341,353,360,377,385,394-7,410; PRO, SP 84/100/135; Acts of the Privy Council 1621-1623, pp.7-25,51-7,70; Chamberlain, Letters, ii. p.394.
18. Andrewes, Works, xi. pp.lvi,lxxi-ii; Acts of the Privy Council 1621-1623, pp.162-201,229-94,326,352,369,373; Neile, M.Ant.De.Dnis. Arch-Bishop of Spalato, p.79; PRO, SP 14/130/106.
19. Acts of the Privy Council 1621-1623, pp.397,463,472-7,495; PRO, SP 14/138/31; Andrewes, Works, xi. p.lxxii; Perceval, An Apology, p.184; Acts of the Privy Council 1623-1625, pp.5,64,109,127,158-9; Borth., Precedent Book ii. pp.374-7,403-4.
20. Acts of the Privy Council 1623-1625, pp.165,237,336; Andrewes, Works, xi. p.lxxii; Lords' Journals, iii. pp.208-35,249-64,272-81,283,285,288-98,304-15; Borth., Precedent Book ii. p.403; BL, Sloane MS 118 fo.29.
21. Acts of the Privy Council 1623-1625, pp.471-80; Acts of the Privy Council 1625-1626 (1934), pp.21-2,34,40-6,83,94,108,118,283; Borth., Precedent Book ii. pp.391-3,398; Laud, Works, iii. p.163; Lords' Journals, iii. pp.435-63; PRO, SP 16/9/23, 11/35.
22. Andrewes, Works, xi. p.xcv fn.a; Acts of the Privy Council 1625-1626, pp.334,403,419; Welsby, Lancelot Andrewes, pp.257,259; Lords' Journals, iii. pp.492-5,556-71,675.

Appendix IV: The itinerary of James Mountagu, Bishop of Bath & Wells (1608-1616) and of Winchester (1616-1618)

Date	Place	Occasion
1608[1]		
April 17	Lambeth Palace	Mountagu's consecration as Bishop of Bath & Wells
April 28	Whitehall	
August 15,18,28	Wells	
Sept. 14	Wells	
Oct. 9	Lambeth	Episcopal consecration
Oct. 24	Newmarket	
1609[2]		
April 16	Whitehall	Preaching to the royal household
July 5	Yeovil, Somerset	On visitation
Sept. 24	Wells*	Ordination
Sept. 27	travelling to London	
Oct. 15	Royston	
Dec. 9	Royston	
1610[3]		
Feb. 9 - April 21	Westminster	Parliament
May 14-5	Westminster	Parliament
May 30 - June 7	Westminster	Parliament
June 21 - July 23	Westminster	Parliament
Sept. 11	Wells Palace	Court of Audience
Sept. 23	Wells*	Ordination
Oct. 16-8	Westminster	Parliament
Oct. 21	London House	Consecration of three Scottish bishops
Nov. 5-15	Westminster	Parliament
Dec. 9	Royston	
Dec. 21	London	
1611[4]		
Jan. 27	Whitehall	Service in Chapel Royal
March 22	Whitehall	Confirmation of Princess Elizabeth
April 8,14	Royston	
May 23	Whitehall	Legal Conference
June 9	Lambeth	Episcopal consecration
Sept. 22	Wells*	Ordination
Nov. 19,22	Newmarket	
Dec. 5, 16	Royston	
1612[5]		
July 7	Wells Cathedral	Consistory court
August 17	Banwell, Somerset	Court of Audience
Sept. 20	Wells*	Ordination
Dec. 9,11	Royston	
1613[6]		
Jan. 5	London	

Date	Place	Occasion
Jan. 20,28	Newmarket	
Jan. 31	Whitehall	Service in Chapel Royal
Feb. 2	Whitehall	Ibid.
Feb. 14	Whitehall	Marriage of Princess Elizabeth & Elector Palatine
Feb. 18	Lambeth	High Commission
Feb. 24	to Royston	
March 3	Cambridge	Royal visit
April 5	Whitehall	Confirmation of Prince Charles
June 4	Bath	Court of Audience
June 6	Bristol	Attending Queen Anne
June 17-8,22-3	Lambeth	High Commission
August 3	Wells	Court of Audience
August 20	Wells	Attending Queen Anne
August 30	Wells Cathedral	Preaching on visitation
Sept. 2	Wells	
Sept. 19	Wells*	Ordination
Dec. 24	Lambeth	
Dec. 26	Whitehall	Service in Chapel Royal
1614[7]		
Feb. 12	Royston	
Feb. 19	Newmarket	
Feb. 24	Royston	
April 3	Lambeth	Episcopal consecration
April 7 - June 7	Westminster	Parliament
June 31	Lambeth	High Commission
July 7	Lambeth	Ibid.
Aug. 9,13,15	Wells Palace	Courts of Audience
Sept. 6,10,13	Wells Palace	Ibid.
Sept. 18	Wells*	Ordination
1615[8]		
Sept. 24	Wells*	Ordination
1616[9]		
July 2	Oatlands, Surrey	
August 24	Wells	Court of Audience
Sept. 9	Wells	
Sept. 19	Wells*	Ordination
Oct. 4		Mountagu's translation to Winchester
Dec. 25	Whitehall	Preaching to the King
1617[10]		
Jan. 20	Whitehall	
March 13	Whitehall	Service in Chapel Royal
March 15 - Sept.	to Scotland	Royal Progress
Sept. 30	Hampton Court	Sworn in as a Privy Councillor
Oct. 31	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
Nov. 1-2,4,9	Whitehall	Ibid.
Nov. 11	Winchester House, Southwark.	Banquet to celebrate its repair

Date	Place	Occasion
Dec. 20-1	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
Dec. 25	Whitehall	Preaching in the Chapel Royal
Dec. 27,30	Whitehall	Privy Council meeting
1618[11]		
Jan. 4,7,8	Whitehall	Ibid.
Feb. 1	Newmarket	Ibid.
Feb. 15,22-4,27	Whitehall	Ibid.
March 1	Whitehall	Ibid.
July 21	Winchester House	Mountagu's death

* There is no prima facie evidence to indicate where Mountagu held his ordination services in September each year. That he ordained ministers in his diocese is consistent both with the external evidence of his itinerary and with the practice of other Court bishops.

Footnotes:

1. Perceval, An Apology, p.181; BL, Lansdowne MS 90 fo.169, Add.MS 5496 fos.18r,33r; PRO, SP 14/35/58; LPL, Fairhurst MS 2004 fo.90r; HMC, 9 Hatfield House, xx. p.260.
2. PRO, SP 14/44/75; SRO, D/D/Ca 158 fo.324r, D/D/Vc 37 fo.13v; Bodl., Carte MS 74 fos.335,337; HMC, 9 Hatfield House, xxi. pp.143-4.
3. Lords' Journals, ii. pp.548-581,593-4,603-8,618-57,666-7,673-8; SRO, D/D/Ca 163 fo.139, D/D/Vc 37 fo.31r; Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum, p.114; Casaubon, Ephemerides, ii. pp.800,803.
4. The Old Cheque Book, pp.152-3,172; BL, Burney MS 365 fos.229v,231v,233r,235r,236r, Add.MS 28843 fo.329r; Perceval, An Apology, p.182; SRO, D/D/Vc 37 fo.27v, D/D/0 ii. (unfoliated).
5. SRO, D/D/Ca 172 fos.150v-5v, 171 fos.266r-7r, D/D/Vc 37 fo.38v, D/D/0 ii. (unfoliated); Bodl., Carte MS 74 fo.337, Tanner MS 74 fo.13.
6. HMC, 45 Buccleuch-Whitehall, i. pp.239,244, 78 Hastings, ii. p.54, 66 Ancaster, pp.364-7; BL, Burney MS 365 fo.238r; Chamberlain, Letters, i. pp.416,495; The Old Cheque Book, pp.161-6,172-3; Registrum Vagum, ii. pp.338-9; Progresses of King James, ii. pp.646,674, iv. p.1088; SRO, D/D/Ca 174 fos.272r,305v,309v, D/D/Vc 37 fo.18r; Bodl., Carte MS 74 fo.383; Howell, State Trials, ii. p.826.
7. SRO, D/D/0 ii. (unfoliated), D/D/Ca 184 fo.167r, 185 fos.223v-4r,226r, 229,233r,235r-6v, D/D/Vc 37 fo.38r; Bodl., Carte MS 74 fo.326; Perceval, An Apology, p.182; Lords' Journals, ii. pp.688-716; PRO, Stac 8/209/26.
8. SRO, D/D/Vc 37 fo.11v.
9. Bodl., Carte MS 74 fos.361,402; SRO, D/D/Ca 201 fo.14v, D/D/Vc 37 fo.15r; PRO, SP 14/90/8.
10. SRO, D/D/0 ii. (unfoliated); Progresses of King James, iii. pp.245,254 fn.4,257,389-90; Acts of the Privy Council 1616-1617, pp.335-6,359 362,366,409,412,416,418; Camden, 'Annals', p.648; Chamberlain, Letters, ii. p.47.
11. Acts of the Privy Council 1617-1619, pp.1,3,6,30,41,48-50,57; HMC, 45 Buccleuch-Whitehall, i. p.253.

Appendix V: The itinerary of John Overall, Bishop of Coventry & Lichfield (1614-1618) and of Norwich (1618-1619).

Date	Place	Occasion
1614[1]		
April 3	Lambeth Palace	Overall's consecration as Bishop of Coventry & Lichfield
April 5,8,11,15-6,19	Westminster	Parliament
May 2,28-31	Westminster	Ibid.
June 4,6-7	Westminster	Ibid.
Aug. 30 - Sept. 22	Coventry & Lichfield diocese	On visitation
Dec. 19	Lambeth	High Commission
1615[2]		
July 9	Lambeth	Episcopal consecration
1616[3]		
June 16	Lambeth	High Commission
July 7	Lambeth	Episcopal consecration
July 27	London	
Nov. 24	Lambeth	High Commission
Dec. 8	Lamberh	Episcopal consecration
1617[4]		
April 13	London	
May 22	Lambeth	High Commission
June 20	London	
Sept.	Coventry & Lichfield diocese	On visitation
Sept. 25	London	
Dec. 14	Lambeth	Episcopal consecration
1618[5]		
Jan. 13	Lambeth	High Commission
April 19	Lambeth	Episcopal consecration
May	London	
July 12	Lambeth	Episcopal consecration
Aug. 7	London	
Sept. 30		Overall's translation to Norwich
1619[6]		
April 4,16	Norwich	
May 12	Norwich	Overall's death

Footnotes:

1. Perceval, An Apology, p.182; Lords' Journals, ii. pp.687-96,709-16; LJRO, B/V/1/28; PRO, SP 14/78/78.
2. Perceval, An Apology, p.182.
3. PRO, SP 14/87/47, 88/137; Perceval, An Apology, pp.182-3; Praestantium ac Eruditorum Virorum Epistolae (Amsterdam, 1684), p.475.
4. Cosin, Correspondence, i. pp.2-3; PRO, SP 14/92/38; Praestantium, pp.484-6; LJRO, B/A/4/17 (unfoliated: 5 - 22 Sept. 1617); Perceval, An Apology, p.183.
5. Bodl., Ashmole MS 826 p.226; Perceval, An Apology, p.183; Cosin, Correspondence, i. pp.3-6; Fasti, ii. p.471.
6. PRO, SP 14/108/30,46; Fasti, ii. p.471.

Appendix VI: The itinerary of George Montaigne, Bishop of Lincoln, 1617-1621

Date	Place	Occasion
1617[1]		
Dec. 14	Lambeth Palace	**Montaigne's consecration as Bishop of Lincoln**
1618[2]		
Jan. 13	Lambeth	High Commission
April 19	Lambeth	Episcopal consecration
June 20	Westminster	
July 12	Lambeth	Episcopal consecration
Sept. 19,22	Lincoln diocese	On visitation
Sept. 24	Boston	
Sept. 25,28	Lincoln diocese	On visitation
1619[3]		
Feb. 20	Buckden Palace,Lincs.	
October	Buckden	Host to James I
1620[4]		
March 26	St.Paul's Cathedral	
June 4	Whitehall	Preaching to James I
July 9	Lambeth	Episcopal consecration
1621[5]		
Jan. 30 - March 5	Westminster	Parliament
March 8,12,15-6,19-22, 26-7	Westminster	Ibid.
April 30	Westminster	Ibid.
May 2-18	Westminster	Ibid.
July 12	Lambeth	High Commission
July 20		**Montaigne's translation to London**

Footnotes:

1. Perceval, An Apology, p.183.
2. Bodl., Ashmole MS 826 p.226; Perceval, An Apology, p.183; LAO, Add.Reg.3 fo.82v,86; PRO, SP 14/99/67.
3. HMC, 78 Hastings, iv. p.202; Camden, 'Annals', p.652.
4. Progresses of King James, iv. p.600; Camden, 'Annals', p.654; Perceval, An Apology, p.183.
5. Lords' Journals, iii. pp.7-36,38,41,44,47,50-63,68,73,97,103-27; Acts of the Privy Council 1621-1623, pp.10-1; Court & Times of James the First, ii. p.267.

Appendix VII: The itinerary of Nicholas Felton, Bishop of Ely 1619-1626

Date	Place	Occasion
1619[1]		
March 11		Translation to Ely
May 13	Westminster Abbey	Funeral of Queen Anne
Sept. 22-3	Ely Palace	Sewers' commission
Oct. 13-4	Cambridge	Ibid.
1620[2]		
Feb. 16	Doctors' Commons, London	Court of Delegates
March 26	St Paul's Cathedral	
July 8	Doctors' Commons	Court of Delegates
July 9	Lambeth Palace	Episcopal consecration
Sept. 22-3,28	Ely	Sewers' commission
1621[3]		
Jan. 30	Westminster	Parliament
Feb. 3,6,10,14-6,19,21-3		
26-7	Westminster	Ibid.
March 1,5-6,8,10,12,15-22		
27	Westminster	Ibid.
April 17-24,26-30	Westminster	Ibid.
May 2-9	Westminster	Ibid.
May 24 - June 4	Westminster	Ibid.
Nov. 11,18	Fulham House	Episcopal consecrations
Nov. 20 - Dec. 18	Westminster	Parliament
1622[4]		
May 16	Lambeth	High Commission
May 22	Lambeth	
1624[5]		
Feb. 19-24	Westminster	Parliament
March 1-3,8-17,23-5	Westminster	Ibid.
April 1,3,6-8,12-5	Westminster	Ibid.
1625[6]		
June 20 - July 11	Westminster	Ibid.
Aug. 1-12	Oxford	Ibid.
1626[7]		
Feb. 6,11,27-8	Westminster	Ibid.
March 1,6-8,13-6,20-31	Westminster	Ibid.
April 17-29	Westminster	Ibid.
May 1-2,6-11,15-26	Westminster	Ibid.
June 2-14	Westminster	Ibid.
Oct. 6	London	Felton's death

Footnotes:

1. Fasti, i. p.343; Progresses of King James, iii. p.538; CUL, UA T/xii/3 pp.39,45. I owe the last reference to Clive Holmes.
2. PRO, DEL 5/6 m.69,85; Progresses of King James, iv. p.600; Perceval, An Apology, p.183; CUL, UA T/xii/3 pp.74,78.
3. Lords' Journals, iii. pp.7-117,129-98; Perceval, An Apology, p.183.
4. PRO, SP 14/130/87,106.
5. Lords' Journals, iii. pp.208-304.
6. Ibid., pp.437-88.
7. Ibid., pp.492-7,507-44,556-679; Fasti, i. p.343.

Appendix VIII: The composition and acta of Ecclesiastical Commissions in London, 1604-1624

Date	Acta	Episcopal attendance
1604[1]		
April 13	Licence granted for temporary release of Francis Barneby	Bancroft
1607[2]		
July 8	Examination of the Archpriest, William Blackwell	Bancroft
1608[3]		
Feb. 1	Ibid.	Andrewes,Bancroft,Ravis
1609[4]		
July 10	Deprivation of Robert Baker,vicar of Chrishall,London diocese,for scandalous behaviour	Ravis
1611[5]		
April 30	Declaration on Jesuits and seminary priests	Abbot,Bilson
Nov. 11	Suspension of Peter Smith,vicar of Alciston,Chichester diocese,for ignorance and negligence	Abbot,King
1612[6]		
May 7	Deprivation and degradation of Nathaniel Tattersall,vicar of Oswestry,S.Asaph diocese, for scandalous behaviour	Abbot,Buckeridge,King, Neile
1613[7]		
Feb. 18	Deprivation of William Johnson, vicar of S.Clement's,Ipswich, Norwich diocese,for adultery and drunkenness	Abbot,Buckeridge,King, Mountagu
June 14	Examination of John Cotton,a recusant	Abbot,King,Neile
June 17,22	Ibid.	Abbot,King,Mountagu,Neile
June 18	Ibid.	Abbot,Andrewes,King, Mountagu,Neile
June 23	Ibid.	Abbot,Mountagu,Neile
July 20	Ibid.	Abbot,Neile
July 22	Ibid.	Abbot
1614[8]		
June 31	Examination of Meredith Mady, rector of Blagdon,Bath & Wells diocese,for adultery and incest	Andrewes,Buckeridge, Mountagu,Neile
July 7	Ibid.	Abbot,Andrewes, Buckeridge,Mountagu, Neile

Date	Acta	Episcopal attendance
Dec. 19	Deprivation of Edmund Peacham, rector of Hinton S.George,Bath & Wells diocese,for libel	Abbot,Andrewes,Neile, Overall
1616[9]		
June 6	Deprivation of Thomas Bold,rector of Winwick,Chester diocese,for simony	Andrewes,Buckeridge, King,Overall
Nov. 24	Deprivation & degradation of Robert Pilkington,vicar of Harpford,Exeter diocese,for drunkenness & bad company	Abbot,Andrewes, Buckeridge,King,Overall
1617[10]		
May 22	Deprivation of Meredith Mady for negligent and scandalous conduct	Abbot,Buckeridge,Cotton King,Overall
1618[11]		
Jan. 13	Examination of Catholic priests	Andrewes,Buckeridge, Felton,King,Montaigne, Overall
June 18	Deprivation & degradation of Anthony Lapthorne,rector of Minchinhampton, Gloucester diocese, for nonconformity	Abbot,Andrewes,King
1619[12]		
April 29	Deprivation of John Eaton,vicar of Wickham Market,Norwich diocese, for doctrinal errors	Buckeridge,King,Morton
1621[13]		
July 12	Examination of Bishop Bayley of Bangor	Abbot,Andrewes,Montaigne, Neile,Williams
1622[14]		
March 30	Examination of the Archbishop of Spalato	Abbot,Andrewes,Montaigne, Neile,Williams
May 16	Deprivation of John Arwyn,vicar of Bethersden,Canterbury diocese,for drunkenness	Abbot,Felton
1623[15]		
Feb. 13	Deprivation & degradation of John Newton,curate of Stock,London diocese,for nonconformity	Abbot,Andrewes,Carey, Harsnett,Montaigne
1624[16]		
Feb. 5	Deprivation of Edward Wotton,vicar of Cardington,Hereford diocese,for adultery	Abbot,Carey
May 27	Deprivation of Samuel Serle,rector of Theydon Garnon,London diocese, for unspecified offences	Abbot,Buckeridge,Harsnett, Montaigne

Footnotes:

This appendix enlarges the list presented in Usher, The Rise and Fall of the High Commission, pp.369-70.

1. PRO, SP 14/7/24.
2. George Blackwell, Mr George Blackwel (made by Pope Clement 8 Arch-Priest of England) his Answeres upon sundry his Examinations: together with his Approbation and taking of the Oath of Allegiance (1607), p.26.
3. Blackwell, A Large Examination taken at Lambeth, sig.a2iiv.
4. PRO, SP 14/47/24. Babbage assumed that Baker was deprived for nonconformity: Puritanism & Richard Bancroft, p.162.
5. PRO, SP 14/63/53; WSRO, Ep.I/69/9. Smith was deprived of his living by February 1613: Ep.I/1/8 fo.64r.
6. PRO, SP 14/69/2.
7. Harison, Registrum Vagum, ii. pp.338-9; HMC, 66 Ancaster, pp.362-72.
8. PRO, Stac 8/209/26; SP 14/78/78.
9. PRO, SP 14/87/47, 88/137.
10. PRO, SP 14/92/38.
11. Bodl., Ashmole MS 826 p.226; LPL, MS 691 fos.24v-5r; GDR 27A pp.435-7.
12. PRO, SP 14/108/14. See also NNRO, Act/45b (unfoliated: 11 October 1614).
13. Acts of the Privy Council 1621-1623, pp.10-1; The Court & Times of James the First, ii. p.267.
14. Neile, M.Ant.De.Dnis Arch-Bishop of Spalato, p.79; PRO, SP 14/130/87.
15. PRO, SP 14/138/31.
16. PRO, SP 14/159/16, 168/50.

Appendix IX: 'Orders to be observed', issued in Chichester diocese, 1606.

Text removed due to third party copyright

Source: WSRO, Ep.I/20/7 fo.40.

Appendix X: Clerical attendance at visitations and synods in Chichester Archdeaconry 1606-1625.

Date	V or S*	Number Cited	Number Present	Number ill or Excused	No record of Attendance	Number Absent	Percent Present
1606	V	120	87	7	9	17	72.5
1607	S	138	82	9	14	33	59.4
1608	S	143	84	10	22	27	58.7
1609[I]	S	107	71	6	9	21	72.1
1610[I]	V	92	64	12	6	10	69.5
1611	S	123	74	34	12	3	60.1
1616	V	159	110	13	25	11	69.1
1617	S	125	63	28	11	23	50.4
1618	S	136	62	15	10	49	45.5
1619	V	141	101	0	20	20	71.6
1620	S	134	76	2	8	48	56.7
1621	S	150	78	5	10	57	52
1622	V	129	92	5	1	31	71.3
1623	S	140	83	8	1	48	59.2
1625	V	134	88	10	5	30	65.6

Source: WSRO, Ep.I/18/27-8, 30-1, 33-5.
Footnote I: Three deaneries only.
* = Visitation or Synod

Appendix XI: Diocesan Administration in Bath & Wells, 1623-1628

In his study of the Somerset clergy, Mr Timothy Peake compares the final years of Arthur Lake's government (1623-6) with the brief rule of his successor, William Laud (1626-8). He argues that 'lax enforcement and non-detection of non-conformity' characterised Lake's last years at Wells, and that that the diocesan administration was revitalised by Laud. His case is based on a comparison of Lake's final visitation of 1623 and an archidiaconal visitation of Taunton in the same year with two visitations of Laud, in 1626 and 1627.[1] My own view is that Mr Peake draws too stark a contrast between the administrations of Lake and Laud, and he misses the influence of Archbishop Abbot. My argument falls into five sections:

(i) 'non-detection of non-conformity' I take to mean the absence of presentments or prosecutions ex officio mero for contempt of the canons, both on ceremony (the omission of the surplice and so on) and on discipline (evading the requirement, for example, to be licensed to preach or serve cures). Non-detection of ceremonial nonconformity occurred in all dioceses in the southern province after about 1606, Bath & Wells included, as I have argued above in Chapter Eight.[2] The arrival of Laud at Bath & Wells did not alter this situation, for there was no sharp rise in presentments or prosecutions for ceremonial nonconformity between 1626 and 1628. As Mr Peake demonstrates clearly, between 1626 and 1628 there was a new, vigorous drive against unlicensed curates.[3] It is equally true, however, that the problem of unlicensed preaching, which had been tackled by Lake's administration, received less attention in 1626-8 than it had done in 1623-6. In Lake's visitation of 1623, twenty-three unlicensed preachers had been detected, compared to only twelve in 1626.[4] Moreover at the same visitation Lake had carefully enforced the royal Directions on Preaching, issued in 1622. Lake warned several ministers to display their copy of the Directions, and he 'especiallye admonished' the churchwardens not to allow any minister to preach unless he could first produce his preaching licence.[5] Clergy were also warned to be guided in their sermons by the book of Homilies, which churchwardens were obliged to purchase. As a result, a relatively large number were presented for not having a copy of the Homilies.[6] In short, Lake's administration did enforce these Directions with some energy, and a number of nonconformist preachers were prosecuted.

(ii) Mr Peake illustrates his argument of lax enforcement in 1623-6 by reference to the archidiaconal visitation of 1623. However, this evidence is

not really admissible. The volume for the visitation of 1623 is a unique survival of archidiaconal administration in the 1620s,[7] and therefore it cannot be determined whether or not after 1626 archidiaconal visitations were more thorough, less thorough or much the same.

(iii) Other evidence, not used by Mr Peake, suggests that Lake was a firm disciplinarian. It has been argued above that the Bishop heard certain office cases in private, and preached sermons of mortification at the public penances of notorious offenders in order to make the occasions more than mere empty rituals. It may also be that Lake was responsible for the diminution in the number of commutations granted during his time at Wells.[8] Lake was equally firm against catholic recusants. In a sermon before the House of Lords in July 1625 he outlined his own approach to the problem of recusants:[9]

> We have made many good lawes, if not to roote out, at least to keepe down so much of their corruption as is dangerous to the state; it were to bee wisht that greater care were taken for informing their consciences ...of this we may be sure, that either God will worke that which we wish, the recovery of those which are seduced; or at least their obstinacie will be without all excuse, and the punishment thereof by sharpe lawes will be no more than is iust in the sight both of God and man.

The diocesan records show Lake following this strategy. During a visitation of Wells city in 1624, Lake interviewed several recusants in private, and won over at least one to the Anglican confession. At the same visitation, Lake ordered the churchwardens to present more recusants. A week later, fresh presentments were duly returned to the registrar.[10] The records of this visitation also disclose Lake's active interest in routine office business. Thus in his charge Lake informed the churchwardens and inquisitors that he had heard rumours of irregularities by parish officials of St. Cuthbert's, including the peculation of legacies, which he ordered to be investigated.[11] None of this evidence implies great laxity.

(iv) The visitation of 1626 was conducted not by Bishop Laud, but by Archbishop Abbot, who held sole jurisdiction in Bath & Wells diocese from 4th May 1626, the day of Lake's death in London, to early October 1626. The preliminaries sessions of the metropolitical visitation were staged in the middle of July and the visitation court processed presentments from early September. Thus it was Abbot's commissaries who instigated the 'remarkable programme' of August 1626 against unlicensed curates and indolent churchwardens.[12] Laud himself was confirmed as Bishop of Bath & Wells on 18 September.[13]

(v) In the light of the evidence presented in (i), (iii) and (iv), the ingredients of this 'remarkable programme' do admit an alternative explanation. First, the fact that so many churchwardens were ordered to submit copies of terriers reflects Abbot's abiding interest in the issue. At his primary metropolitical visitation of Bath & Wells in 1613, about eighty churchwardens had been prosecuted for failing to return terriers, a number far in excess of the usual volume of presentments on this score in other visitations.[14] Secondly, the fact that a large number of churchwardens were prosecuted for failing to return a copy of their register, which by canon 70 of 1604 they were obliged to submit each April, may imply, as Mr Peake suggests, that they had escaped detection in previous years.[15] It may equally be the result of the relative hiatus in diocesan authority following Lake's death in May, at precisely the time when indolent churchwardens were usually prosecuted for not returning their register. Thirdly, that so many churchwardens were prosecuted for not submitting full presentments was probably a reaction by Abbot's commissaries to the low volume of presentments at the visitation, compared to 1623.[16]

In short, I propose that there are no good grounds for characterising Lake's administration as particularly lax. I accept that at the metropolitical visitation of 1626 there was launched a campaign against churchwardens who failed to submit terriers and against unlicensed curates which, as Mr Peake demonstrates, continued into 1627.[17] This finding is consistent with one recurrent argument of this thesis: that diocesan administrations often concentrated on one or two major problems at any one time. In similar fashion, Bancroft's metropolitical visitation of Bath & Wells in 1605 focussed on ceremonial nonconformity and inadequate church furnishings,[18] that of Abbot in 1613 on the provision of terriers, and that of Lake in 1623 on unlicensed preachers and poor standards of clerical education.[19]

Footnotes:

1. T.H. Peake, 'The Somerset Clergy and the Church Courts in the diocese of Bath & Wells 1625-1642' (Bristol M.Litt. thesis, 1978), pp.86-95,135-50.
2. See above pp.276-313.
3. Peake, op.cit., pp.86-7,92-4,136,144-8.
4. SRO, D/D/Vc 82 (unfoliated: Masters,Daniel,William Williams,Robert Williams,Salkeld,Rooke,Pearce,Foxcroft,Godwin,Hodder,Arundell,Tanner, Hull,Palmer,Methwin,Millner,Boorne,Richmond,Voide), D/D/Ca 236 (unfol: Wilmott,Taylor,Carpenter,Polewheel); Peake, op.cit., p.143.
5. SRO, D/D/Vc 82, (unfoliated: Price,Davies,Hadlie), D/D/Ca 237 fo.55r.
6. About 30 churchwardens were presented in 1623 for not having the Homilies, compared to about 3 in the visitation of 1620: SRO, D/D/Ca 219-220, 235-236 (all unfoliated). See also D/D/O ii. (unfoliated: Lake to the Dean and Chapter of Wells, 30 September 1622).
7. Stieg, Laud's Laboratory, pp.167-8 incorrects states that the archidiaconal act book for 1623 is the only archidiaconal volume to survive for the early seventeenth century. In fact SRO, D/D/Ca 236 is an archidiaconal visitation book for Wells in 1604-5.
8. See above pp.108,114,116-8,133 fn.93 and below p.368.
9. Lake, Sermons, iii. p.172.
10. SRO, D/D/Ca 244 fos.1r-8r.
11. SRO, D/D/Ca 243a fos.1v-2r.
12. Peake, op.cit., pp.91-2; LPL, Reg.Abbot ii. fos.274r-7r; SRO, D/D/Ca 243a, passim, 255, & 249, where the court heading states that Arthur Duck is presiding as (metropolitical) commissary.
13. LPL, Reg.Abbot ii. fos.97v-103.
14. Peake, op.cit., pp.91-2; SRO, D/D/Ca 180, passim.
15. Peake, op.cit., p.91.
16. For example, in 1623 118 ministers and 115 pairs of churchwardens were presented from 14 deaneries, compared to 75 ministers and 49 pairs of churchwardens from 10 deaneries in 1626. SRO, D/D/Ca 235-6,251,255.
17. Peake, op.cit., p.94.
18. SRO, D/D/Ca 140,142.
18. SRO,D/D/Vc 82, passim. See above pp.187-92.

(ii) Printed Primary Sources

ABBOT, George: 'A Preface to the Reader' in Sir William Hart, The Examinations, Arraignment and Conviction of George Sprot, Notary in Aye-mouth. Together with his Constant and Extraordinarie Behaviour at his death, in Edenborough, Aug 12 1608 (1608)

ABBOT, Robert: The Exaltation of the Kingdome and Priesthood of Christ. In Certaine Sermons upon the 110 Psalme: preached in the Cathedrall Church and City of Worcester in the time of Christmasse Anno Domini 1596 (1601)

ABRIDGMENT of that Booke which the Ministers of the Lincoln diocess delivered to his Maiestie upon the first of December last, being the first part of an Apologie for themselves and their Bretheren that refuse the Subscription and Conformitie which is required (1605)

ABSTRACT of Somersetshire Wills, ed. F. Brown (6 vols., 1887-90)

'ACT Book of the Archdeacon of Taunton', ed. C. Jenkins in Collectanea, II. A collection of documents from various sources, (Somerset Record Society, xliii. 1928)

ACTS of the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral Church of Chichester 1545-1642, ed. W.D. Peckham (Sussex Record Society, lviii. Cambridge,1959)

ACTS of the Privy Council of England, (8 vols., for 1601-25), ed. J.R. Dasent (1907-33)

AINSWORTH, Henry: Counterpoyson: Considerations touching the Points in Difference between Godly Ministers and the People of the Church of England and the Seduced Brethren of the Separation (Amsterdam? 1608)

ALUMNI Cantabrigienses, Part I. From the earliest Times to 1751, ed. J. & J.A. Venn (4 vols., Cambridge,1922-7)

ALUMNI Oxonienses: the Members of the University of Oxford 1500-1714, ed. J. Foster (4 vols., Oxford,1891-2)

[AMES, William:] A Reply to Dr Mortons Generall Defence of Three Nocent Ceremonies (1622)

[AMES, William:] A Reply to Dr Mortons Particular Defence of Three Nocent Ceremonies, viz the Surplice, Crosse in Baptisme and Kneeling at the receiving of the Sacramentall Elements of Bread and Wine (1623)

ANDREWES, Lancelot: Of Episcopacy. Three Epistles of Peter Moulin... answered by the right reverend father in God Lancelot Andrews, late Lord Bishop of Winchester (1647)

ANDREWES, Lancelot: Sacrilege a Snare: a Sermon preached ad Clerum in the University of Cambridge by...Lancelot Andrews...when he proceeded Doctor in

Divinity (1646)

ANDREWES, Lancelot: A Collection of Posthumous and Orphan Lectures: delivered at St Pauls and St. Giles his Church by Lancelot Andrews, Lord Bishop of Winchester (1657)

ANDREWES, Lancelot: Works, ed. J.P. Wilson & J. Bliss (11 vols., Oxford, 1854)

ARCHBISHOP Grindal's Visitation, 1575: Comperta et Detecta Book ed. W.J. Sheils (Borthwick Texts & Calendars: Records of the Northern Province, iv. 1977)

ARTICLES of Accusation and Impeachment of the House of Commons, and all the Commons of England against William Pierce Doctor of Divinitie and Bishop of Bath and Wells (1642)

ARTICLES to be enquired of, within the archdeaconry of Essexx by the church-wardens and sworne-men in every parish (1615)

ARTICLES to be enquired of, within the Commissarishlp of Essex and Hertford (1625)

ARTICLES to be enquired of, within the Archdeaconry of Glocester, in the generall visitation of the Right Wor: M.Samuel Burton, Archdeacon of the Dioces of Glocester. Holden in the yeere of our Lord God, 1618 (1618)

Certaine ADVERTISEMENTS and articles, given by the Worshipfull Master Robert Iohnson Archdeacon of Leicester...in the yeare of our Lord God 1613 (1613)

ARTICLES to be enquired of by the churchwardens in the visitation of the right Worshipfull, Maister Robert Iohnson...Arch-deacon of Leicester, in the yeare of our Lord God, 1622 (1622)

ARTICLES to be enquired within the Archdeaconry of Middlesex... (1616)

ARTICLES upon which the church-wardens and questmen are to make their inquirie...to be exhibited...to the Arch-deacon of Norfolke, or his Officiall. Ann.Dom.1608 (1608)

ARTICLES ministred in the visitation of the right worshipfull Maister John King Archdeacon of Nottingham in the yeere of our Lord God 1599 (Oxford,1599)

ARTICLES ministred in the visitation of the right worshipful Maister Iohn King, Doctor of Divinitie, Archdeacon of Nottingham, in the yeare of our Lord God 1605 (Oxford,1605)

ARTICLES to bee enquired of, by the churchwardens and sworne men in the visitation holden by the Archdeacon of Rochester, in the yeare of our Lord Christ 1608 (1608)

ARTICLES for the church-wardens and inquirers to ground their presentments upon, to be exhibited under their oathes and hands to Mr Archdeacon of Sudbury, or his Officiall, in the visitation Ann.Dom.1624 (1624)

ARTICLES to bee inquired of by the church-wardens and swornemen, within the Archdeaconry of Surrey...Anno 1619 (1619)

ARTICLES to bee inquired of by the church-wardens and swornemen, within the archdeaconry of Surrey...holden Anno [1621]

ARTICLES to be enquired of, by the church-wardens and sworne-men, in the visitation of the right worshipfull, the Archdeacon of Surrey (1625)

ARTICLES to be inquired of, in the first metropolliticall visitation of the most reverend father in God, George, by Gods providence, Arch-Bishop of Canterbury and Primate of all England; and and for the dioces of [sic] in the yeare...1616 and in the yeare of his Graces translation [sic]

ARTICLES to be ministred and to be enquired of, and answered in the first generall visitation of the reverend father in God, John, by Gods permission, Bishop of Bristoll (Oxford,1603)

ARTICLES to be inquired of within the diocesse of Chester in the ordinary visitation of...George Lord Bishop of Chester anno domini 1605... (1605)

ARTICLES to be enquired of in the ordinary trienniall visitation of the reverend father in God Thomas...Lord Bishop of Chester. In the yeere of our Lord God 1617 (1617)

ARTICLES ministred by...Thomas by the grace of God Bishoppe of Chichester, to the churchwardens throughout the whole diocesse of Chichester at the visitation begun there the 14 of September 1586... [1586]

ARTICLES ministred by...Anthony by the grace of God Bishop of Chichester unto the churchwardens throughout the whole diocesse of Chichester, at the visitation begun there the 6 of September 1600... (1600)

ARTICLES to be enquired of within the Diocesse of Chichester, in the first generall visitation of the reverend father in God, Lancelot Bishop of Chichester. holden in the yeere..1606 (1606)

ARTICLES to be inqired of in the ordinarie visitation, of the most reverend father, Richard...Archbushop of Caunterburie and Primat of all England, in, and for the dioces of Coventry and Lichfielde, in the yeare of our Lord God, 1609 (1609)

ARTICLES to be enquired of within the diocesse of Coventry and Lichfield, in the trienniall visitation of the right reverend father in God Thomas... holden...in the yeere of our Lord God 1620 (1620)

ARTICLES to be enquired of, within the dioces of Durham. In the trienniall

visitation of the reverend father in God, Richard...Lord Bishop of Durham, in the yeare of our Lord God, 1624 (1624)

ARTICLES to be inquired of by the church-wardens and sworne-men in the ordinarie visitation of the reverend father in God, Lancelot Lord Bishop of Elie, within the diocesse of Elie. Ann.1610 (Cambridge,1610)

ARTICLES to be inquired of by the church-wardens and sworne-men in the ordinarie visitation of the reverend father in God, Lancelot Lord Bishop of Elie, within the diocesse of Elie. Ann.1613 (Cambridge,1613)

ARTICLES to bee enquired of by the church-wardens and sworne-men in the ordinary visitation of the Lord Bishop of Excester...in Anno Dom,1599 [1599]

Articles to be inquired of, in the first metropoliticall visitation of the most reverend father Richarde...Archbushop of Canterbury and Primat of all Englande: in and for, all thiese diocesses following (viz) Exeter, Norwich, Chichester, St Davids, Llandaffe, Heriford, Worcester, Bristol, Bath and Welles, and Coventrie and Litchfielde, in the yeare of our Lord God 1605 (1605)

ARTICLES to be enquired of within the dioces of Gloucester, in the first generall visitation of the reverend father in God, Henry Lorde Bishop of Gloucester (1607)

ARTICLES to be inquired of, in the first metropliticall visitation of the most reverend father George...Arch-Bishop of Canterbury and primate of all England, in and for the dioces of Glocester in the yeare of our lord God 1612 [1612]

ARTICLES ecclesiastical, to be enquired of by the church-wardens and sworne-men within the dioces of Gloucester. In the visitation of the right reverend, father in God, Myles...this present yeere 1622 (1622)

ARTICLES to be enquired of within the diocesse of Lincolne... (Cambridge, 1598)

ARTICLES to be enquired of within the diocese of Lincolne. In the visitation of the reverend father in God, William Bishop of Lincolne (Cambridge,1601)

ARTICLES to be enquired of, within the diocesse of Lincolne. In the visitation of the reverend father in God, William L.Bishop of Lincolne (Cambridge,1604)

ARTICLES to be enquired of,within the diocese of Lincolne. In the visitation of...William L.Bishop of Lincolne (Cambridge,1607)

ARTICLES to be enquired of within the diocesse of Lincolne, in the first visitation of...Richard, by Gods providence, Bishop of Lincolne, in the yeere of our Lord God 1614 (1614)

ARTICLES to be enquired of within the diocesse of Lincolne. In the primarie visitation of...George by the providence of God, Bishop of Lincolne.

An.Dm.1618 (1618)
ARTICLES to be enquired of within the diocesse of Lincolne in the primarie visitation of...Iohn, by Gods providence, Bishop of Lincolne and lord Keeper of the Great Seale of England (1622)
ARTICLES to be enquired of within the diocese of Lincolne in the generall and triennial visitation of...Iohn...Bishop of Lincolne, Lord Keeper of the Great Seale of England (1625)
ARTICLES to be enquired of, within the dioces of London, in the third generall visitation of the reverend father in God, Richard Bishop of London (1604)
ARTICLES to be enquired of within the dioces of London, in the first generall visitation of the reverend father in God Thomas...Holden in the yeere of our Lord God 1607 [1607]
ARTICLES to be enquired of within the dioces of London, in the first generall visitation of the right reverend father in God, Iohn, Lord Bishop of London. olden in the yeare of our Lord God 1612 (1612)
ARTICLES to be enquired of within the dioces of London, in the second generall visitation of the right reverend father in God, Iohn, Lord Bishop of London. Holden in the yeere of our Lord God 1615 (1615)
ARTICLES, to be enquired of within the dioces of London, in the first general visitation of the right reverend father in God, George, Lord Bishop of London: holden in the yeare of our Lord God 1621 (1621)
ARTICLES to be enquired of within the dioces of London in the second generall visitation of...George, Lord Bishop of London. Holden in the yeere of our Lord God 1624 (1624)
ARTICLES to be inquired of in the dioces of Norwich, in the ordinarie visitation of the reverend father in God, Iohn Lord Bishop of Norwich. Ann.Dom.1611 et consecrationis suae 9 (Cambridge,1611)
ARTICLES to be inquired of, in the first metropoliticall visitation, of the most reverend father, George, by Gods providence, Arch-Bishop of Canterbury and Primate of all England: in, and for the dioces of Norwich, in the yeare of our Lord God 1613... (1613)
ARTICLES to be inquired of, in the ordinary visitation of the most reverend father, George, by Gods providence, Arch-Bishop of Canterbury and Primate of all England; in, and for the dioces of Norwich, in the yeare of our Lord God, 1618 [1618]
ARTICLES to be inquired of in the diocesse of Norwich, in the ordinarie visitation of the reverend father in God, Iohn Lord Bishop of Norwich (Cambridge,1619)

ARTICLES to be inquired of within the dioces of Norwich, in the ordinary visitation of ...Samuel, Lord Bishop of Norwich (1620)

ARTICLES to be enquired of, in the diocese of Norwich. In the ordinary visitation of the reverend father in God, Samuel, Lord Bishop of Norwich. Anno Domini 1627 (1627)

ARTICLES to be enquired of within the dioces of Oxford given by the reverende father in God Iohn by Gods permission now Bishop of Oxford in his visitation begun the second day of October 1604 (Oxford,1604)

ARTICLES to be enquired of within the dioces of Oxford , in the first visitation of the right reverend father in God, Iohn Bishop of Oxford (Oxford, 1619)

ARTICLES to bee enquired of within the dioces of Oxford, in the triennial visitation of...Iohn Bishop of Oxford. Held in the yeare of our Lord God 1622... (1622)

ARTICLES ecclesiasticall to be enquired of by the church-wardens and sidesmen within the dioces of Oxon: set forth by the authority of...Iohn...Lord Bishop of Oxon:Anno 1628 (1628)

ARTICLES to be enquired of within the dioces of Peterborough in the visitation of... Richard...Lord Bishop of Peterborough this present yeare, 1600. And presentment to be made thereof by the churchwardens and sidemen for that purpose lawefully appointed, in visitations, sinods, or els where, within the diocesse aforesaid... (1600)

ARTICLES to be inquired of...in the visitation of the reverend father in God, Thomas by Gods permission L.Bishop of Peterborough, in the yeare of our Lord God 1602 (1602)

ARTICLES to be inquired of within the diocesse of Peterborough in the visitation of the reverend father in God, Thomas...Lord Bishop of Peterborough this present yeare 1605...and for that purpose lawfully appointed in visitations, synods or els where (Cambridge,1605)

ARTICLES to be inquired of, in the first Metropoliticall visitation of...Richard by Gods providence Arch-bushop of Canterburie...In and for the dioces of Peterborough in the yeare...1607 (1607)

ARTICLES to be inquired of within the dioces of Peterborough, at the visitation of the reverend father in God, Thomas...Lord Bishop of Peterborough, this present yeare 1608 (Cambridge,1608)

ARTICLES to be inquired of within the diocesse and iurisdiction of Peterborough, at the visitatio of...Thomas...Lord Bishop of Peterborough, this present yeare 1611 (1611)

ARTICLES to be inquired of in the first Metropoliticall visitation of...George...Arch-Bishop of Canterbury and Primate of all England in and for the dioces of Peterbury in the yeare of our Lord 1613 [1613]

ARTICLES to be enquired of within the diocess and iurisdiction of Peterborough, at the visitation of...Thomas...Bishop of Peterborough, this present yeare 1614 (1614)

ARTICLES to be enquired of within the diocesse and iurisdiction of Peterborough at the visitation of Thomas...this present yeae 1617 [1617]

ARTICLES to be inquired of within the dioces and jurisdiction of Peterburgh, at the visitation of...Thomas...this present yeare 1620 (1620)

ARTICLES to be enquired of within the diocesse and iurisdiction of Peterborow, at the visitation of...Thomas...Bishop of Peterborow, this present yeare 1623 [1623]

ARTICLES to be enquired of within the diocesse and iurisdiction of Peterborough: at the visitation of...Thomas...Bishop of Peterborough, this present yeare 1626 (Cambridge,1626)

ARTICLES to be enquired of by the churchwardens and sworn-men in the first visitation of the right reverend father in God, William...Bishop of Rochester, in the yeare of our Lord Christ, 1605 (1605)

ARTICLES of enquirye, given in charge by...Henrie...Bishop of Sarum...in his ordinary and triennial visitation intended to be holden in...Anno.Dom 1614 as followeth (1614)

ARTICLES to be enquired of, within the dioces of Salisburie, in the first visitation of...Robert...Lord Bishop of Sarum. Holden in the yeare of our Lord God 1616 (1616)

ARTICLES to be enquired of in the diocesse of Salisburie in the first visitation of the reverend father in God Robert Lord Bishop of Sarum (1620)

ARTICLES to be enquired of in the diocesse of Salisburie in the first visitation of the reverend father in God, Iohn Lord Bishop of Sarum (1622)

ARTICLES to b enquired of by the church-wardens and swornemen within the diocesse of Winchester in the visitation of Thomas Lord Bishop of Winchester in his trienniall visitation, holden 1603 (1603)

ARTICLES to be enquired of by the church-wardens and sworne-men within the diocesse of Winchester in the triennial visitation of the reverend father in God, Thomas Lord Bishop of Winchester, holden in the yeare of our Lord God, 1606 (1606)

ARTICLES to be inquired of by the church-wardens and swornemen, in the primary visitation of the right reverend father in God, Lancelot Lord Bishop

Of Winton, within the diocesse of Winchester. Anno 1619 (1619)
ARTICLES to be enquired of by the church-wardens and sworne-men, in the triennial visitation of the right reverend in God, Lancelot Lord Bishop of Winton, within the diocesse of Winchester. Anno 1625 (1625)
ARTICLES to be enquired of within the dioces of Worcester, in the generall visitation of...Gervase, Lord Bishop of Worcester: holden in the yeare of our Lord God, 1607 (1607)
ARTICLES to be enquired of by the churchwardens and swornmen within the diocesse of Worcester. In the visitation of...Iohn, Lord Bishop of Worcester, holden in the yeare of our Lord God, 1626 (1626)
ARTICLES to be enquired of in the visitation of...Iohn, by the providence of God, Bishop of Worcester. In the yeere of our Lord God, 1632 (1632)
ARTICLES to be enquired of in the diocesan visitation of the most reverend father in God Tobie...Archbishop of Yorke Primate of England and Metropolitane. In the yeare of our Lord 1610... (1610)
ARTICLES to bee inquired of in the diocesan visitation of the most reverend father in God Toby...L.Archbishop of Yorke, Primate of England and Metropolitane. Begun and continued in the yeeres...1622 and 1623 (1623)
ARTICLES to be enquired of in the metropolitical visitation of...Samuel... Lord Archbishop of Yorke...begun and continued in the yeeres...1628 and 1629 (1629)
ASSHETON, Nicholas: The Journal of Nicholas Assheton of Downham...for part of the year 1617 and part of the year following, ed. F.R. Raines (Chetham Society, xiv. 1848)
ATTERSOLL, William: A Commentarie upon the Fourth Booke of Moses, called Numbers (1618)
ATTERSOLL, William: A Continuation of the Exposition of the Booke of Numbers: or the History of Balak the K. and Balaam the False Prophet (1610)
AUBREY, John: Brief lives, chiefly of contemporaries, set down down...between the years 1669 and 1696, ed. A. Clark (2 vols., Oxford,1898)
AYLET, Robert: Divine and Moral Speculations in Metrical Numbers upon Various Subjects (1654)
BABINGTON, Gervase: Certaine Plaine, Briefe and Comfortable Notes upon Everie Chapter of Genesis (1592)
BABINGTON, Gervase: Comfortable Notes upon the Bookes of Exodus and Leviticus (1604)
BABINGTON, Gervase: Workes (1615)
B(ADDELEY) R(ichard) & N(AYLOR), J(oseph): The Life of Dr Thomas Morton

late Bishop of Duresme (York,1669)

BACON, Francis: The Letters and the Life, ed. J. Spedding (7 vols., 1861-74)

BALL, Thomas: The Life of the Renowned Doctor Preston, ed. E.W. Harcourt (Oxford,1885)

BARLOW, William: A Brand, Titio Erepta. On the Fift day of November last, before the honourable Lordes of his Maiesties Privie Councell and the grave Iudges of the law (1607)

BARLOW, William: One of the Foure Sermons preached before the Kings Maiestie at Hampton Court in September last. This concerning the Antiquitie and Superioritie of Bishops. Sept.21.1606 (1606)

BARLOW, William: The Summe and Substance of the Conference which it pleased his excellent Maiestie to have with the Lords, Bishops and other of his Clergie...in his Maiesties Privy-Chamber at Hampton Court Ianuary 14 1603 (1604)

BARRELL, Robert: The Spiritual Architecture: or the balance of Gods Sanctuary to discerne the Weight and Solidity of a True and Sincere, from the Levitie, and Vanitie of a False and Counterfeit Profession of Christianity (1624)

BARWICK, John: The Fight, Victory And Triumph of S.Paul. Accommodated to the right reverend father in God Thomas late L.Bishop of Duresme, in a Sermon preached at his Funeral...together with the Life of the said Bishop (1660)

BAUGHE, Thomas: A Summons to Iudgement. Or a sermon for the Crosse, but delivered upon occasion in the Cathedrall Church of S.Paul London, the 6 day of Iune 1613 (1614)

BAYNES, Paul: The Diocesans Tryall, wherein all the sinnewes of Doctor Downhams Defence are brought into three Heads and orderly dissolved (1621)

BEDELL, William: Two Biographies of William Bedell, Bishop of Kilmore, ed. E.S. Shuckburgh (Cambridge,1902)

BELL, Thomas: The Anatomie of Popish Tyrannie (1603)

BELL, Thomas: The Catholique Triumph: conteyning a Reply to the pretended Answere of B.C. (a masked Iesuite) lately published against The Tryall of the New Religion (1610)

BENEFIELD, Sebestian: A Commentarie or Exposition upon the First Chapter of the Prophecy of Amos. Delivered in XXI Sermons in the Parish Church of Meisey Hampton in the diocesse of Gloucester (Oxford,1613)

BENEFIELD, Sebestian: A Commentarie or Exposition upon the Second Chapter of the Prophecie of Amos. Delivered in XXI Sermons in...Meysey-

Hampton in the diocesse of Glocester (1620)

BENEFIELD, Sebestian: A Commentary or Exposition upon the Third Chapter of the Prophecie of Amos. Delivered in XVII sermons in...Meysey-Hampton in the diocesse of Glocester (1629)

BENEFIELD, Sebestian: Doctrinae Christianae Sex Capita (Oxford,1610)

BERNARD, Richard: A Guide to Grand-Iury Men, divided into Two Bookes (1627)

BERNARD, Richard: A Key to Knowledge for the opening of the Secret Mysteries of St Iohns Mysticall Revelation (1617)

BERNARD, Richard: A Threefold Treatise of the Sabbath, distinctly divided into the Patriarchall, the Mosaicall, and the Christian Sabbath (1641)

BERNARD, Richard: Christian See to thy Conscience, or a Treatise of the nature, the kinds and manifold differences of Conscience, all very briefly, and yet more fully laid open then hitherto (1631)

BERNARD, Richard: Plaine Evidences: the Church of England is Apostolicall, the Separation Schismaticall. Directed against Mr Ainsworth the Separatist and Mr Smith the Se-Baptist (1610)

BERNARD, Richard: The Faithfull Shepheard: or the Shepheards Faithfulnesse (1607)

BERNARD, Richard: The Faithfull Shepheard amended and enlarged: with the Shepheards practise in preaching annexed thereunto (1609)

BERNARD, Richard: The Faithfull Shepheard: wholy in a manner transposed and made anew, with precepts and examples, to further young Divines in the studie of Divinitie (1621)

BERNARD, Richard: The Ready Way to Good Workes, or a Treatise of Charitie (1635)

BERNARD, Richard: Thesaurus Biblicus seu Promptuarium Sacrum (1644)

BERNARD, Richard: Two Twinnes: or Two Parts of one Portion of Scripture (1613)

BILSON, Thomas: A Sermon preached at Westminster before the King and Queenes Maiesties, at their Coronations on Saint Iames his day, being the XXV of Iuly 1603 (1604)

BILSON, Thomas: The Perpetual Governement of Christes Church (1593)

BILSON, Thomas: The Effect of Certaine Sermons touching the full redemption of mankind by the death and bloud of Christ Iesus...preached at Paules Crosse and elsewhere in London (1599)

BLACKWELL, George: A Large Examination taken at Lambeth, according to his Maiesties direction, point by point, of Mr George Blakwell, made Arch-

Priest of England by Pope Clement 8 (1607/8)

BLACKWELL, George: Mr George Blackwel (made by Pope Clement 8 Arch-Priest of England) his Answeres upon sundry his Examinations: together with his Approbation and taking of the Oath of Allegiance (1607)

BODLEY, Thomas: Letters of Sir Thomas Bodley to Thomas James, ed. G.W. Wheeler (1926)

BOOKE of Common Prayer and the Administration of the Sacraments (1607)

BOUGHEN, Edward: A sermon of Confirmation, preached in Oxford, at the first visitation of the right reverend father in God, Iohn Lord Bishop of Oxford. September 27 1619 (1620)

BOWND, Nicholas: Sabbatum Veteris et Novi Testamenti (1606)

[BRADSHAW, William:] A Myld and Iust Defence of Certeyne Arguments at the last session of Parliament directed to that most honorable High Court, in behalfe of the Ministers suspended and deprived...against an intemperat and uniust consideration of them by M. Gabriel Powell (1606)

BUCKERIDGE, John: A Sermon preached before his Maiestie at Whitehall, March 22 1617 being Passion-Sunday touching Protrastion and Kneeling in the Worship of God. To which is added a Discourse concerning Kneeling at the Communion (1618)

BURTON, Henry: A Censure of Simonie (1624)

BURTON, Henry: A Narration of the Life of Mr Henry Burton (1643)

CADE, Anthony: A Sermon necessary for these Times (Cambridge,1636)

CALAMY, Edmund: The Nonconformist Memorial, ed. S. Palmer (2 vols., 1803)

CALDERWOOD, David: History of the Kirk in Scotland, ed. T. Thomson vii. (Edinburgh,1845)

CALENDAR of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Elizabeth, (5 vols., for 1580-1625), ed. M.A.E. Green (1867-72)

CALENDAR of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of James I, (4 vols., for 1603-25), ed. M.A.E. Green (1857-9)

CALENDAR of Wynn (of Gwydir) Papers, ed. J. Ballinger (Aberystwyth,1926)

CAMDEN, William: 'The Annals of James I' in A Complete History of England, ii. (1706)

CARLETON, Dudley: Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain 1603-1614. Jacobean Letters, ed. M. Lee (New Brunswick,1972)

CARLETON, George: An Examination of those things wherein the Author of the late Appeale holdeth the Doctrines of the Pelagians and Arminians to be the Doctrines of the Church of England (1626)

CARLETON, George: A Thankfull Remembrance of Gods Mercy. In a

historicall collection of the great and mercifull deliverances of the Church and State of England, since the Gospel beganne here to flourish, from the beginning of Queene Elizabeth (1627)

CARLETON, George: The Madnesse of Astrologers: or, an examination of Sir Christopher Heydons booke intituled A Defence of Iudiciarie Astrologie (1624)

CARLETON, George: Concensus Ecclesiae Catholicae contra Tridentinos (1613)

CARLETON, George: Directions to know the True Church (1615)

CARLETON, George: Iurisdiction Regall, Episcopall, Papall within is declared how the Pope hath intruded upon the Iurisdiction of Temporall Princes and of the Church (1610)

CARLETON, George: The life of Bernard Gilpin, a man most holy and renowned among the northerne English (1629)

CARLETON, George: Tithes examined and proved to bee due to the Clergie by a Divine Right (1606)

CARPENTER, Richard: A Pastoral Charge: faithfully given and discharged, at the trienniall visitation of the Lord Bishop of Exon: holden in Barnstaple the seventh of September 1616 (1616)

CASAUBON, Isaac: Ephemerides, ed. J. Russell (2 vols., Oxford,1850)

CASAUBON, Isaac: Epistolae (Rotterdam,1709)

CAVENDISH, George: The Life and Death of Cardinal Wolsey, ed. R.S. Sylvester (Early English Text Society, ccxliii. 1959)

CHAMBERLAIN, John: Letters, ed. N.E. McClure (2 vols., Philadelphia,1939)

CHAMBERS, Richard: Sarahs Sepulture or a Funerall Sermon, preached for the Right Honourable and Vertuous Lady, Dorothie Countesse of Northumberland, at Petworth in Sussex (1620)

CHAPTER Acts of the Dean and Canons of Windsor, 1430, 1523-1672, ed. S. Bond (Windsor,1966)

CHETWIND, Edward: The Strait Gate and Narrow Way to Life (1612)

CHRYSOSTOM, St.John: The Six Books on the Priesthood of St John Chrysostom, ed. F.W. Hohler (Cambridge, 1837)

CHURCHWARDENS' Presentments: Part I. Archdeaconry of Chichester, ed. H. Johnstone (Sussex Record Society xlix. Lewes,1947-8)

CLARKE, Samuel: A Collection of the Lives of Ten Eminent Divines (1662)

CLARKE, Samuel: The Lives of sundry Eminent Persons in this later Age (1683)

CLARKE, Samuel: The Lives of Thirty-two English Divines (1677)

COLLINS, Samuel: A sermon preached at Paules-Crosse upon the 1 of November, being All-Saints day, Anno 1607 (1607)

COMMONS Debates 1621, ed. W. Notestein, F.H. Relf & H. Simpson (7 vols.,

New Haven,1935)

CONCILIA Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae, ab anno MDXLVI ad annum MDCCXVII, ed. D. Wilkins (4 vols., 1737)

CONSTITUTIONAL Documents of the Reign of James I, ed. J.R. Tanner (Cambridge,1952)

COOKE, Alexander: Pope Joane: a Dialogue betweene a Protestant and a Papist (1610)

COSIN, John: Correspondence, ed. G. Ornsby, i. (Surtees Society lii, 1869)

COSIN, John: Works, ed. J. Sansom (5 vols., Oxford,1843-55)

COTTON, John: The Way of Congregationall Churches Cleared (1648)

CROOKE, Samuel: Three Sermons (1615)

COURT and Times of James the First, ed. T. Birch (2 vols., 1848)

CURTEYS, Richard: An Exposition of certayne Words of S.Paul to the Romaynes entiteled by an old wryter Hugo: A Treatise of the Workes of Three Dayes. Also an other Worke of the Truth of Christes Naturall Body (1577)

DALECHAMP, Caleb: Christian Hospitalitie, handled common-place-wise in the Chappel of Trinity Colledge in Cambridge (Cambridge,1632)

DARRELL, John: A Detection of that sinnful shamful lying and ridiculous Discours of Samuel Harshnet entituled: A Discoverie of the fradulent Practises of Iohn Darrell (1600)

DAVENANT, John: Letters of John Davenant, Puritan Divine, ed. I.M. Calder (New Haven, 1937)

DEBATES in the House of Commons in 1625, ed. S.R. Gardiner (Camden Society, 2nd series, vi. 1873)

DIOCESE of Bangor in the Sixteenth Century, being a Digest of the Registers of the Bishops AD 1512-1646, ed. A.I. Pryce (Bangor,1923)

DIOCESE of Norwich: Bishop Redman's Visitation, 1597. Presentments in the archdeaconries of Norwich, Norfolk and Suffolk , ed. J.F. Williams (Norfolk Record Society, xviii. 1946)

DOCUMENTARY Annals of the Church of England, ed. E. Cardwell (2 vols., Oxford,1844)

DOVE, John: An Advertisement to the English Seminaries and Iesuites (1610)

DOWNAME, George: A Defence of the Sermon preached at the Consecration of the Bishop of Bath and Welles, against a Confutation thereof by a namelesse Author (1611)

DOWNAME, George: Two Sermons, the one commending the Ministerie in generall: the other defending the Office of Bishops in particular (1608)

DOWNAME, John: A Guide to Godlynesse, or a Treatise of a Christian Life

(1622)

DOWNAME, John: Consolations for the Afflicted (1613)

DOWNAME, John: Lectures upon the Foure First Chapters of the Prophecie of Hosea (1608)

EBURNE, Richard: A Plaine Path-way to Plantations: that is, a Discourse in generall, concerning the Plantation of our English people in other Countries (1624)

'ECCLESIASTICAL returns in 81 parishes in East Sussex, made in 1603', ed. W.C. Renshaw in Miscellaneous Records (Sussex Record Society, iv. Lewes, 1905)

ELY Episcopal Records, ed. A. Gibbons (Lincoln,1891)

ENGLISH Orders for Consecrating Churches in the Seventeenth Century, ed. J. Wickham Legg (Henry Bradshaw Society, xli. 1911)

ENGLISH Reports, lxxiii. (1907), lxxiv. (1907), lxxvii. (1907), cxxiii. (1912)

EXTRACTS from the two earliest Minute Books of the Dean and Chapter of Norwich Cathedral, 1566-1649, ed. J.F. Williams & B. Cozens-Hardy (Norfolk Record Society, xxiv. 1953)

FACULTY Office Registers 1534-1549, ed. D.S. Chambers (Oxford,1966)

[FALCONER, John:] A Briefe Refutation of Iohn Traskes Iudaical and Novel Fancyes ([St Omer],1619)

FASTI Ecclesiae Anglicanae 1541-1857, ed. J. Le Neve (3 vols., Oxford,1854)

FAVOUR, John: Antiquitie triumphing over Novelti[e] (1619)

FEATLEY, Daniel: Clavis Mystica: a Key opening divers difficult and mysterious Texts of Holy Scripture, handled in Seventy Sermons (1636)

FENTON, Roger: A Treatise against the necessary dependance upon that one Head, and the present reconciliation to the Church of Rome. Together with certaine Sermons preached in publike assemblies, ed. E. Utie (1617)

FERRAR Papers, ed. B. Blackstone (Cambridge,1938)

FIELD, Nathaniel: Some short Memorials concerning the Life of that reverend divine Doctor Richard Field, ed. J. Le Neve (1717)

FORME and Manner of making and consecrating Bishops, Priests and Deacons (1607)

FORTESCUE Papers, ed. S.R. Gardiner (Camden Society, 2nd series, i. 1871)

FOTHERBY, Martin: Atheomastix: clearing Foure Truthes, against Atheists and Infidels (1622)

FOTHERBY, Martin: Foure Sermons lately preached. Whereunto is added, an Answere unto certaine Obiections of one unresolved, as concerning the use of the Crosse in Baptisme (1608)

FULLER, Nicholas: Miscellaneorum Theologicorum. Quibus non modo Scripturae Divinae, sed et aliorum Classicorum Auctorum plurima Monumenta explicantur atque illustrantur (Heidelberg,1612)

FULLER, Thomas: Abel Redevivus: or the Dead yet speaking. The Lives and Deaths of Modern Divines (1651)

FULLER, Thomas: The Church History of Britain, ed. J.S. Brewer (6 vols., Oxford,1845)

FULLER, Thomas: The History of the Worthies of England, ed. P.A. Nuttall (3 vols., 1840)

FULLER, Thomas: The Holy State. The Profane State (1663)

GAUDEN, John: Ecclesiae Anglicanae Suspiria: the tears, sighs, complaints and prayers of the Church of England (1659)

GIBBENS, Nicholas: Questions and Disputations concerning the Holy Scripture; wherein are contained briefe, faithfull and sound Expositions of the most difficult and hardest Places (1601)

GIBSON, Samuel: Ecclesiasticall Benediction. A Sermon of the power and prerogative belonging to the publike Ministers to blesse the people: preached by S.G. at a Visitation at Oundle Ap 14 1619 (1620)

GIBSON, Samuel: The Only Rule to Walke By: a Sermon preached at a Synod, or meeting of Ministers in S. Michaels Church in Coventry the second of October 1615 (1616)

GLANVILLE, John: Articuli Christianae Fidei (Oxford,1613)

GODWIN, Francis: De Praesulibus Angliae Commentarius (1616)

GODWIN, Francis: To the Parson, Vicar or Curate of...and to everie of them [Oxford,1603] (S.T.C.11948)

GOODMAN, Godfrey: The Court of King James the First, to which are added, Letters, ed. J.S. Brewer (2 vols., 1839)

GOODMAN, Godfrey: The Fall of Man or the Corruption of Nature, proved by the light of our naturall Reason (1616)

GRAILE, Edmund: Little Timothie, His Lesson: or, a summary Relation of the historicall part of Holy Scripture, comprised in Meeter (1611)

GUILD, William: Moses Unvailed (1620)

HACKET, John: Scrinia Reserata: a Memorial offer'd to the great deservings of John Williams (1693)

HAKEWILL, George: The Auncient Ecclesiasticall Practise of Confirmation. Confirmed by arguments drawne from Scripture, reason, councels, fathers, and later writers. Upon occasion of the confirmation of the Prince his Highnesse, performed on Munday in Easter-weeke, 1613... (1613)

HALL, Joseph: Noah's Dove, bringing an Olive of Peace to the tossed Ark of Christ's Church (1850)

HALL, Joseph: Works, ed. P. Hall (12 vols., Oxford,1837)

HARINGTON, John: A Briefe View of the State of the Church of England, as it stood in Q. Elizabeths and King James his reigne, to the yeere 1608: a character and history of the Bishops of those Times (1653)

HARISON, Anthony: Registrum Vagum, ed. T.F. Barton (Norfolk Record Society, xxxii-iii. 1963-4)

HARSNETT, Samuel: A Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures, to withdraw the harts of her Maiesties subiects from their Allegeance, and from the Truth of Christian Religion professed in England, under the pretence of casting out devils... (1603)

HARSNETT, Samuel: A Discovery of the fradulent Practises of Iohn Darrel,bacheler of artes (1599)

HARSNETT, Samuel: Three Sermons preached by the reverend and learned Dr Richard Stuart...to which is added a Fourth Sermon, preached by the right reverend father in God, Samuel Harsnett, Lord Arch-Bishop of Yorke (1656)

HEYLYN, Peter: Cyprianus Anglicus: or, the History of the Life and Death of the most reverend and renowned Prelate William...Lord Archbishop of Canterbury (1668)

HEYWOOD, Oliver: Life of John Angier of Denham, ed. E. Axon (Chetham Society, new series, xcvii. 1937)

[HIERON, Samuel:] A Short Dialogue proving that the ceremonyes, and some other corruptions now in question, are defended, by none other arguments than such as the Papists have here tofore used... (1605)

HISTORICAL Manuscripts Commission:

Fourth Report (1874)

9: Calendar of the Manuscripts of the most Hon. The Marquess of Salisbury, preserved at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire, vols.XV-XXI, ed. M.S. Giuseppi & G. Dyfnallt Owen (1930-70)

12: Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Dean and Chapter of Wells, ed. W.H.B. Bird & W.P. Baildon (2 vols., 1907-13)

29: Report of the Manuscripts of the Duke of Portland preserved at Welbeck Abbey, vol. IX. ed. R.F. Isaacson (1923)

45: Report on the Manuscripts of the Duke of Buccleuch and Queensbury ...preserved at Montagu House, Whitehall vols. I & III. ed. R.E.G. & E.F. Kirk (1899-1926)

66: Report on the Manuscripts of the Earl of Ancaster preserved at

Grimsthorpe, ed. S.C. Lomas (Dublin,1907)

78: Report on the Manuscripts of the lare Reginald Rawdon Hastings Esq. of the Manor House, Ashby-de-la-Zouche vols.II & IV ed. F. Bickley (1930-47)

HISTORY and Constitution of a Cathedral of the Old Foundation: illustrated from Documents (hitherto almost entirely unpublished) in the Registry and Muniment Room of the Cathedral of Chichester, ed. C.A. Swainson (1880)

H(OLLAND), H(enry): Monumenta Sepulchraria Sancti Pauli (1614)

HOOKER, Richard: Works, ed. J. Keble (3 vols., Oxford,1836)

HOWSON, John: To the Minister, Churchwardens & Parishioners of the diocesse of Oxon [1622]

HULL, Willliam: The Third Worke of Mercy: or, a sinners entertainement of harbourlesse Christ, 6 Sermons (1612)

HUMFREY, Richard: Saint Ambrose his Christian Offices in 3 Bookes (1637)

HUTTON, Matthew: Correspondence, ed. J. Raine (Surtees Society, xvii. 1843)

HYATT, James: The Preachers President or the Master and Scholler. In a Sermon preached at a Synode, holden by the right reverend father in God Iohn Lord Bishop of Chester, at Wigan in Lancashire, the 21 of Aprill 1625 (1625)

HYDE, Edward: The History of the Rebellion of Civil Wars in England, i. (Oxford,1702)

I, S: Certaine Godlie and Learned Sermons (1601), [S.T.C.14058]

INGMETHORPE, Thomas: A Sermon upon the Words of Saint Paul 'Let everie Soul be subiect unto the Higher Powers' (1619)

INSTITUTIONES Clericorum in comitatu Wiltoniae ab Anno 1297 ad Annum 1810, ed. T. Phillipps (2 vols., 1825)

IRELAND, Thomas: The Oath of Allegeance defended in a Sermon preached at a Synode in the metropoliticall Church of Yorke (1610)

ISAACSON, Henry: Saturni Ephemerides sive Tabula Historico-Chronolgia (1633)

ISAACSON, Henry: The Life and Death of Lancelot Andrewes, D.D, ed. S. Isaacson (1829)

JACKSON, Thomas: Christs Answer unto Iohns Question: or, an Introduction to the Knowledge of Iesus Christ and him Crucified (1625)

JAMES I: A Meditation upon the Lord's Prayer written by the Kings Maiestie for the benefit of all his Subiects, especially of such as follow the Court (1619)

JAMES I: A Meditation upon the 27,28,29 verses of the XXVII chapter of St Matthew. Or a Paterne for a Kings Inauguration (1620)

JAMES I: King James his Apopthegmes or Table-talke, as they were by him delivered, ed. B.A., (1643)

JAMES I: The Political Works of James I, ed. C.H. McIlwain (Cambridge, Mass., 1918)

JAMES I: Workes (1616)

JAMES I: 'King James and the English Puritans: an unpublished Document' Blackwoods Magazine, clxxxviii. (1910)

JEWEL, John: Workes (1611)

JOHN Le Neve's Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae 1541-1587, ed. J.M. Horn, D.S. Bailey & D.M. Smith (5 vols., 1969-79)

JONES, William: Reports (1675)

KECKERMANN, Bartholomaeus: Heavenly Knowledg: A Manuduction to Theologie, ed. Thomas Vicars (1626)

KELLET, Edward: Miscellanies of Divinitie (Cambridge,1633)

KING, Henry: A Sermon preached at Pauls Crosse the 25 of November 1621, upon occasion of that false and scandalous Report (lately printed) touching the supposed Apostasie of the right reverend father in God, Iohn King, late Lord Bishop of London (1621)

KING, John: A Sermon at Paules Crosse, on behalfe of Paules Church. March 26 1620 (1620)

KING, John: A Sermon of Publicke Thanks-giving for the happy recovery of his Maiesty from his late dangerous Sicknesse: preached at Pauls-Crosse the 11 of Aprill 1619 (1619)

KING, John: Lectures upon Jonas delivered at Yorke 1594 (1611)

LAKE, Arthur: Sermons with some Religious and Divine Meditations... whereunto is prefixed by way of preface A Short View of the Life and Vertues of the Author (1629)

LAKE, Arthur: Ten Sermons upon Severall Occasions, preached at Pauls Crosse and elsewhere (1641)

LANGHORNE, Lancelot: Mary sitting at Christs Feet. A Sermon preached at the Funerall of Mris Mary Swaine, the wife of Mr William Swaine, at St Buttolphs without Aldergate (1611)

LAUD, William: Works, ed. J. Bliss & W. Scott (7 vols., Oxford,1847-60)

[LEIGHTON, Alexander:] An Appeal to the Parliament, or Sions Plea against the Prelacie [Amsterdam,1628]

[LESLIE, Henry:] A Speech delivered at the Visitation of Downe and Conner, held at Lisnegarvy the 26th of September 1638 (1639)

LEY, John: Sunday a Sabbath: or, a preparative discourse for discussion of Sabbatary Doubts, being the first part of a greater Worke (1641)

LLOYD, David: Memoires of the Lives, Actions, Sufferings of those...excellent

Personages that suffered...for the Protestant Religion (1668)

LLOYD, David: State-Worthies or the States-men and Favourites of England since the Reformation (1670)

LORDS Journals, ii-iii. (1578-1628)

LOUGHER, Robert: A Sermon preached at Cern in the County of Dorset, the 18 day of September 1623 at the visitation of the right reverend father in God, the Lord Bishop of Bristoll (1624)

MANDEVILL, Robert: Timothies Taske: or a Christian sea-card guiding through the coastes of a peaceable Conscience to a Peace constant and a Crowne immortall...in two Synodall assemblies in Carliell (Oxford,1619)

MANNINGHAM, John: Diary, ed. R.P. Sorlien (Hanover,1976)

MARSHE, Richard: A Sermon preached at the Consecration of the right reverend father in God Richard Senhouse Lord Bishop of Carlile, in the metropoliticall Church of York, the six and twentieth of September 1624 (1625)

MASON, Francis: Of the Consecration of the Bishops of the Church of England: with their Succession, Jurisdiction, and other things incidental to their Calling: as also of the Ordination of Priests and Deacons (1613)

MASON, Francis: The Authoritie of the Church in making Canons and Constitutions concerning things indifferent and the Obedience thereto required: with particular application to the present estate of the Church of England (1607)

MASON, Henry: The New Art of Lying, covered by Iesuites under the Vaile of Equiocation, discovered and disproved (1624)

MASON, Henry: The Tribunall of the Conscience: or a Treatise of Examination shewing why and how a Christian should examine his Conscience and take an account of his Life (1626)

MATERIALS for the Life of Thomas Morton, Bishop of Durham, ed. J.E.B. Mayor (Cambridge Antiquarian Society Communications, iii. 1864)

MATTHEW, Robert: Peters Net Let Downe or the Fisher and the Fish both prepared towards a blessed Haven. Delivered at a Synod at Chipping-Norton in Oxford-Shire (1634)

MATTHEW, Tobie: 'Two Sermons', The Christian Observer, cxviii-xx. (1847)

MEMORIALS of Affairs of State in the reigns of Queen Elizabeth and King James I. Collected (chiefly) from the original papers of Sir R. Winwood, ed. E. Sawyer (3 vols., 1725)

MEREDETH, Richard: Two Sermons preached before his Maiestie, in his Chappell at Whitehall, the one the xi of Februarie, the other the xxv of the same month (1606)

MEREDYTH, John: The Iudge of Heresies. One God, one Faith, one Church. Out of which there is no Salvation (1624)

MEREDYTH, John: The Sinne of Blasphemie against the Holy Ghost scholastically examined; the reasons of the absolute Irremissibility thereof displayed; an Admonition to all revolting Apostates annexed (1622)

'METROPOLITICAL Visitation of the Archdeaconry of Winchester 1607-1608' A Hampshire Miscellany, i. ed. A.J. Willis (Folkestone,1963)

MILBOURNE, Richard: Concerning Impositions of Hands. A Sermon at the Lord Archbishop his Visitation metropolitical, held at St Marie Cray in Kent, by the Bishop of Rochester his Graces Commissioner, the 7 of September last (1607)

MORTON, Thomas: A Catholike Appeale for Protestants, out of the Confessions of the Roman Doctors; particularly answering the nisnamed Catholike Apologie for the Roman Faith, out of the Protestants (1609)

MORTON, Thomas: A Defence of the Innocencie of the Three Ceremonies of the Church of England (1618)

MYRIELL, Thomas: The Christians Comfort. In a Sermon appointed for the Crosse, but preached in S.Pauls Church on Candlemas Day, 1623 (1623)

MYRIELL, Thomas: The Devout Soules Search, with the happie Issue of Comfort found. In a Sermon preached at Paules Crosse Ian.14 1610 (1610)

NEILE, Richard: M.Ant.De.Dnis. Arch-Bishop of Spalato, his shiftings in Religion, a Man for many Masters (1624)

NORTON, John: Abel being Dead yet Speaketh: or the Life and Death of...Mr John Cotton (1658)

OLD Cheque-Book or Book of Remembrance of the Chapel Royal 1561-1744, ed. R.F. Rimbault (Camden Society, 2nd series, iii. 1872)

OTTERBOURNE, Thomas: Duo Rerum Anglicarum Scriptores Veteres (2 vols., Oxford,1732)

OXLEY, Thomas: The Shepheard, or a Sermon preached at a Synode in Durisme Minster upon Tuesday, being the fift of April 1608 (1609)

OVERTON, William: Oratio Doctissima et Gravissima (Oxford,1601)

PARKHURST, John: Letter Book of John Parkhurst Bishop of Norwich compiled during the Years 1571-5, ed. R.A. Houlbrooke (Norfolk Record Society, xliii. 1974-5)

PARRY, Henry: The Summe of Christian Religion, delivered by Zacharius Ursinus in his Lectures upon the Catechisme (1611)

PAULE, George: The Life of the most reverend and religious Prelate John Whitgift, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury (1612)

PETER, Hugh: A Dying Father's last Legacy to an onely Child (1660)

PHILLIPS, Jerome: The Fisher-Man: a Sermon preached at a Synode held at Southwell in Nottinghamshire (1623)

POTTER, Christopher: A Sermon preached at the Consecration of the right reverend father in God Barnaby Potter, DD and L.Bishop of Carlisle, at Ely house in Holbourne March 15 1628 (1629)

PRAESTANTIUM ac Eruditorum Virorum Epistolae (Amsterdam,1684)

PRICE, Sampson: The Beauty of Holines: or the Consecration of a House of Prayer in the example of our Saviour. A Sermon preached inthe chappell at the Free-Schoole in Shrewsbury...At the Consecration of the Chappell by the right reverend father in God, the Lord Bishop of Coventrey and Lichfield (1618)

'PRIMARY Visitation of the diocese of Lincoln by Bishop Neile, A.D. 1614' ed. E. Venables, Associated Architectural Societies' Reports and Papers, xvi. (1881-2)

PRINCE, John: Danmonii Orientales Illustres: or the Worthies of Devon (1810)

PROCEEDINGS in Parliament 1610, ed. E.R. Foster (2 vols., New Haven,1966)

PROCEEDINGS of the Lancashire Justices of the Peace at the Sheriff's Table during Assize week, 1578-1694, ed. B.W. Quintrell (The Record Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, cxxi. Bristol,1981)

PROGRESSES, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities of King James the First, ed. J. Nichols (4 vols., 1828)

[PRYNNE, William:] A Looking-Glasse for all Lordly Prelates [1636]

PRYNNE, William: Canterburies Doome (1646)

[PRYNNE, William:] Certain Quaeres propounded to the Bowers at the Name of Iesus and to the Patrons thereof. Wherein the authorities and reasons alleadged by Bishop Andrewes and his followers, in defence of this Ceremony, are briefly examined and refuted (1636)

PRYNNE, William: The Antipathie of the English Lordly Prelacie both to Regall Monarchy and Civil Unity (1641)

QUARTER Sessions Records for the County of Somerset i. James I 1607-1625, ed. E.H. Bates (Somerset Record Society, xxiii. 1907)

RECORDS of the Borough of Leicester, ed. H. Stocks and W.H. Stevenson (Cambridge,1923)

REEVE, Edmund: The Christian Divinitie, contained in the Divine Service of the Church of England (1631)

REGISTRUM Sacrum Anglicanum, ed. W. Stubbs (Oxford,1897)

RICHARDSON, Charles: A Workeman that Needeth not to be Ashamed: or the Faithfull Steward of Gods House (1616)

ROGERS, Francis: A Visitation Sermon, preached at the Lord Archbishops trienniall and ordinary Visitation, in St.Margarets in Canterbury, upon Aprill the fift, 1630 (1633)

SANDERSON, Robert: Two Sermons: preached at two several Visitations, at Boston, in the diocesse and county of Lincolne (1622)

SCLATER, William: A Key to the Key of Scripture: or an Exposition with Notes upon the Epistle to the Romanes, begun at Walsall in Stafford-shire, continued at Pitminster in Somerset (1629)

SCLATER, William: A Quaestion of Tythes Revised. Arguments for the Morality of Tything enlarged and cleared (1623)

SCLATER, William: A Threefold Preservative against Three Dangerous Diseases of these Latter Times...Prescribed in a Sermon at S.Pauls Crosse in London, September 17 1609 (1610)

SELECT Library of the Nicene and post-Nicene Fathers, vii. ed. H. Wace & P. Schaff (Oxford,1894), xii. ed. R.L. Feltoe (Oxford,1895)

SMITH, Miles: A Learned and Godly Sermon preached at Worcester at an Assise (Oxford,1602)

SMITH, Miles: Sermons (1632)

SOMERSET Incumbents, ed. F.W. Weaver (Bristol,1889)

SPAIN and the Jacobean Catholics i. 1603-1612, ed. A.J. Loomie (Catholic Record Society, lxiv. 1973)

SPAIN and the Jacobean Catholics ii. 1613-1624, ed. A.J. Loomie (Catholic Record Society, lxviii. 1978)

SPARKE, Thomas: A Brotherly Perswasion to Unitie and Uniformitie in Iudgment and Practise touching the received and present Ecclesiasticall Government and the Authorised Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of England (1607)

SPRINT, John: Cassander Anglicanus: shewing the necessity of Conformitie to the prescribed Ceremonies of our Church, in case of Deprivation (1618)

STATE of the Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I as illustrated by documents relating to the diocese of Lincoln, i, ed. C.W. Foster (Lincoln Record Society, xxiii. Horncastle,1926)

STATE Trials, ii. ed. T.B. Howell (1816)

STATUTES and Constitutions of the Cathedral Church of Chichester, ed. F.G. Bennett, A.H. Codrington & C. Deedes (Chichester,1904)

STOW, John: The Annales or General Chronicle of England (1615)

STUART Royal Proclamations, i. Royal Proclamations of King James I 1603-1625, ed. J.F. Larkin & P.L. Hughes (Oxford,1973)

SUBSCRIPTION Book of Bishops Tounson and Davenant 1620-1640, ed. B. Williams, (Wiltshire Record Society, xxxii. Devizes,1977)

SURVEY of the Booke of Common Prayer (1606)

SURVEY of the Booke of Common Prayer (1610)

'SURVEY of the diocese of Gloucester 1603' ed. W.J. Sheils in An Ecclesiastical Miscellany (Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society Records section, xi. Gateshead,1976)

SWINBURNE, Briefe Treatise of Testaments and last Willes (1611)

SYNODOLIA: a collection of Articles of Religion, Canons and Proceedings of Convocations...from the year 1547 to the year 1717, ed. E. Cardwell (2 vols., Oxford,1842)

TAYLOR, Thomas: Works (1653)

THORNBOROUGH, John: The Last Will and Testament of Iesus Christ touching the blessed Sacrament of his Body and Bloud (Oxford,1630)

THORNE, William: A Kenning-Glasse for a Christian King (1603)

TRANSCRIPT of the Registers of the Company of Stationers 1554-1640, iii. ed. E. Arber (1876)

TWISSE, William: Of the Morality of the Fourth Commandement as still in force to binde Christians (1641)

TWO Elizabethan Puritan Diaries, by Richard Rogers and Samuel Ward, ed. M.M. Knappen (1933)

VAUGHAN, Edward: A plaine and perfect Method for the easie Understanding of the whole Bible (1617)

VICARS, Thomas: The Sword Bearer: or the Byshop of Chichester's Armes emblazoned in a Sermon preached at a Synod (1627)

VICARS, Thomas: Pusillus Grex (Oxford,1627)

VICARS, Thomas: The Grounds of that Doctrine which is according to Godlinesse. Or a Briefe and Easie Catechisme...with Graces and Prayers for them that want better helps (2nd ed., 1630; 3rd ed., 1631)

VICARS, Thomas: Manuductio ad Artem Rhetoricam (1621)

VISITATION Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation, ed. W.H. Frere i. (Aklcuin Club Collections, xiv. 1910)

VISITATION of the county of Gloucester taken in the year 1623, ed. J. Maclean & W.C. Heane (Harleian Society, xxi. 1885)

WALKER, Anthony: 'The Life of that Famous Grecian Mr John Bois, S.T.B., one of the Translators of the Bible' Desiderata Curiosa, ed. F. Peck (ii.VIII, 1735)

WALTON, Izaack: Life of Dr Robert Sanderson, late Bishop of Lincoln (1678)

WELDON, Anthony: The Court and Character of K. James (1650)

WESTERMAN, William: Iacobs Well: or a Sermon preached before the Kings most excellent Maiestie at Saint Albans in his summer Progresse 1612 (1613)

WESTON, William: The Autobiography of an Elizabethan, ed. P. Caraman (1955)

WHITE, Francis: The Orthodox Faith and Way to the Church Explained and Iustified (1617)

WIDLEY, George: The Doctrine of the Sabbath handled in Foure Severall Bookes or Treatises (1604)

WILLIAMS, John: Great Britains Salomon. A Sermon at the magnificent Funeral of the most high and mighty King Iames, the late King of Great Brittaine, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith (1625)

WOOD, Anthony: Athenae Oxonienses...to which are added the Fasti, or Annals of the said University, ed. P. Bliss (5 vols., 1813-20)

WYNN, John: The History of the Gwydir Family, ed. J. Ballinger (Cardiff,1927)

YONGE, Walter: Diary,1604-1628 ed. G. Roberts (Camden Society, Ist series, xli. 1848)

YOUNG, John: Diary of John Young S.T.P. Dean of Winchester 1616 to the Commonwealth, ed. F.R. Goodman (1928)

(iii) Secondary Sources

ATKYNS, R: The Ancient and Present State of Glostershire, ed. B.S. Smith (2 vols., 1974)

ATTREE, F.W.T. & BOOKER, J.H.L: 'The Sussex Colepepers. Part II' Sussex Archaeological Collections, xlviii. (Lewes,1905)

AYLMER, G.E. & CANT, R.ed: A History of York Minster (Oxford,1977)

BABBAGE, S.B: Puritanism & Richard Bancroft (1962)

BARNARD, E.A.B: 'Lewis Bayly, Bishop of Bangor (d. 1631) and Thomas Bayly (d. 1657) his son' Transactions of the honourable Society of Cymmrodorion (vol. for 1928-9; 1930)

BEARCROFT, P: A Historical Account of Thomas Sutton Esq., and of his Foundation in Charter-House (1737)

BENHAM, W.G: 'Pedigree of Archbishop Samuel Harsnett', Essex Review xl. (Colchester,1931)

BENNETT, G.V: White Kennett 1660-1728 (1957)

BIRCH, T: Life of Henry Prince of Wales, eldest son of King James I (1760)

BLOMEFIELD, F: An Essay towards a Topographical History of the County of Norfolk, iii. (1806)

BOWKER, M: The Henrician Reformation: the diocese of Lincoln under John Longland, 1521-1547 (Cambridge,1981)

BRETT, T: Suffragan Bishops and Rural Deans, ed. J. Fendall (Cambridge,1858)

BROOK, B: The lives of the Puritans (3 vols., 1813)

WILLIS BUND, J.W: 'Religious Life in Worcestershire in the Seventeenth Century, shown by the Sessions Records' Associated Architectural Societies' Reports and Papers, xxiv. (1898)

BURN, J.S: The High Commission: Notice of the Court and its Proceedings (1865)

CARTER, C. S: Richard Hooker (1947)

CASSAN, S.H: Lives of the Bishops of Bath and Wells (1829)

CLARK, A: 'Dr Plume's Pocket-Book' Essex Review xv. (Colchester,1906)

CLARK, A: 'Dr Plume's Notebook' Essex Review xv. (Colchester,1906)

COCKBURN, J.S: A History of English Assizes 1558-1714 (Cambridge,1972)

COLLINSON, J: The History and Antiquities of the County of Somerset, i. (Bath,1791)

COLLINSON, P: Archbishop Grindal 1519-1583: the struggle for a reformed Church (1979)

COLLINSON, P: The Elizabethan Puritan Movement (1967)

COLLINSON, P: 'The Jacobean Religious Settlement: the Hampton Court conference' in Before the English Civil War: Essays on early Stuart Politics and Government, ed. H. Tomlinson (1983)

COLLINSON, P: Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism (1983)

COLLINSON, P: 'Popular Prelates: Elizabethan and Jacobean roots of the low Church tradition' in Friends of Lambeth Palace Lbrary Annual Report (1982), pp.11-22.

COLLINSON, P: The Religion of Protestants: the Church in English Society 1559-1625 (Oxford,1982)

COOPER, J.H: 'The Vicars and Parish of Cuckfield in the Seventeenth Century' Sussex Archaeological Collections, xlv. (Lewes,1902)

CURTIS, M.H: 'Hampton Court Conference & its Aftermath' History xlvi. (1961)

DANSEY, W: Horae Decanicae Rurales, being an attempt to illustrate...the names and title...of Rural Deans (2 vols., 1835)

DENT, C.M: Protestant Reformers in Elizabethan Oxford (Oxford,1983)

DICTIONARY of National Biography, from the Earliest Times to 1900, ed. L. Stephen & S. Lee (63 vols., 1885-1900)

DIOCESE of Salisbury: Guide to the Records of the Bishop, the Archdeacons of Salisbury and Wiltshire and other Archidiaconal and Peculiar Jurisdictions, and to the Records from the Bishop of Bristol's sub-Registry for Dorset (Bradford-on-Avon,1973)

DUNCAN, G.I.O: The High Court of Delegates (Cambridge,1971)

DUNNING, R.W: 'Rural Deans in the Fifteenth Century' Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, xl. (1967)

EAGLE, xvii. (Cambridge,1893)

EMMISON, F.G: Elizabethan Life: Morals and the Church Courts (Chelmsford, 1973)

EVANS, J.T: Seventeenth Century Norwich: Politics, Religion and Government,1620-1690 (Oxford,1979)

FINCHAM, K: 'Contemporary Opinions of Thomas Weelkes' Music & Letters, lxii. (1981)

FINCHAM, K.C. 'Ramifications of the Hampton Court conference in the dioceses, 1603-1609' Journal of Ecclesiastical History (forthcoming, 1985)

FINCHAM, K. & Lake, P: 'The Ecclesiastical Policy of James I' Journal of British Studies (forthcoming, 1985)

FLETCHER, A: A County Community in Peace & War: Sussex 1600-1660 (1975)

FOSTER, W.R: The Church before the Convenants: the Church of Scotland

1596-1630 (Edinburgh,1975)

FULLER, M.J: The Life, Letters & Writings of John Davenant DD, 1572-1641 (1897)

GIBBONS, A: Ely Episcopal Records (Lincoln,1891)

GIBSON, E: Codex Juris Ecclesiastici Anglicani: or, the Statutes, Constitutions, Canons, Rubricks and Articles of the Church of England (2 vols., Oxford,1761)

GIBSON, J.S.W: Wills and where to find them (1974)

GOODWIN, G: A Catalogue of the Harsnett Library at Colchester (1888)

GREEN, I.M: The Re-establishment of the Church of England 1660-1663 (Oxford,1978)

HEAL, F. & O'DAY, R. ed: Church & Society in England: Henry VIII to James I (1977)

HEAL, F: Of Prelates & Princes: a Study of the Economic and Social Position of the Tudor Episcopate (Cambridge,1980)

HEAL, F: 'The Archbishops of Canterbury and the Practice of Hospitality' Journal of Ecclesiastical History xxxiii. (1982)

HEMBRY, P.M: The Bishops of Bath & Wells 1540-1640: Social and Economic Problems (1967)

HERVEY, M.F.S: The Life, Correspondence & Collections of Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel (Cambridge,1921)

HIGHAM, F: Catholic and Reformed: a Study of the Anglican Church 1559-1662 (1962)

HIGHAM, F: Lancelot Andrewes (1952)

HILL, J.E.C: Society & Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England (1964)

HILL, J.E.C: Economic Problems of the Church from Archbishop Whitgift to the Long Parliament (Oxford,1956)

HILLS, A: 'Samuel Harsnett (1561-1631)' Essex Review li. (Colchester,1942)

HOLMES, C: Seventeenth-Century Lincolnshire (Lincoln,1980)

HOULBROOKE, R: Church Courts and the People during the English Reformation 1520-1570 (Oxford,1979)

HUTCHINS, J: The History and Antiquities of the County of Dorset (4 vols., 1973)

JEDIN, H: A History of the Council of Trent tr. E. Graf (2 vols., 1957-61)

JOYCE, J: England's Sacred Synods. A Constitutional History of the Convocations of the Clergy (1855)

KALU, O.U: 'Bishops and Puritans in Early Jacobean England: a Perspective on Methodology' Church History xlv. (1976)

KALU, O.U: 'Continuity in change: Bishops of London and Religious Dissent in Early Stuart England' Journal of British Studies, xviii. (1978)

KAUTZ, A.P: 'The Selection of Jacobean Bishops' Early Stuart Studies, ed. H.S. Reinmuth (Minneapolis,1970)

KENNEDY, D.E: 'The Jacobean Episcopate' Historical Journal, v. (1962)

KENNEDY, W.P.M: Elizabethan Episcopal Administration: an Essay in Sociology and Politics (Alcuin Club Collections, xxv-xxviii. Oxford,1924-5)

KENYON, J: The Stuart Constitution (Cambridge,1966)

KIRBY, I.M: Diocese of Gloucester: a Catalogue of the Records of the Bishops and Archdeacons (Gloucester,1968)

LAKE, P.G: 'Matthew Hutton - a Puritan Bishop?' History, lxiv. (1979)

LAKE, P.G: Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church (Cambridge,1982)

LAMONT, W.M: Godly Rule: Politics & Religion 1603-1660 (1969)

LAMONT, W: 'The Rise and Fall of Bishop Bilson' Journal of British Studies, v. (1966)

LATHBURY, T: A History of the Convocation of the Church of England: being an account of the Proceedings of the Anglican Ecclesiastical Councils from the Earliest Period to the Year 1742 (1842)

LEVACK, B.P: The Civil Lawyers in England 1603-1641 (Oxford,1973)

'LIFE of Robert Abbot, Bishop of Salisbury' in The Life of Dr George Abbot, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury (Guildford,1777)

McGRATH, P: Papists and Puritans under Elizabeth I (1967)

MAJOR, K: Handlist of the Records of the Bishop of Lincoln and the Archdeacons of Lincoln and Stow (Oxford,1953)

MANNING, R.B: Religion and Society in Elizabethan Sussex (Leicester,1969)

MANNING, R.B: 'The Crisis of Episcopal Authority during the Reign of Elizabeth I' Journal of British Studies, xi. (1971)

MARCHANT, R.A: The Church under the Law: Justice, Administration and Discipline in the diocese of York 1560-1640 (Cambridge,1969)

MARCHANT, R.A: The Puritans and the Church Courts in the diocese of York 1560-1642 (1960)

MARSHALL, E: On Suffragan Bishops in England (Oxford,1892)

MASON, A.J: The Church of England and Episcopacy (Cambridge,1914)

MILWARD, P: Religious Controversies of the Jacobean Age: a Survey of Printed Sources (1978)

MONRO, C: Acta Cancellariae (1847)

MORGAN, I: Prince Charles's Puritan Chaplain (1957)

MORRILL, J.S: 'The Church of England 1642-9' in Morrill ed. Reactions to the

English Civil War 1642-1649 (1982)

NUTTALL, G.F: 'Peterborough Ordinations 1612-1630 and Early Nonconformity' Journal of Ecclesiastical History, xxx. (1979)

O'DAY, R: 'Cumulative Debt: the Bishops of Coventry & Lichfield and their Economic Problems c.1540-1640' Midland History, iii. (1976)

O'DAY, R: The English Clergy: the Emergence and Consolidation of a Profession 1558-1642 (Leicester,1979)

O'DAY, R: 'Thomas Bentham: a Case Study in the Problems of the Early Elizabethan Episcopate' Journal of Ecclesiastical History, xxiii. (1972)

O'DAY, R. & HEAL, F. ed: Continuity and Change: Personnel and Administration of the Church of England 1500-1642 (Leicester,1976)

0'DAY R. & HEAL, F. ed: Princes and Paupers in the English Church 1500-1800 (Leicester,1981)

OLLARD, S.L: 'Confirmation in the Anglican Communion' in Confirmation and the Laying on of Hands by various Writers, i. (1926)

OWEN, D.M: Ely Records. A Handlist of the Records of the Bishop and Archdeacon of Ely (Cambridge,1971)

OWEN, D.M: 'Synods in the diocese of Ely in the later Middle Ages and the Sixteenth Century' Studies in Church History, iii. ed. G.J. Cuming (Leiden, 1966)

OWEN, D.M: The Records of the Established Church in England (British Records Association: Archives and the User, i. 1970)

OWEN, H.G: 'The Episcopal Visitation: its Limits and Limitations in Elizabethan London' Journal of Ecclesiastical History, xi. (1960)

PARKER, T.M: 'Arminianism and Laudianism in Seventeenth-Century England', Studies in Church History, i. ed. C.W. Dugmore & C. Duggan (1964)

PARSONS, F.G: The History of St Thomas's Hospital (3 vols., 1932-4)

PATTISON, M: Isaac Casaubon 1559-1614 (1875)

PECK, L.L: Northampton: Patronage and Policy at the Court of James I (1982)

PECKHAM, W.D: 'The Vicars Choral of Chichester Cathedral' Sussex Archaeological Collections, lxxviii. (Oxford,1937)

PERCEVAL, A.P: An Apology for the Doctrine of Apostolical Succession (1839)

PETERS, R: Oculus Episcopi: Administration in the Archdeaconry of St Albans 1580-1625 (Manchester,1963)

PHILLIMORE, R: The Ecclesiastical Law of the Church of England (2 vols., 1895)

POOLE, G.A: Diocesan Histories: Peterborough [1882]

PORTER, H.C: Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge (Camridge,

1958)

PRICE, F.D: 'Bishop Bullingham and Chancellor Blackleech: a diocese divided' Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society, xci. (1972)

PRICE, F.D: 'Gloucester diocese under Bishop Hooper 1551-3' Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society, lx. (1938)

PUSEY, E.B.ed: 'Preface of the Editor' in The Abbe Gaume's Manual for Confessors (1878)

QUINTRELL, B.W: 'The Royal Hunt and the Puritans, 1604-1605', Journal of Ecclesiastical History, xxxi. (1980)

RAINES, F.R. & SUTTON, C.W: Life of Humphrey Chetham (Chetham Society, new series, xlix. 1903)

REIDY, M.F: Bishop Lancelot Andrewes, Jacobean Court Preacher (Chicago, 1955)

RENSHAW, W.C: 'Notes from the Act Book of the Archdeaconry Court of Lewes' Sussex Archaeological Collections, xlix. (Lewes,1906)

REYNOLDS, H.E: Wells Cathedral: its Foundation, Constitutional History and Statutes (Leeds,1881)

ROGAN, J: 'King James's Bishops' University of Durham Journal, xlvii. (1956)

TREVOR-ROPER, H.R: Archbishop Laud, 1573-1640 (1962)

TREVOR-ROPER, H.R: Historical Essays (1957)

TREVOR-ROPER, H.R: 'King James and his Bishops' History Today, v. (1955)

RUSSELL, A.T: Memoirs of the Life and Works of... Lancelot Andrewes,D.D. (Cambridge,1863)

SEAVER, P.S: The Puritan Lectureships: the Politics of Religious Dissent 1560-1662 (Stanford,1970)

SHORT Title Catalogue of Books printed in England, Scotland and Ireland, and of English Books printed Abroad 1475-1640, ed. A.W. Pollard & G.R. Redgrave (1926)

SHEILS, W.J: The Puritans in the diocese of Peterborough, 1558-1610 (Northampton Record Society, xxx. Northampton,1979)

SHRIVER, F: 'Hampton Court Re-visited: James I and the Puritans' Journal of Ecclesiastical History, xxxiii. (1982)

SHRIVER, F: 'Orthodoxy and Diplomacy: James I and the Vortius Affair', English Historical Review, lxxxv. (1970)

SHUFFLETON, F: Thomas Hooker 1586-1647 (Princeton,1977)

SMITH, D.M: Guide to the Bishops' Registers of England and Wales: a Survey from the Middle Ages to the abolition of Episcopacy in 1646 (1981)

SOMMERVILLE, J.P: 'The Royal Supremacy and Episcopacy Iure Divino 1603-1660', Journal of Ecclesiastical History, xxxiv. (1983)

SPUFFORD, M: Contrasting Communities: English Villagers in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries (Cambridge,1979)

STEER, F.W. & KIRBY, I.M: Diocese of Chichester: a Catalogue of the Records of the Bishop, Archdeacons and former Exempt Jurisdictions (Chichester,1966)

STEER, F.W. & KIRBY, I.M: Diocese of Chichester: a Catalogue of the Records of the Dean and Chapter, Vicars Choral, St Mary's Hospital, Colleges and Schools (Chichester,1967)

STIEG, M: Laud's Laboratory: the diocese of Bath and Wells in the early Seventeenth Century (East Brunswick, N.J.,1982)

STRYPE, J: The Life and Acts of the most reverend father in God John Whitgift (1718)

'SUMMARY Inventories of the Archives of the Worcester Diocesan Registry' (3 vols., Worcester,1961)

SWINDEN, H: The History and Antiquities of the Ancient Burgh of Great Yarmouth in the County of Norfolk (Norwich,1773)

SYKES, N: Church and State in England in the XVIIIth Century (Cambridge,1934)

SYKES, N: From Sheldon to Secker (Cambridge,1959)

TAIT, J: 'The Declaration of Sports for Lancashire (1617)' English Historical Review, xxxii. (1917)

TAYLOR, B: 'William Laud, Dean of Gloucester 1616-1621' Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society, lxxvii. (Gloucester,1959)

THOMAS, K.V: Religion and the Decline of Magic (1971)

THORESBY, R: Vicaria Leodensis: or the History of the Church of Leedes in Yorkshire (1724)

ROSE-TROUP, F: John White the Patriarch of Dorchester and the Founder of Massachusetts 1575-1648 (1930)

TYACKE, N.R.N: 'Arminianism and English Culture' in Britain and the Netherlands, vii. ed. A.C. Duke & C.A. Tamse (The Hague,1981)

TYACKE, N.R.N: 'Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter-Revolution' in C. Russell ed. The Origins of the English Civil War (1973)

TYLER, P: 'The Significance of the Ecclesiastical Commission at York' Northern History, ii. (1967)

USHER, R.G: The Reconstruction of the English Church (2 vols., 1910)

USHER, R.G: The Rise and Fall of the High Commission (Oxford,1913 & 1968)

VAGE, J.A: 'Ecclesiastical discipline in the early seven_ teenth century: some findings and some problems from the archdeaconry of Cornwall' Journal of the Society of Archivists, vii. (1982)

VICTORIA County History of Cambridge and the Isle of Ely, iv-vi. viii. ed. P.B. Pugh, C.R. Elrington & A.P.M. Wright (Oxford,1953-82)

WELSBY, P.A: George Abbot, the Unwanted Archbishop, 1562-1633 (1962)

WELSBY, P.A: Lancelot Andrewes, 1555-1626 (1958)

WHITE, F.O: Lives of the Elizabethan Bishops (1898)

WILLIAMS, F.B: Index of Dedications and Commendatory Verses in English Books before 1641 (1962)

WILLIS, A.J: 'Handlist of the Episcopal Records of the diocese of Winchester', (1964) [typescript; Bodl., ref: 111 c 5]

WILLLIS, B: A Survey of the Cathedrals (3 vols., 1742)

WILLSON, D.H: King James VI and I (1956)

WILLSON, D.H: 'James I and his Literary Assistants', Huntington Library Quarterly, viii. (1944-5)

ZAGORIN, P: The Court and the Country: the Beginning of the English Revolution in the mid-Seventeenth Century (New York,1970)

(iv) Theses

ALLEN, E.J.I: 'The State of the Church in the diocese of Peterborough, 1601-1642' (Oxford B.Litt. thesis, 1972)

BARRATT, D.M: 'The Condition of the Parish Clergy between the Reformation and 1660, with special reference to the dioceses of Oxford, Worcester and Gloucester' (Oxford D.Phil thesis, 1949)

CASSIDY, I: 'The Episcopate of William Cotton, Bishop of Exeter 1598-1621, with special reference to the State of the Clergy and the Administration of the Ecclesiastical Courts' (Oxford B.Litt. thesis, 1964)

CHRISTOPHERS, R: 'Social and Economic Background of the Surrey Clergy, 1520-1620' (London Ph.D. thesis, 1975)

FOSTER, A.W: 'A Biography of Archbishop Richard Neile, 1562-1640' (Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1978)

HAJZYK, H: 'The Church in Lincolnshire, c.1595-c.1640' (Cambridge Ph.D. thesis, 1980)

HEAL, F.M: 'The Bishops of Ely and their diocese during the Reformation period, c.1515-1600' (Cambridge Ph.D. thesis, 1972)

INGRAM. M.J: 'Ecclesiastical Justice in Wiltshire 1600-1640, with special reference to Causes concerning Sex and Marriage' (Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1976)

KALU, O.U: 'The Jacobean Church and Essex Puritans. A Regional Study on the Enforcement of Church Discipline and of the Survival of Puritan Nonconformity, 1603-1628' (Toronto Ph.D. thesis, 1973)

KAUTZ, A.P: 'The Jacobean Episcopate and its Legacy: A Study of the Episcopacy in Canterbury and York during the Reign of King James I' (Minnesota Ph.D. thesis, 1952)

LANDER, S: 'The diocese of Chichester 1508-58' (Cambridge Ph.D. thesis, 1974)

MACAULEY, J.S: 'Richard Mountague, Caroline Bishop, 1575-1641' (Cambridge Ph.D. thesis, 1965)

MILDON, W.H: 'Puritanism in Hampshire and the Isle of Wight from the Reign of Elizabeth to the Restoration' (London Ph.D. thesis, 1934)

O'DAY, R: 'Clerical Patronage and Recruitment in England in the Elizabethan and Early Stuart Periods, with special reference to the diocese of Coventry and Lichfield' (London Ph.D. thesis, 1972)

OWEN, H.G: 'The London Parish Clergy in the Reign of Elizabeth I' (London Ph.D. thesis, 1957)

PEAKE, T.H: 'The Somerset Clergy and the Church Courts in the diocese of

Bath and Wells, 1625-1642' (Bristol M.Litt. thesis, 1978)
POTTER, J.M: 'The Ecclesiastical Courts in the diocese of Canterbury, 1603-1665' (London M.Phil. thesis, 1973)
SHEILS, W.J: 'The Puritans in Church and Politics in the diocese of Peterborough, 1570-1610' (London Ph.D. thesis, 1974)
SHIPPS, K.W: 'Lay Patronage of East Anglian Puritan Clerics in Pre-Revolutionary England' (Yale Ph.D. thesis, 1971)
SHRIVER, F.H: 'The Ecclesiastical Policy of James I: Two Aspects: the Puritans (1603-5) - the Arminians (1611-25)' (Cambridge Ph.D. thesis, 1967)
THOMAS, G.W: 'Archbishop John Williams: Politics and Prerogative Law, 1621-1642' (Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1974)
THOMPSON, S: 'The Pastoral Work of the English and Welsh Bishops, 1500-1558' (Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1984)
TYACKE, N.R.N: 'Arminianism in England in Religion and Politics, 1604 to 1640' (Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1968)
WHITEMAN, E.A.O: 'The Episcopate of Dr Seth Ward, Bishop of Exeter (1662-7) and Salisbury (1667-1688/9), with special reference to the Ecclesiastical Problems of his Time' (Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1951)