

Church of England Record Society · 5

VISITATION ARTICLES
AND INJUNCTIONS OF THE
EARLY STUART CHURCH · II

Edited by KENNETH FINCHAM

Church of England Record Society

Volume 5

VISITATION ARTICLES
AND
INJUNCTIONS
OF THE
EARLY STUART CHURCH

VOLUME II

This selection of articles and injunctions issued by archbishops, bishops, archdeacons, and other ecclesiastical ordinaries in the early Stuart Church concentrates on the Church of Charles I, from his accession in 1625 to the outbreak of the Civil War in 1642. The volume traces the impact of Laudian reforms as well as the defensive reaction of the Church hierarchy in 1641–2. The range of churchmanship included is broad, stretching from the articles and injunctions of Laudian enthusiasts such as Bishops Wren and Montagu to those issued by Calvinist episcopalians such as Hall and Thornborough. The introduction places these texts in their historical and historiographical contexts, and an appendix lists all surviving sets of visitation articles for the years 1603–1642. The volume will be a valuable work for reference for anyone interested in the government and ideals of the early Stuart Church.

Dr KENNETH FINCHAM is Senior Lecturer in History at the University of Kent at Canterbury.

VISITATION ARTICLES
AND
INJUNCTIONS
OF THE
EARLY STUART CHURCH

VOLUME II

EDITED BY

Kenneth Fincham

THE BOYDELL PRESS

Church of England Record Society

© Kenneth Fincham 1998

All Rights Reserved. Except as permitted under current legislation no part of this work may be photocopied, stored in a retrieval system, published, performed in public, adapted, broadcast, transmitted, recorded or reproduced in any form or by any means, without the prior permission of the copyright owner

First published 1998

A Church of England Record Society publication
Published by The Boydell Press
an imprint of Boydell & Brewer Ltd
PO Box 9, Woodbridge, Suffolk IP12 3DF, UK
and of Boydell & Brewer Inc.
PO Box 41026, Rochester, NY 14604-4126, USA

ISBN 0 85115 518 9

ISSN 1351-3087

Series information is listed at the back of the volume

A catalogue record for this book is available
from the British Library

This publication is printed on acid-free paper

Printed in Great Britain by
St Edmundsbury Press Ltd, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	xi
Abbreviations	xii
Introduction	xiii
Textual Conventions	xxix
1. Bishop Valentine Carey's articles for Exeter diocese, 1625.	1
<i>Collated with:</i>	
i. Bishop Joseph Hall's articles for Exeter diocese, 1631.	10
ii. Hall's articles for Exeter diocese, 1631, collated with his articles for the same, 1638.	11
2. Archdeacon Theophilus Aylmer's articles for London archdeaconry, 1625.	12
<i>Collated with:</i>	
i. Archdeacon Thomas Paske's articles for London archdeaconry, 1626.	19
ii. Paske's articles for London archdeaconry, 1626, collated with his articles for the same, 1631.	20
iii. Paske's articles for London archdeaconry, 1631, collated with Archdeacon Gabriel Clark's articles for Durham archdeaconry, 1636.	21
iv. Aylmer's articles for London archdeaconry, 1625, collated with Archdeacon Morgan Wynne's articles for Lincoln archdeaconry, 1637.	21
3. Archdeacon Thomas Paske's order for London archdeaconry, 1627.	23
4. Bishop Richard Montagu's articles for Chichester diocese, 1628.	24
<i>Collated with:</i>	
i. Montagu's articles for Chichester diocese, 1631.	31
ii. Montagu's articles for Chichester diocese, 1631, collated with his articles for the same, 1634.	32
iii. Montagu's articles for Chichester diocese, 1634, collated with his articles for the same, 1637.	32
5. Royal declaration for the peace of the Church, 1628-9.	33
6. Archbishop Samuel Harsnett's orders for York diocese, 1629.	35
7. Royal instructions to the episcopate, 1629.	37
i. Circulated in Lincoln diocese, 1630.	39
ii. Circulated in Surrey archdeaconry, 1630.	40

8.	Bishop Godfrey Goodman's articles for Gloucester diocese, 1631.	42
	<i>Collated with:</i>	
	i. Goodman's articles for Gloucester diocese, 1634.	49
	ii. Goodman's articles for Gloucester diocese, 1634, collated with his articles for the same, 1637.	53
	iii. Goodman's articles for Gloucester diocese, 1637, collated with his articles for the same, 1640.	55
9.	Bishop Robert Wright's articles for Bristol diocese, 1631.	56
	<i>Collated with:</i>	
	i. Wright's articles for Coventry and Lichfield diocese, 1633.	68
	ii. Wright's articles for Coventry and Lichfield diocese, 1636.	70
	iii. Wright's articles for Coventry and Lichfield diocese, 1636, collated with his articles for the same, 1639.	70
	iv. Wright's articles for Bristol diocese, 1631, collated with Bishop Robert Skinner's articles for the same, 1637.	73
	v. Skinner's articles for Bristol diocese, 1637, collated with his articles for the same, 1640.	74
10.	Archdeacon Elizeus Burgess's articles for Rochester archdeaconry, c. 1632.	75
	<i>Collated with:</i>	
	i. Burgess's articles for Rochester archdeaconry, 1636.	80
11.	Orders agreed on by the general vestry of St Bartholomew Exchange, London, 1633.	81
12.	Archbishop George Abbot's order on the reception of communion in Crayford church, Kent, 1633.	83
13.	Archbishop William Laud's metropolitanical articles for Lincoln diocese, 1634.	85
	<i>Collated with:</i>	
	i. Laud's articles for Worcester diocese, 1635.	96
	ii. Laud's articles for Worcester diocese, 1635, collated with Bishop John Thornborough's articles for the same, 1636.	97
	iii. Laud's articles for Worcester diocese, 1635, collated with his articles for Lincoln diocese, 1638.	98
	iv. Laud's articles for Lincoln diocese, 1634, collated with Bishop John Williams's articles for the same, 1635.	99
	v. Williams's articles for Lincoln diocese, 1635, collated with his articles for the same, 1641.	103
	vi. Laud's articles for Lincoln diocese, 1634, collated with Archdeacon John Fulnetby's articles for Stafford archdeaconry, 1635.	105

14. Archbishop William Laud's injunctions to parochial clergy during his metropolitanical visitation, 1634–7.
 - i. Lincoln diocese, 1634. 106
 - ii. Gloucester diocese, 1635. 107
 - iii. Chichester diocese, 1635. 108
 - iv. London diocese, 1637. 109
15. Archbishop William Laud's articles for Exeter cathedral, 1634. 110
Collated with:
 - i. Laud's articles for Bristol cathedral, 1634. 112
 - ii. Laud's articles for Wells cathedral, 1634. 113
 - iii. Laud's articles for Peterborough cathedral, 1635. 113
 - iv. Laud's articles for Gloucester cathedral, 1635. 114
 - v. Laud's articles for St Paul's cathedral London, 1636. 114
 - vi. Bishop George Coke's articles for Hereford cathedral, 1637. 115
16. Bishop Edmund Griffith's articles for Bangor diocese, 1634. 116
Collated with:
 - i. Bishop William Roberts's articles for Bangor diocese, 1640. 123
17. Dean Richard Steward's orders for the peculiar of Chichester deanery, 1635. 124
18. Bishop William Juxon's articles for the London ministry, 1635. 126
19. Bishop John Williams's order to rail in the communion tables in Lincoln diocese, 1635. 127
20. Dean Richard Baylie's articles for the hospital of St John, Wilton, 1635. 128
21. Bishop Matthew Wren's articles for Hereford diocese, 1635. 129
Collated with:
 - i. Wren's articles for Norwich diocese, 1636. 145
 - ii. Wren's articles for Norwich diocese, 1636, collated with his articles for Ely diocese, 1638–9. 150
 - iii. Wren's articles for Norwich diocese, 1636, collated with Bishop John Towers's articles for Peterborough diocese, 1639. 155
22. Bishop Matthew Wren's orders for Norwich diocese, 1636. 157
23. Bishop Matthew Wren's appointment of standing commissioners in Norwich diocese, c. 1636. 161
24. Bishop John Thornborough's articles for Worcester cathedral, 1636. 165
25. Archbishop Richard Neile's injunctions for Southwell minster, 1636. 167

26.	Bishop John Owen's articles for St Asaph diocese, 1637.	172
	<i>Collated with:</i>	
	i. Owen's articles for the same, 1642.	181
27.	Bishop William Juxon's injunctions for Barstable deanery, London diocese, 1637.	183
28.	Bishop Robert Skinner's charge in Bristol diocese, 1637.	184
29.	Bishop Richard Montagu's articles for Norwich diocese, 1638.	191
30.	Archdeacon William Kingsley's injunctions to the churchwardens of St Margaret, Canterbury, 1639.	210
31.	Archdeacon Ewers Gower's articles for Northumberland archdeaconry, 1639.	212
32.	Bishop John Towers's orders for Brackley combination lecture, Peterborough diocese, 1639.	216
33.	Bishop Richard Montagu's directions at a synod in Norwich diocese, 1639.	218
34.	Bishop William Juxon's articles for London diocese, 1640.	222
35.	Archdeacon Hugh Robinson's articles for Gloucester archdeaconry, 1641.	245
36.	Archdeacon William Higgins's articles for Derby archdeaconry, 1641.	248
	Appendix: Visitation Articles 1603–1642: An Interim Listing	257
	Index	281

In Memory of Liz Foster and Angela Fincham

This book is produced with the assistance of a grant from
Isobel Thornley's Bequest to the University of London

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Visitation articles and injunctions are scattered across many libraries and record offices in and beyond Great Britain, and this collection would have taken far longer to compile but for the invaluable help and guidance of many friends, colleagues, archivists and librarians. I am most grateful to William Allen, Graham and Margaret Anderson, Melanie Barber, Penny Bulloch, Andrew Butcher, Richard Clark, Aude Fitzsimons, Lynn Hauley, Steven Hobbs, Henry James, Harriet Jones, Tim and Alison McCann, Muriel McCarthy, Judith Maltby, Michael Meredith, Peter Nockles, Roger Norris, Michael Pearson, Nigel Ramsay, Bill and Sarah Sheils, Michael Stansfield, Wendy Toulson, Nicholas Tyacke, Frances Willmoth, Laetitia Yeandle and Peter Yorke. David Smith at the Borthwick has been very supportive; Frank Stubbings of Emmanuel College Cambridge was especially kind and helpful on numerous occasions; Nicholas Cranfield helped me to sort out the tangled printing history of Bishop Montagu's articles of 1638, and checked my transcriptions with great speed and thoroughness; Andrew Foster has been a generous critic throughout the time I've been working on these two volumes; while it has been a pleasure to have Stephen Taylor as my general editor for this volume.

Thanks are also due to the following for permission to reprint the documents indicated: the Master and Fellows of Emmanuel College Cambridge (2, 10); the Master and Fellows of Jesus College Cambridge (21.iii); the diocese of Canterbury (32); the Bishop and Dean of Chichester (14.iii, 17); the Governors and Guardians of Marsh's Library, Dublin (1, 8, 9, 9.iv, 13.vi, 16, 16.i, 26, 35); the Provost and Fellows of Eton College (36); the Bishop of Gloucester (14.ii); the Corporation of London (7.ii, 11, 27); the Society of Antiquaries of London (3); the Clerk of the Records of the House of Lords (15.i-ii); the Burke Library of Union Theological Seminary in the city of New York (31); the Master and Scholars of Balliol College, Oxford (1.i); St Albans Diocese and Hertfordshire Record Office (14.iv); Wiltshire and Swindon Record Office (20); the Bishop of Worcester (24); and the Borthwick Institute, York (25).

ABBREVIATIONS

AO	Archives Office
BI	Borthwick Institute, York
BL	British Library, London
Bodl.	Bodleian Library, Oxford
CUL	Cambridge University Library
<i>Documentary Annals</i>	E. Cardwell ed. <i>Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church of England</i> (2 vols, Oxford, 1839)
GL	Guildhall Library, London
HMC	Historical Manuscripts Commission
Laud, <i>Works</i>	William Laud, <i>Works</i> , eds. J. Bliss and W. Scott (7 vols, Oxford, 1847–60)
LPL	Lambeth Palace Library
PRO	Public Record Office
RO	Record Office
RSTC	<i>Revised Short-Title Catalogue of Books. . . 1475–1640</i> , eds. A.W. Pollard, G.R. Redgrave and K.F. Pantzer (3 vols, 1976–91)
<i>Second Ritual Report</i>	Appendix E to <i>Second Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the Rubrics, Orders and Directions for. . . Public Worship</i> (Parliamentary Papers, 38, 1867–8)
VCH	<i>Victoria County History</i>
Volume I	<i>Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Early Stuart Church, Volume I</i> , ed. K. Fincham (Church of England Record Society, i, 1994)
Wing	D. Wing, <i>Short-Title Catalogue of Books. . . 1641–1700, i</i> (revised 2nd edition, 1994)

INTRODUCTION

This is the second of two volumes devoted to visitation articles and injunctions issued in the English Church from 1603 to 1642.¹ The two are intended to be read and consulted together: Volume I focused on the Church of James I, though it included some articles, based on Jacobean prototypes, which were issued after 1625, while this collection covers the reign of Charles I up to the Civil War. The introductions are also complementary, discussing the purpose and significance of articles and injunctions, and relating them respectively to the Jacobean and Caroline Churches. Taken together, the two volumes print or reprint visitation articles from twenty-six of the twenty-seven dioceses of England and Wales, and injunctions, orders or charges from twelve of them.² Moreover an appendix to this volume lists extant visitation articles for the entire period of 1603 to 1642. Of the four hundred and one sets identified there, one hundred and thirty-five are reproduced or collated in these two volumes, and many others commented on in the footnotes.³

The introduction to Volume I examined the character, authorship and survival rates of visitation articles and that heterogeneous collection of directions, orders and charges which may be termed injunctions. Seven major 'families' of enquiries were identified amongst the numerous printed articles used in parochial visitations during the reign of James I, and their progeny was traced into the 1630s. These groupings reveal how ecclesiastical ordinaries often borrowed clauses or whole sets from the enquiries compiled by colleagues; the popularity of some sets of articles over others can be explained, in part, in terms of presentation or convenience, but in part also by theological preferences. Thus, for example, Bishop Overall's ritualist set for Norwich diocese of 1619 was adopted wholesale by a succession of anti-Calvinist bishops in the 1620s, but was extensively modified by the Calvinist Bishop of Salisbury, John Davenant, who retained its clear format while moderating many ceremonial and anti-puritan clauses. In short, an ordinary's choice and alteration of articles can often tell us much about his churchmanship. In the analysis which follows, these findings are explored further for the Caroline Church. We begin, however, with a consideration of two small classes of visitation enquiries, relating to cathedral churches and peculiar jurisdictions.

The introduction to Volume I investigated the genealogy of visitation articles relating to diocesan and archidiaconal visitations. What can we learn from a similar study of articles issued for cathedral churches and ecclesiastical peculiars? Though we possess a small number of sets for the early Stuart

¹ See *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Early Stuart Church, Volume I*, ed. K. Fincham (Church of England Record Society, i, 1994).

² The missing diocese is Sodor and Man, for which no articles or injunctions appear to survive for the early Stuart Church.

³ The introduction to the appendix explains the method of compilation, on which these figures are based.

Church, there are enough to permit some general observations. Visitation articles for cathedral communities are invariably in manuscript, and usually survive as loose papers, separate from *comperta et detecta* books, which would explain why so many have perished. Though the fifty-nine sets listed in the appendix cover all but two cathedrals (Oxford and Carlisle), forty-four of the fifty-nine were issued by either the archbishops of Canterbury or York, and the majority of these are recorded in the archiepiscopal registers at Lambeth. Separate sets of questions were usually compiled for the members of the chapter, and for the vicars-choral and lay clerks, but very few of the latter are extant.⁴ In contrast to churchwardens' presentments, cathedral enquiries often elicited detailed answers, which sometimes survive for visitations for which the questions are lost.⁵ Establishing plausible relationships between sets of enquiries is difficult with so poor a survival rate. Nevertheless, it is clear that successive archbishops of Canterbury drew on their predecessors' articles. Archbishop Richard Bancroft used the same set in visitations across the southern province between 1605 and 1609, which he took from those used by Archbishop John Whitgift.⁶ Archbishop Abbot adapted Bancroft's set, and his three surviving sets for cathedral chapters (of Bristol, Salisbury and Hereford)⁷ show that he devised additional clauses specific to each community he was visiting. At Bristol in 1612 Abbot asked why the mayor and aldermen were boycotting cathedral services; two years later, at Hereford, he inserted new questions on the maintenance of episcopal property and the government of the almshouses, all evidence, if more is needed, that Abbot's reputation for negligent government is scarcely deserved. His successor Laud, who adopted both Abbot's diocesan articles (no. 13) and his cathedral enquiries (no. 15), also often added clauses investigating particular abuses. The influence of these metropolitanical articles is hard to trace, though as late as 1636 Bancroft's set was the source for the questions circulated by Bishop Thornborough of Worcester (no. 24), who may have first used it as bishop of Bristol between 1603 and 1617, before his translation to Worcester, while Laud's set for Hereford in 1636 was used by the local bishop, George Coke, at his visitation the following year (no. 15.vi). Hereford, indeed, has a splendid run of four sets compiled in consecutive years from 1634 to 1637. The first of these, circulated by Bishop Augustine Lindsell in 1634, consisted of thirty-one detailed questions to the dean and chapter, examining worship as well as fabric and the wider community. The following year the visitor was Bishop Wren. Just as his diocesan articles were an expanded version of Lindsell's set, so his cathedral enquiries enlarged on those of his predecessor, and ran to fifty-three questions. Laud's much shorter set of eighteen clauses was issued at his metropolitanical visitation in 1636, which, as we have seen, was adopted at George Coke's primary visitation of 1637. This example illustrates how cathedral

⁴ For exceptions, see entries in the appendix for London (1607), Salisbury (1613 and 1634), Chichester (1615) and Hereford (1634 and 1635).

⁵ These are too numerous to list: but for examples, see the answers to Archbishop Abbot's enquiries at Worcester in 1616 (Hereford and Worcester RO, 714.7, BA2082) and the answers to Bishop Carleton's enquiries at Chichester in 1619 and 1622 (West Sussex RO, Ep.1/20/9, /10).

⁶ Volume I, pp. 24–5; *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation*, eds. W.H. Frere and W.P. Kennedy (Alcuin Club Collections, xxv–xxvii, 3 vols, 1924), iii. pp. 331–3.

⁷ Volume I, pp. 118–21; Hereford Cathedral Archives, no. 1556.

enquiries, like diocesan sets, could vary considerably in length and content. Both those issued by Wright of Coventry and Lichfield (1633) and Morton of Durham (1637) run to forty questions, but the emphasis on the first is with decorous observance of divine worship, the second on the preservation of fabric and revenues of the community.⁸ Like diocesan articles, they may yield important clues about a bishop's priorities.

A patchwork of peculiar jurisdictions extended across many dioceses, where many parishes, colleges and hospitals enjoyed some independence from episcopal or archidiaconal control, and answered to ordinaries who might be bishops, deans, chapters or individual prebendaries of cathedral churches. These peculiars had the contemporary reputation of being barriers to effective government, since they complicated administrative control, and could be relatively impervious to wider changes in the Church. In the late 1630s, for example, Richard Baxter exercised his nonconformist ministry in the royal peculiar of Bridgnorth, Shropshire, secure from episcopal supervision.⁹ However we should distinguish between compact jurisdictions, often subject to annual visitations, and more isolated and autonomous jurisdictions, where supervision was much less evident and probably less decisive. What can visitation articles contribute to this issue? Regrettably, though these peculiars amounted to over eight hundred parishes, only twenty sets of enquiries survive for this period.¹⁰ A minority of these sets are printed, and relate to the larger jurisdictions, exercised by the dean and chapter of St Paul's London, the dean of the Arches, the dean and chapter of Exeter, the dean of Shoreham and the bishop of Exeter over his peculiars in that diocese. The remainder are in manuscript, and largely consist of survivals amongst the rich papers of the peculiars of Salisbury diocese, and the records of Laud's metropolitical visitations of 1634–5 to Eton, Winchester and Dulwich colleges and Croydon hospital. The printed sets are virtually indistinguishable from diocesan and archidiaconal enquiries. The dean and chapter of Exeter reproduced Bishop Chaderton's articles for Lincoln diocese (1607) for their visitation of 1609,¹¹ while Bishop Carey re-used his diocesan enquiries of 1625 for his episcopal peculiars that same year.¹² Equally unsurprising is the fact that the dean and chapter of St Paul's cathedral, London, in 1632 recycled the articles issued by one its canons, Thomas Paske, in his capacity as archdeacon of London.¹³ Smaller jurisdictions usually relied on manuscript articles, which were often shorter than those used by bishops or archdeacons. It may not be a coincidence that the most summary of these relate to tiny jurisdictions. Thus Prebendary John Barnston was content to circulate a set of

⁸ Lichfield Joint RO, ex Dean and Chapter, B/V/3, 1636; Durham Dean and Chapter Library, Hunter MS 11, item 40.

⁹ M. Ingram, *Church Courts, Sex and Marriage in England, 1570–1640* (Cambridge, 1987), p. 212; K. Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor: the Episcopate of James I* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 148–9; Laud, *Works*, v. pp. 318, 320; *The Autobiography of Richard Baxter* (1974), p. 18. For an alternative view, see R. Houlbrooke, *Church Courts and the People during the English Reformation 1520–1570* (Oxford, 1979), pp. 34–5.

¹⁰ For listings of peculiars, see A. Whiteman ed. *The Compton Census of 1676: a Critical Edition* (Oxford, 1986); C. Humphery-Smith, *The Phillimore Atlas and Index of Parish Registers* (1995).

¹¹ *RSTC*, 10207.5, 10236.5.

¹² See below, p. 1 fn. 1.

¹³ *RSTC*, 10273, 10270.5; the latter is collated below, p. 20.

six questions at his annual visitation of Bishopstone parish, Wiltshire, in 1624. They read as follows:¹⁴

1. Whether is your church, chauncell and churchyard withe your parsonidge house in good and sufficient reparations.
2. Doe all your parishioners resort to the churche and receive the sacraments as the lawe requireth.
3. Have you in your churche all ornaments and books by lawe required.
4. Are there any adulterers fornicators incontinent persons, drunckards, prophaners of the Lords daye and other hollidayes, common swearers or other offenders in any sorte whatsoever against the canons and laws ecclesiasticall, or are there any in your parishe diffamed commonly reported, or vehemently suspected, of any of the crimes aforesaid.
5. Are there any that to your knowledge or by common fame or report have committed incontinencie before marreadge.
6. What other crime, faulte, fame or suspicion of any fault or crime of ecclesiasticall jurisdiction, is there in your parishe. You shall not faile to present the same.

There are some startling omissions here, especially the conduct and conformity of the minister; such summary articles might imply a complacent attitude towards the exercise of ecclesiastical justice, though this would need to be checked against the court proceedings arising from the visitation. Moreover, alongside such short sets there survives a set of forty-two detailed questions, probably transcribed from a printed set, issued in 1621 for another visitation of a single parish, Uffculme in Devon, which, like Bishopstone, was a prebendal peculiar of Salisbury cathedral.¹⁵ We also possess the set used by Dean Gordon of Salisbury for his annual visitation of 1613, which consist of twelve, fairly full questions.¹⁶ Our sample is so small that few firm conclusions can be reached, beyond noting the greater variety in length and content of these sets, compared to episcopal and archidiaconal enquiries. Here, as elsewhere, visitation articles need to be placed alongside other evidence, in this case the churchwardens' presentments and prosecutions by the peculiar court, before the full significance of these variations in length and detail can be assessed.

A larger number of visitation articles and injunctions survive for the Caroline Church than for its Jacobean predecessor. It has been possible to assemble a collection of texts which extends across the entire ecclesiastical hierarchy, from archiepiscopal articles and injunctions for both provinces, through enquiries and orders of bishops, archdeacons and deans, to decisions reached by the vestry of a London parish. The range of churchmanship is equally broad, stretching from the articles and orders of Laudian enthusiasts such as Bishops Montagu, Skinner, Wren and Towers, to those issued by Calvinist episcopalians such as Hall, Abbot, Williams and Thornborough. Though many are reprints, most of the collations of articles are new, and a significant number of articles and injunctions are published for the first time (nos. 7. i-ii, 14, 15.vi, 17, 20, 23,

¹⁴ Wiltshire RO, D6/3/1; similarly, the official for the Lord of Savernake's visitation of Great and Little Bedwyn, Wiltshire, in c.1628-32 used a set of twelve concise questions (*ibid.*, D21/2/1).

¹⁵ Wiltshire RO, D20/2/1.

¹⁶ Folger Shakespeare Library, V.a.324.

25, 27, 30). In regional terms, the northern province is under-represented in this collection, because many of its articles belong to sets already printed or collated in Volume I; conversely, the Church in Wales is a little more prominent in this volume, with the earliest diocesan enquiries for Bangor and St Asaph being included here (nos. 16, 26).¹⁷

That the Caroline Church witnessed a drive to secure greater uniformity of worship and tighter regulation of preaching is a commonplace, though historians contest the novelty, the ideological mainsprings, even the authorship, of these changes. Can a study of visitation articles and injunctions throw some light, rather than more heat, on these developments? First, we must consider the groupings of printed articles after 1625. Volume I identified seven principal 'families' of printed visitation articles in the early Stuart Church, to which now can be added an eighth. Archdeacon Theophilus Aylmer of London reworked the articles of Archbishop Abbot to produce a distinctive set by 1625 (no. 2), which was imitated by other ordinaries below the rank of bishop over the next fifteen years. These included his successor Archdeacon Paske between 1626 and 1640, the ordinaries of two local exempt jurisdictions – the deanery of the Arches and the peculiar of the dean and chapter of St Paul's – and, outside the metropolis, Archdeacons Clark of Durham (1636) and Wynne of Lincoln (1637). Aylmer's set became distinctive, too, in the hands of Paske, for its use of a different type-face to highlight particular questions within clauses, accompanied by a pointing finger printed in the margin. Representative examples of six of the other seven 'families' of articles can be found in sets printed between 1625 and 1642, the exception being Archbishop Bancroft's set for the southern province of 1605. Among the most popular of the other six, after 1625, were variants on Bishop Overall's articles for Norwich diocese of 1619, which were used, with few alterations, by Bishops Harsnett and Corbet at Norwich, Davenant at Salisbury, White at Carlisle and Norwich, Montagu at Chichester (no. 4), Howson at Durham and Owen at St Asaph (no. 26).¹⁸ They also inspired the most *avant-garde* enquiries of the 1630s. These were first compiled by Augustine Lindsell at Peterborough (1633), which he took to Hereford (1634), to be followed by Coke of Hereford (1640) and Morgan Godwyn, his Archdeacon of Salop (1639); they also influenced Dee's set for Peterborough (1634, 1637). Lindsell's set was also expanded by Matthew Wren at Hereford, Norwich and Ely between 1635 and 1638–9 (no. 21), whose articles, in turn, were adapted by Towers at Peterborough in 1639 (no. 21.iii) and by Archdeacon Bostock of Suffolk (1640).¹⁹ These sets were characterised by minute enquiries into the furnishings of the church, the conduct of services and the reverence showed by clergymen and laity alike. Other ritualist sets, though less dependent on Lindsell, were composed by Bishops Montagu for Norwich in 1638 (no. 29) and Duppa for Chichester in the same year, to be reproduced by Archdeacon James Marsh of Chichester in 1640.²⁰ Most of these churchmen were strong supporters of Laudian reforms, though the churchmanship of Bishops Owen and

¹⁷ There is also a set for Llandaff for 1640 (*RSTC*, 10246), not reprinted here, which is a thoroughly conventional set based on Bishop Vaughan's influential prototype: see Volume I, pp. 26–38.

¹⁸ See also Volume I, pp. 157–77.

¹⁹ *RSTC*, 10317–19, 10216, 10217.5–18, 10346.

²⁰ *RSTC*, 10185, 10188.

Coke and Archdeacon Godwyn remains, as yet, unclear.²¹ In contrast, several senior anti-Calvinist bishops retained more conventional sets, among them Archbishops Laud of Canterbury and Neile of York, and Bishops Curle of Winchester and Juxon of London.²² Thus Laud's set for his metropolitanical visitation (no. 13) was based on that of his predecessor, Archbishop Abbot, and was adopted by a pair of Jacobean appointees, Bishops Thornborough of Worcester and Williams of Lincoln (nos. 13.ii, iv), and quarried by a third, Davenant of Salisbury.²³ Since this trio was uncomfortable with aspects of the new ritualism of the 1630s, we may interpret their borrowings as a gesture, at minimal cost, of conformity to Laudianism. How moderate Laud's articles were, in practice, will be addressed later.

How much do visitation articles, as a group, disclose about shifting priorities after 1625? A small minority, read against typical Jacobean sets, imply that little had changed. As late as 1639 John Quarles was reprinting for the archdeaconry of Northampton the enquiries used by his former diocesan, Bishop Thomas Dove, in 1623, while Bishop William Murray's set for Llandaff of 1640 contains little that would have been out of place in the 1610s.²⁴ However the majority of visitation articles in the 1630s refer, explicitly or implicitly, to the royal instructions of 1629, circulated via the bench of bishops to every parish (no. 7). Most commonly, articles refer to the five-point clause on lecturers, and sometimes cite Charles I's declaration of 1628–9 against controversial preaching (no. 5). Some went further: both Thornborough of Worcester in 1632, and Wright of Coventry and Lichfield in 1633, devoted a whole appendix to the instructions, while extracts were summarised at the end of enquiries for several archdeaconries in the diocese of London, and elsewhere.²⁵ Several continued to ask about the observance of James I's directions of 1622 against contentious or inappropriate preaching,²⁶ and churchwardens in the archdeaconries of Durham (1636) and London (1640) were required to display their copies of both the directions of 1622 and the instructions of 1629.²⁷ The latter also shaped Bishop Towers's orders for the Brackley combination lecture, set up in 1639 (no. 32).

Relatively few bishops or archdeacons enquired in their articles about the reading of the book of Sports, re-issued in 1633.²⁸ Bishops Bancroft (Oxford, 1635), Wren (Norwich, 1636, and Ely, 1638–9), Montagu (Norwich, 1638) and Archdeacons Wickham (York, 1635) and Layfield (Essex, 1637) were anxious to establish if the book had been read by the incumbent before his congregation, mindful, no doubt, that some ministers had evaded the task by outright refusal, by reading it outside service time or by finding someone else to read it. Additionally Archdeacon Thornborough of Worcester (1634) wished to know if any had opposed the reading, while Bridgeman of Chester (1634, 1637) asked if

²¹ One exception might appear to be Bishop Davenant's use of Overall's articles, but see Volume I, pp. xx–xxi, 173–7.

²² See Volume I, pp. 26 fn. 1, 85–9, 111–14, 186–7.

²³ See Volume I, pp. 176–7.

²⁴ *RSTC*, 10283, 10315, 10246.

²⁵ See below, p. 69; *RSTC*, 10369, 10199.5, 10271.5, 10276.7, 10373.

²⁶ For example, see below, pp. 60–1.

²⁷ *RSTC*, 10194, 10272.

²⁸ Reprinted in Volume I, pp. 149–51.

parishioners used any recreations forbidden by the declaration.²⁹ The most detailed enquiries, however, were composed by Bishop Goodman of Gloucester (1634, 1637) who urged that churchwardens report any who abused ‘the liberty’ permitted by the book.³⁰ Two observations can be offered on this theme. First, if it is true that Archbishop Laud ‘did not envisage the incumbent as the sole means’ of publishing the book,³¹ this latitude was not exploited by these ordinaries, who expected the local minister to read it himself.³² Second, we may wonder why there were so few references to the book of Sports in visitation articles? Sometimes it may have been ideological opposition from bishops such as John Davenant, who declined to submit names of clerical refuseniks,³³ but timing was also important. Curle of Winchester was a vigorous enforcer of the book, which appeared shortly after his primary visitation of 1633, and by the time his next visitation fell due, in 1636, offenders had already been detected and prosecuted, which would explain its absence from his articles.³⁴ More intriguing is the example of Archbishop Laud, who, it is claimed, ‘tempered and undercut the letter of the king’s orders’ on this, as on other matters. The omission of any mention of the book in his articles might lend support to this interpretation. Dr Davies has demonstrated that Laud was more circumspect than some of his suffragans in disciplining offenders, though we should remember that as late as 1637 his Vicar-General, on visitation in London diocese, was urging ministers to read the book of Sports within the month, or face deprivation.³⁵ These examples again remind us that articles need to be placed in the broader context of the visitation process, and the operation of diocesan justice, before their significance can be fully ascertained.

Insights into the timing and character of Caroline altar policy also emerge from visitation articles and injunctions. The hearing before the Privy Council in November 1633 over the position of the communion table in St Gregory-by-St Paul’s London is usually seen as a test-case which launched a national drive to erect east-end altars. Prior to this we know of a few parochial disputes over the location of the communion table, most famously at Grantham in 1627,³⁶ but there was evidently some official encouragement as well. The earliest surviving example of an ordinary requiring that communion tables be railed at the east end

²⁹ See Volume I, pp. 46, 91; below, pp. 147, 153, 206; *RSTC*, 10312, 10372.7 (added in manuscript at the end), 10177–8.

³⁰ See below, pp. 51, 52. Goodman’s questions probably inspired an enquiry from his archdeacon in 1635 about parishioners who either ‘disturbe, let or discourage others from lawfull sports and recreations upon the Lords day’ or else exploited the liberty granted by the book of Sports (*Articles to be enquired of in the generall visitation of the archdeacon of the diocesse of Gloucester. . . 1635, 1635, sig. Bv*).

³¹ J. Davies, *The Caroline Captivity of the Church* (Oxford, 1992), pp. 180–1.

³² The possible exception here would be Archdeacon Thornborough of Worcester, who enquired who read the book and in what manner (*RSTC*, 10372.7). However Wren of Norwich used the same phraseology, and we know from other evidence that he expected the local minister to read the book in person.

³³ Davies, *Caroline Captivity*, pp. 194–5.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 190; Bodl., Carte MS 77 fos 346v, 350v; Volume I, pp. 186–7.

³⁵ Davies, *Caroline Captivity*, pp. 180–95, 303; *Winthrop Papers, Volume III 1631–1637* (Massachusetts Historical Society, 1943), p. 370.

³⁶ E. Venables, ‘The Altar-Controversy at Grantham in the Seventeenth Century’ *Associated Architectural Societies’ Reports and Papers* 13 (1875–6), pp. 46–61; N. Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: the Rise of English Arminianism c.1590–1640* (Oxford, 1987), p. 199.

of chancels occurs in 1630 in Samuel Clerke's set for the archdeaconry of Derby.³⁷ It reads:

Have you in your church, or chappell. . . a communion table set upon a frame, with a comely carpet, and linnen covering, and is your communion table set at the east end of the chancell, and cancelled in from prophane use. . .

Though Clerke's activities as Archdeacon remain obscure, he was well-known as a vehement opponent of the puritans in Peterborough diocese, where he was an active surrogate in the church courts. It may not be a coincidence that it is in Peterborough diocese where a similar entry next occurs, in the articles issued by Bishop Francis Dee for his primary visitation of 1634.³⁸ Official policy was clarified, for the southern province at least, by the injunction issued by Archbishop Laud's visitors in 1635–7,³⁹ which required that communion tables be placed on a north-south axis at the east end of chancels, and there railed in, an order which was sometimes cited in episcopal articles in subsequent years.⁴⁰ The only bishop openly to challenge this ruling was Laud's enemy, John Williams, who ordered in 1635 that tables be railed in, but said nothing about their location (no. 19). This omission was quite deliberate, for two years later Williams was to condemn in print the erection of east-end altars.⁴¹ Contrary to some claims, Laud's metropolitical injunction did not specify *where* communicants should receive, though it appears that during the metropolitical visitation his Vicar-General encouraged reception at the rails.⁴² However, a handful of ordinaries used their articles or injunctions to insist on this practice – notably Bishops Wren at Norwich in 1636, Warner at Rochester for 1638 and Towers at Peterborough in 1639, and Edward Layfield for Essex archdeaconry in 1638 and 1639.⁴³ By contrast Wren's successor at Norwich, Richard Montagu, questioned the requirement, and provided for parishioners to receive, kneeling in rows in the chancel, with only the 'best in the parishe' next to the rails.⁴⁴

Once again, some articles ignored the issue of a railed altar. The most notable are Archbishop Laud's metropolitical articles, used in twenty dioceses between 1634 and 1637, which contain the traditional formulation that at communion the table should be 'placed in such convenient sort within the chancell or church, as that the minister may be best heard in his prayer and administration: and that the

³⁷ *Articles given by Doctour Clerke, Archdeacon of Derby, and delivered to the church-wardens. . . at his visitation there holden in the yeare of our Lord God 1630* (1630), p. 1.

³⁸ 'Is the same table placed conveniently at the east end of the chancell of your church or chappell, and is it so cancelled in and kept as not to be prophaned by sitting, leaning or writing upon it, by casting bookes or hats, or cloakes upon it.' (*Articles to be enquired of throughout the whole diocesse of Peterborough: in the first visitation of. . . Francis. . . Bishop of Peterborough, 1634*, sig. A2v.)

³⁹ See below, pp. 108, 109.

⁴⁰ See below, pp. 157, 174; *Articles to be inquired of, throughout the diocesse of Chichester, in the first visitation of. . . Brian Duppa, Bishop of that diocesse* (1638), sig. B2v.

⁴¹ John Williams, *The Holy Table, Name and Thing* (1637), *passim*.

⁴² Pace Davies, *Caroline Captivity*, p. 218; PRO, SP 16/485/118. By 1637, Vicar-General Brent was ordering that this practice be observed in Canterbury diocese: Canterbury Cathedral Archives, Z.4.6 fo 127r and *passim*.

⁴³ See below, pp. 155–6, 159; *RSTC*, 10321.5, 10200–1. Archdeacon Newell of Buckingham in his articles for 1637 also recommended the practice (PRO, SP 16/375/54).

⁴⁴ See below, pp. 218–19.

greatest number may communicate'.⁴⁵ The apparent incompatibility of this clause with his metropolitical injunction for the communion table to be railed at the east end of the chancel was publicised by Laud's opponents in the 1630s, and more recently has been cited by some historians as evidence of the archbishop's unenthusiastic endorsement of a policy which, they suggest, he did not devise.⁴⁶ Yet we should recall that many colleagues, whose support for a railed altar is not in question, also retained standardised phrases about the communion table in their articles, among them Archbishop Neile, whose enquiry about the 'conveniency' of the communion table remained unaltered from 1624 to 1640, and Bishop Juxon, who employed the same phrase as Laud in his articles throughout the 1630s.⁴⁷ In this light, the clause in Laud's articles may not reflect his distaste for official policy so much as an acute awareness, which some of his closest colleagues evidently shared, that it lacked full canonical status.⁴⁸ In any case, the clause was modified in 1638, at Laud's visitation to Lincoln diocese during Bishop Williams's suspension, to read that the table should stand 'within the chancell or church as has been appointed by the ordinary', a phrase whose meaning must have been clear enough to the churchwardens of the diocese, since Laud required them to certify that their communion tables now stood at the east end of their chancels.⁴⁹

The moderate content and tone of Laud's articles reflect their paternity, as a modified version of the set compiled by his predecessor, Archbishop Abbot, and this was acknowledged by some Calvinist contemporaries, who pressed in 1640 for their adoption nationwide.⁵⁰ Yet a rounded view of Laud's intentions on visitation must also take account of his injunctions (no. 14) and his private orders to his Vicar-General for each diocese, such as the instruction in Bristol diocese to enquire about the covenant of grace used by John White, puritan patriarch at Dorchester.⁵¹ These sources indicate that Laud required full liturgical conformity and strict regulation of preaching, a declaration of war on the Jacobean accommodation of puritan nonconformity and pulpit piety. Thus his choice of Abbot's visitation articles may tell us more about Laud's caution and sense of vulnerability than his real intentions; an uncontroversial set of enquiries would serve his purposes well enough, a view evidently endorsed by Neile of York, Curle of Winchester and Juxon of London, all of whom, as we have noted, relied on fairly conventional enquiries. The challenges which Wren encountered at Norwich in 1635–8 owed much to his exercise of vigorous discipline, but also something to his provocative set of articles.⁵²

⁴⁵ See below, p. 85.

⁴⁶ PRO, SP 16/327/101; Williams, *The Holy Table*, p. 83; Davies, *Caroline Captivity*, p. 216; K. Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (Yale, 1992), pp. 333–4.

⁴⁷ *RSTC*, 10192.7, 10265–6, 10361, 10380–1. A similar point can be made about the articles of Goodman at Gloucester for 1631–40, Montagu at Chichester for 1628–37, Curle at Winchester for 1636–9 and Skinner at Bristol for 1637–40; see below, pp. 26, 31, 32, 45, 49, 53, 55, 61, 73–4; *RSTC*, 10365–6.

⁴⁸ Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, pp. 207–8.

⁴⁹ See below, p. 98; Lincolnshire AO, Vj 30, esp. fos 147, 182v.

⁵⁰ For a collation of the two sets, see Volume I, pp. 111–14; for their proposed adoption in 1640, see below, p. xxvi.

⁵¹ PRO, SP 16/260/90, 285/48.

⁵² R.W. Ketton-Cremer, *Norfolk in the Civil War* (1969), pp. 62–88; Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, pp. 369–74; and see below, pp. xxv–vi.

While Laud's injunctions typify the renewed emphasis on observance of canonical rites and ceremonies during the 1630s, other sets of articles and injunctions disclose new concerns, sometimes elaborating on existing canons, and sometimes inspired by the rubric in the prayer book. Many but not all of these were issued by leading anti-Calvinists. There is only space here to examine these developments in detail in two areas: attendance at weekday services and reverence during divine worship. For the first, canon 15 of 1604 stipulated that incumbents should say the litany on Wednesdays and Fridays each week, in the presence of at least one member of each household. Most Jacobean visitation articles merely enquired if the litany was read on those days,⁵³ but in the later 1620s the attendance of parishioners became a matter of official concern. In 1627 Archdeacon Paske of London, acting on instructions from Bishop Montaigne, ordered that ministers and churchwardens ensure that 'every housholder. . . or one (at the least) of his family' should attend these midweek services, and defaulters be admonished and, if necessary, prosecuted (no. 3). In subsequent years Paske highlighted this duty by printing the clause in a different type in his articles, while reiterating the point at visitation meetings, which prompted at least one parish vestry, St Bartholomew Exchange, into action in 1633.⁵⁴ During the 1630s many sets – for Goodman of Gloucester, Wright at Bristol and at Coventry and Lichfield and his successor at Bristol, Bishop Skinner, Archdeacon Clark of Durham and others – echoed this concern.⁵⁵ Reverent conduct of parishioners inside church was also examined more minutely. Many Jacobean articles had enquired about the infringement of canon 18 of 1604, which amongst other provisions stated that no man should remain covered in church during the service, 'except he have some infirmity; in which case let him wear a nightcap or coif'. From the 1620s specific attention was directed at parishioners who failed to remove their hats. Again Bishop Montaigne of London was amongst the first to tackle this issue, and the subject was taken up in a circular of Archbishop Harsnett of York in 1629 (no. 6), and resurfaced in articles issued by, among others, Corbet and Bancroft of Oxford (1629–38), Bishop Thornborough of Worcester (1632) and his son, Archdeacon Thornborough in 1638, Archbishop Neile in 1633, Bishop Bridgeman of Chester in 1637, Archdeacons Clark of Durham (1636) and Gower of Northumberland in 1639.⁵⁶ Many ordinaries in the 1630s, enlarging on prayer book rubrics, were also concerned that parishioners should stand for the gospel, the canticles and the gloria, as well as the creed. Canon 18 specified the points in the liturgy when parishioners should kneel, but only mentioned standing for the creed, and most Jacobean sets reproduced it in full or summary form. Bishop Overall of Norwich in 1619 was amongst the first to widen this enquiry to include standing at the canticles and the *Gloria Patri*, while others instead emphasised standing for the gospel.⁵⁷ By the 1630s such questions were common: the injunctions of Laud (no. 14.i) required that the congregation stand

⁵³ For exceptions, see Volume I, pp. 17, 51, 80 (the latter, perhaps significantly, relates to Bishop Montaigne's time at Lincoln diocese, before his promotion to London).

⁵⁴ See below, pp. 20, 81.

⁵⁵ See below, pp. 46, 56, 68, 73; *RSTC*, 10194, 10271.5, 10273.

⁵⁶ See Volume I, pp. 68, 87, 199, 202–3 and 202 fn.1; below, p. 000; *RSTC*, 10178, 10194, 10271.5, 10273, 10311–13, 10369, 10373.

⁵⁷ See Volume I, pp. 165–6, 170–2.

at the gospel, while those of Juxon specified the gospel and the *Gloria Patria* (no. 27); Bishop Wright asked at Lichfield cathedral if the people stood facing east for all the creeds and after every psalm, and Archdeacon Morgan Godwyn of Salop urged that the people stand ‘at each creed, at the gospell, at each “Glorie be to the Father” etc at the *Te Deum*, according to the practise of his maiesties chappell royall, and of the cathedrall church of Hereford’, a nice illustration of the status accorded by Laudian ritualists in the 1630s to both the royal chapels and cathedrals as models for parochial churches to imitate.⁵⁸

The incorporation of prayer book rubrics into Caroline visitation articles went well beyond this issue. Godparents were reminded of their duty to bring their godchildren to confirmation;⁵⁹ godparents, communicants and even newly-weds were now expected to have been confirmed;⁶⁰ the ceremony of churching should take place at the communion table, or even at the rails, with the woman decently veiled;⁶¹ and auricular confession as a preparation for holy communion, first recommended in Bishop Overall’s articles of 1619, was included in many enquiries issued in Charles I’s reign.⁶² Although some of these novel questions had a broader appeal, many were rehearsed by a small number of bishops, especially Wren, Montagu, Goodman and Towers; it is important to note, therefore, that most were incorporated into the set of visitation articles adopted by convocation in 1640 for use throughout England and Wales: what had hitherto been a minority choice of enquiries was now redefined as orthodox questions.⁶³

Other changes related to more practical elements of the Laudian reformation. Articles were directed at the location and height of pews,⁶⁴ and the preservation of church fabric, occasionally with reference to the archdeacon’s responsibility to survey churches as laid out in canon 86 of 1604. However the only archidiaconal set to emphasise this was for Suffolk, which in the 1620s and 1630s contained a separate section on steeples; while in many dioceses both bishops and archdeacons conducted church surveys out of visitation-time.⁶⁵ Questions about the compilation of ecclesiastical terriers, which recorded the property of parochial benefices, also became increasingly common in

⁵⁸ Lichfield Joint RO, ex Dean and Chapter, B/V/3, 1636; Morgan Godwyn, *Articles to be inquired of in the archdeaconrie of Salop, within the diocese of Hereford, in the yeare 1639* (1639), sig. B2r. For other examples, see below, pp. 156, 157, 214; *RSTC*, 10243, 10302, 10318, 10343.

⁵⁹ As urged by Bishops Lindsell of Peterborough and Hereford (1633–4), Wren of Hereford (1635) and Montagu of Norwich (1638), and Archdeacon Byng of Norwich (1638): *RSTC*, 10216, 10302, 10317; see below, pp. 135, 202.

⁶⁰ See below, pp. 46, 79, 136, 202, 204; Bishops Lindsell and Dee also enquired if anyone communicated who was not already confirmed: *RSTC*, 10317–19; Bishops Goodman and Wren, and Archdeacon Byng also asked if newly-weds took communion: see below, pp. 53, 140; *RSTC*, 10302.

⁶¹ D. Cressy, ‘Purification, Thanksgiving and the Churching of Women in Post-Reformation England’ *Past and Present* 141 (1993), pp. 131–40; and see below, pp. 53, 100, 123, 158, 204 and *RSTC*, 10185, 10200, 10243, 10302, 10342, 10373. Bishops Wren, Duppa, Montagu and Towers also asked whether communion, if celebrated, was received by the churching woman: see below, pp. 142, 156, 204; *RSTC*, 10185.

⁶² See Volume I, pp. 164, 169–72; see below, pp. 28, 136; *RSTC*, 10216, 10217.5, 10318–19, 10139.3, 10339.

⁶³ For further discussion of these articles of 1640, see below, pp. xxvi–vii.

⁶⁴ See Volume I, p. 187 and below, pp. 98, 132, 148, 159–60, 192, 210; *RSTC*, 10302, 10323.7, 10343.5.

⁶⁵ See Volume I, p. 68 and below, pp. 71, 149, 193; *RSTC*, 10341–6; Davies, *Caroline Captivity*, p. 75.

archidiaconal and episcopal articles in the 1620s and 1630s.⁶⁶ Nevertheless diocesan collections of these records indicate that they were often produced following metropolitanical visitations, in the southern province by Abbot in the 1610s and by Laud in the 1630s. Though Laud's desire to protect ecclesiastical revenues is well-known, it is significant that his only major alteration to his original set of metropolitanical articles was the incorporation of five questions on the preservation of glebeland.⁶⁷ Accompanying these new priorities were attempts to address long-standing problems, such as clerical drunkenness, a matter condemned by Laud, Juxon and Montagu in their injunctions and charges.⁶⁸

These latter sources, where they exist, afford valuable insights into the priorities of the visitor. Visitation articles do not always provide clear indications of the agenda of a visitation, especially where an ordinary was merely reproducing a set inherited from his predecessor. Such an example concerns Bishop Robert Skinner of Bristol, an intimate of Laud, whose visitation articles reprint, with minor alterations, those of his predecessor but one, Robert Wright. The survival of his private address to the clergy on visitation in 1637 (no. 28) transforms our understanding of his intentions. Using the Pauline language so beloved of evangelical Calvinists, Skinner presented a robust defence of pure, peaceful and profitable preaching, attacking the 'fancie, or passion, or affection' of some preachers, the 'siding and seditious popularitie' of others, as well advocates of such doctrines as 'real baptisme'. Contempt for ecclesiastical authority 'argues men are very far gone, and almost given over to a reprobate minde'. He concluded with a defence of ceremonial uniformity, reminding all of their oath of subscription, a reproach to 'conformist puritans' whom many Laudians feared had subscribed in bad faith and were a menacing fifth-column within the Church. This denunciation of puritan practices casts his articles in a new light: clerical conformity for Skinner was a matter of pressing concern, rather than a matter of routine enquiry.

Skinner's visitation speech is an extremely rare survival for the early Stuart Church. That the practice was not unusual can be inferred from the example of John Hacket, Archdeacon of Bedford, on his annual visitations in the 1630s. Here Hacket would deliver an address to his clergy 'to enlarge my selfe year by year upon the severall parts of the liturgie'. He devoted two speeches on Sunday observance, concluding that the book of Sports 'might and ought to bee read withall obedience'. When at a subsequent meeting Hacket defended the term 'table' in preference to 'altar', he found himself reported to Laud and had to backtrack rapidly.⁶⁹ Like Skinner, Hacket was addressing issues of discipline, but from a perspective less exercised by a puritan menace.

The introduction of new and more searching enquiries in the 1630s produced much comment and some protest. Bishop Towers's articles for Peterborough diocese in 1639 (no. 21.iii) were discussed by a group of gentry, meeting at the sheriff's table during the Northampton Assizes, who were alarmed that they contained 'new things to be practized in the worship and service of God which

⁶⁶ For example, see Volume I, pp. 68, 185; below, pp. 6, 13, 46, 62; *RSTC*, 10172, 10214.5, 10283, 10336.

⁶⁷ Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor*, pp. 139–40; and see below, pp. 96–7.

⁶⁸ See below, pp. 107, 183, 220.

⁶⁹ Bodl., Cherry MS 2 fos 115, 129r, 131, 135.

are not enjoyed by the rubrick and cannons of the Church of England'. They decided to approach Towers and, while assuring him of their general conformity to ecclesiastical law, request that he moderate some of the 'very strict and unusuall' articles. Though no particular questions were identified, it is probable that Towers's requirement that communicants receive at the rails was particularly controversial. Although Towers's predecessor, Francis Dee, had prosecuted those who refused to come up to the rails, he had not mentioned the practice in his diocesan enquiries.⁷⁰ Moreover, Towers's set was based on the most notorious of all Caroline visitation articles, the articles devised by Bishop Matthew Wren for Norwich in 1636, so that they contained plenty of other provocative questions.

Wren had conducted three visitations in five years, at Hereford, Norwich and Ely. For the first, he extended the articles of his predecessor, Lindsell, drawing on over a dozen sets dating back to 1570, and thereafter continued to expand and modify his enquiries with unparalleled diligence (no. 21, i-ii), so that they represent Wren's developing ideal of the devout and well-ordered parochial community.⁷¹ He was also concerned that his subordinates should support rather than undermine his efforts on their regular visitations. The articles for the archdeaconry of Sudbury, printed in c.1637, were prefaced with the note that churchwardens should 'have speciall care' to present any infringements of Wren's articles of 1636, especially those in the fourth section, 'concerning the saying and singing of divine service in your church'.⁷² At Ely, Wren informed his archdeacon, Daniel Wigmore, that his attempts to 'reduce all things unto the best order' in his recent visitation would be frustrated unless Wigmore modelled the archidiaconal enquiries on his own. Therefore he enclosed a copy of his articles (no. 21.ii), particularly recommending 47 clauses.⁷³ Wren's selection included questions about the sacraments and major rites, confession before communion, communion at weddings and churchings, profane table-talk by parishioners, furnishings within the church including the altar, and an enquiry about the power of parish vestries. There is much overlap here with Wren's orders issued three years before at Norwich (no. 22), and the letter throws light on the generally obscure relationship between episcopal and archidiaconal sets. Wigmore's set for Ely archdeaconry does not survive, so we cannot establish if Wren's advice was heeded in full or in part.

Wren's articles for Norwich of 1636 attracted criticism as a result of their length, content and rigorous enforcement. They were accompanied by twenty-eight orders or injunctions (no. 22), which summarised many of the articles as a compendium of the new ritualism in divine service, the observance of which was to be monitored by standing commissioners (no. 23). Wren's articles consisted of 132 clauses, containing no fewer than 897 separate questions, and his articles

⁷⁰ Bedford County RO, St John of Bletsoe MSS, J 1361; see below, pp. 155-6; Northampton RO, Church Inspection Book 5 (1637); *RSTC*, 10318-19.

⁷¹ The annotated copy of Wren's 1636 set, drawn up in 1641, in which he identifies his sources, is in Bodl., Tanner MS 68 fos 63-72.

⁷² *Articles to be ministred. . . in the visitation of the right worshipfull Mr Archdeacon of Sudbury. Anno Dom. 163[]*, (163[]).

⁷³ CUL, Ely Diocesan Records F/5/40 fos 120v-1r. The full list runs as follows: 1.1, 2.2, 3, 11; 3.2-4, 6, 9-11, 15; 4.3, 6-8, 13, 16-17, 23-4, 29, 32, 35-9, 41, 43, 48, 50; 5.9; 6.5, 8, 9; 7.1-2, 4, 8, 10, 14, 18; 8.1, 4, 5; 9.4.

for Ely were longer still. As Wren rightly observed, the same question sometimes reappeared in different sections, but in other respects his defence at his impeachment in 1641 was disingenuous. His claims that his Norwich articles were no longer than those of many contemporaries was true in respect of the number of clauses but not of individual questions within them, and his statement that their detail was to help 'country plain people' by breaking down general questions into their component parts ignored the novelty and ideological drive behind many of them. Wren also pleaded that he was the more thorough since as Bishop of Norwich he was only able to conduct visitations once every seven years, but his articles were fuller still for Ely, two years later, where he could visit triennially.⁷⁴ Unsurprisingly Wren's orders came under sustained attack at his impeachment, as well as two clauses in his articles which, it was argued, placed unreasonable demands on churchwardens answering on oath. The first was whether anyone discoursed 'profanely at meal-time, touching religion, or the holy scriptures', which petitioners from Cambridgeshire regarded as an attempted prohibition on 'godlie and Christian discourse', and the second was whether the minister 'expound the holy scripture according to the sense of the ancient fathers'?⁷⁵ While Wren had himself devised the former question, the latter was taken, via Lindsell, from Overall's innovative set of 1619, and was used by at least eight other ordinaries in five dioceses. The clause was in fact an unwarranted extension of the canons of 1571, which required preachers, rather than churchwardens, to ensure that false doctrine was not peddled from the pulpit.⁷⁶ But what would have been the most taxing demand on churchwardens was a proverb printed in Greek which appeared in Richard Montagu's suppressed articles for Norwich diocese in 1638. These were withdrawn when it was discovered that the London printers had omitted an entire section of questions, and Montagu took the opportunity to make some alterations, including the removal of the Greek phrase, before the set was reprinted at Cambridge.⁷⁷ In April 1640 the citizens of Norwich complained to the House of Commons about the 'needles and unprofitable articles' devised by Wren and Montagu; later that month the Commons voted against many aspects of the Laudian programme, among them the use of visitation articles which rested not on law but on the bishop's authority.⁷⁸

The diversity of visitation articles was also noted in convocation. Canon 9 of 1640 censured 'impertinent, inconvenient, or illegal enquiries' and adopted one set of visitation articles to be used throughout the Church. Calvinists such as Archdeacon Holdsworth of Huntingdon as well as Peter Heylyn, official apologist of the ecclesiastical establishment, unanimously backed the idea of an official set, but they had different models in mind. While Holdsworth wished that Laud's enquiries might be adopted, to avoid 'too much liberty of new articles', Heylyn's intentions were rather different. His compilation omitted any

⁷⁴ S. Wren, *Parentalia* (1750), pp. 12–13, 19–21, 110.

⁷⁵ See below, pp. 135, 148; Wren, *Parentalia*, pp. 12–13; BL, Egerton MS 1048 fo 24, printed in W.M. Palmer, 'Episcopal Visitations Returns, Cambridgeshire, 1638–1662' *Transactions of the Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire Archaeological Society* 4 (1915–30), pp. 384–7.

⁷⁶ Volume I, pp. xvi, 162.

⁷⁷ See below, pp. 191 fn. 1, 197 fn. 26.

⁷⁸ *Proceedings of the Short Parliament of 1640*, eds. E.S. Cope and W.H. Coates (Camden Society, 4th series, 19, 1977), pp. 181, 279.

reference to the book of Sports, and avoided Wren's formulation about purity of doctrine and theological table-talk, but he incorporated many of the novel questions on ceremony. Among them were enquiries about the performance of churching near the communion table, with the candidate veiled, communicants having been already confirmed, the taking of communion by newly-weds and churched women, the practice of confession, the congregation standing at the creed 'and other parts of divine service' as well as the erection of a railed altar. The draft articles, 'full of offensive enquiries' according to Holdsworth, were endorsed with minor modifications by convocation, and were used only once, at Bishop Juxon's visitation of London in the autumn of 1640 (no. 34), before the canons were declared illegal by the House of Commons.⁷⁹ Heylyn's set was longer than any other of the period, partly because it drew extensively on the prayer book offices, the Elizabethan injunctions and advertisements, and the royal instructions of 1629, as well as ecclesiastical canons from 1571 to 1640, to specify in detail how the church should be furnished, divine service celebrated and ministers, churchwardens, and laity conduct themselves in and outside church. There was also provision, of which Juxon took full advantage, to insert articles relating to particular dioceses. The idea of a common book of articles was revived at the Restoration, though the model which emerged was closer in structure and detail to Laud's set than to Heylyn's.⁸⁰

The handful of visitation articles which survive for 1641–2 reflects the parliamentary assault on Laudianism and the uncertain future facing the Church. Bishop Owen of St Asaph (no. 26.i) and Archdeacon Robinson of Gloucester (no. 35) issued articles pruned of any controversial clauses, which in Owen's case included the omission of canonical requirements for parishioners to kneel at communion and ministers to baptise with the sign of the cross, though he did add a question aimed against 'schismaticall conventicles'.⁸¹ By contrast, the visitation articles of Bishop Williams (no. 13.v), newly sprung from the Tower, provided a perfect vehicle for condemning Laudian reforms as innovatory and illegal: he condemned 'new start-questions of Arminianisme', the erection of altars and the new ritualism. A memorable clause ran:

Do you know of any parson, vicar, or curate, that hath introduced any offensive rites or ceremonies into the Church, not established by the laws of the land; as namely, that make three courtesies towards the communion-table, that call the said table an altar, that enjoyn the people at their coming into the church to bow towards the east, or towards the communion-table, that call upon them to stand up at the *Te Deum*, *Benedictus*, *Magnificat*, the *Gloria Patri*, or at other times then at the creed and the gospel, that refuse to give the communion to any that will not come up and receive it at the rails, that never pray before their sermons, but bid the people pray, or use any other new and voluntary rite or ceremonie not warranted by law?

At the end of the articles Williams reprinted orders of the House of Lords against new rites and ceremonies and the restoration of the communion table to

⁷⁹ LPL, MS 943 p. 600; Laud, *Works*, iv. p. 256; Davies, *Caroline Captivity*, pp. 262–4. Juxon's visitation took place in September and October 1640 (Bodl., Rawlinson MS B 373).

⁸⁰ I.M. Green, *The Re-establishment of the Church of England 1660–1663* (Oxford, 1978), pp. 136–8.

⁸¹ We possess articles for Owen's fourth (1637) and sixth (1642) visitations so it is possible, though unlikely, that these changes were introduced for his fifth visitation.

its pre-Laudian position in the church or chancel. His public stance as victim of Laudianism and champion of Calvinist doctrine and protestantism by law established gave Williams real political leverage in 1640–1, and accounts for his promotion to the archbishopric of York, but thereafter deepening religious divisions and political crisis eroded his influence. Simultaneously, with the outbreak of Civil War, and the collapse of the church courts' inquisitorial role, the production of visitation articles appears to have ceased.

What broad conclusions can be drawn from a study of visitation articles across the years 1603–42? The fact that many sets underwent constant revisions suggests that they were valued as a means to exercise ecclesiastical justice and to recommend good practice and pastoral aspirations. Their full significance, however, can only be appreciated once we have studied the related documents of the visitation, such as the charge or injunctions, and the evidence from detection books or churchwardens' presentments. It is also clear that the relative uniformity of sets used in the Jacobean Church, all drawing on the canons of 1604, was undermined in the 1630s with the emergence of new enquiries about church furnishings and ritual, largely based on prayer book rubrics, which some ordinaries employed but many ignored. At the same time visitation articles became controversial. Some demanded unpopular or costly changes – in the arrangement of pews, the erection of rails, the reading of the book of Sports, greater reverence in divine service and so on – while others such as Wren's asked questions which, it was alleged, 'would puzzle the deepest learned churchwarden in England, to answer'.⁸² As vehicles for articulating Laudian ideals, visitation articles became targets for criticism. In his attack on episcopal jurisdiction in 1636, William Prynne asked rhetorically whether visitation articles had been devised by convocation and ratified by king and parliament: 'if not (as none of them are)', use the articles 'for waste paper, or to stop musterd-pots', he advised.⁸³ These volumes, by contrast, suggest that such articles deserve a better fate, for they repay careful study.

⁸² *A Report of the Committee of the Charge against Matthew Wren. . . July 5th 1641* (1641), p. 2.

⁸³ William Prynne, *Brief Instructions for Church-wardens and others to observe in all Episcopall or Archidiaconall Visitations and Spirituall Courts* (1636), sig. π v.

TEXTUAL CONVENTIONS

The original spelling and punctuation have been retained, except where the latter obscures the sense of a passage, standard abbreviations of English and Latin words have been extended, and capitalization modernized. Typographical omissions have been supplied, and placed within square brackets.

Collations:

Some sets of articles are numbered consecutively though they contain several sections, grouped under different headings. In collating these sets, references are made simply to numbers of individual articles. Other sets, however, are divided into a series of separately-numbered sections. These latter sections are here given numbers, printed in bold type both in the text and in the collations. Numbers of individual articles are printed in Roman type: when two sets are collated, the derivative has the numbers of its articles placed in brackets, while the original does not. In a few cases, the derivative has a different sequence of sections from the original, to which attention is drawn in the footnotes, and in these cases those sectional numbers in the derivative varying from the original are also placed in brackets. In most cases, the original and derivative share the same sequence of sections, the numbers of which are printed without brackets.

In collating sets, individual articles are placed in one of four categories: *Identical*, *Modification*, *Omission* and *Addition*. Each needs some explanation.

Identical: This category includes not just the exact reproduction in the derivative of an individual article from the original, but also an article in the derivative which contains very minor variations in construction or phraseology, which make no difference to the sense or purpose of the original article. For example, in his enquiries for London diocese in 1612, based on a set for London diocese in 1605, Bishop John King added 'touching the premisses' to the end of article 4 in Section 1, which, nevertheless, is entered in the collation in Volume I as 'identical'. To count every tiny change, however trivial, is neither useful nor economical. Articles in this category are listed by section and number.

Modification: Any significant change in the derivative to an individual article from the original enquiries is entered in this category: terms used are 'vice', 'omits', 'inserts', 'adds', 'opens' and 'reads'. Each has a precise usage. 'vice' (in place of) where one sentence or phrase is substituted for another; 'omits' where a word, phrase or sentence is deleted; 'inserts' for an addition in the body of the original article; 'adds' for an addition at the end of the original article; 'opens' denotes minor changes at the start of the article, so that the first phrase or sentence of the derivative article is reproduced, ending where the derivative reverts to the wording of the original; 'reads' denotes a series of minor changes, so that the derivative article is reproduced in whole or, where specified, in part.

Omission: An article in the original omitted from the derivative, listed by section and number.

Addition: An entirely new article in the derivative, reproduced in full.

Date and place of publication are identified in the footnotes; oaths and charges to churchwardens are omitted.

1. BISHOP VALENTINE CAREY'S ARTICLES FOR EXETER DIOCESE, 1625.

*Articles to be enquired of within the dioces of Exeter, in the generall and triennall visitation of the reverend father in God, Valentine Lord Bishop of Exeter. Holden, anno domini 1625.*¹

Church

1. Whether your church chappell and chancell bee in a decent and seemely order, and not decayed or deformed in any part? Are the ten commaundements set upon the east end of your said church and chappell? And are other chosen sentences of the scripture written upon the wals thereof in convenient places, and have you belonging to your church a bible in the largest volume, not torne or wanting leaves, two bookes of common prayer of the last edition and largest volume, the bookes of homilies, and the workes of Bishop Iewell, the Paraphrase of Erasmus: if not, then what is defective, and by whose default?
2. Whether you have two fayre and fitting surplusses with sleeves for your minister, and another without sleeves for your clarke, a font of stone set in the ancient usuall place of your church, with a comely timber covering thereunto, a decent communion table, with a carpet of silke or such like, and a fayre lynneth cloth belonging to the same table, a communion cup of silver, and a cover agreeable to the same, and a sweete pot or stoop of pewter, if not, of purer mettall, to containe the wine prepared for the Lords table?
3. Whether you have your accustomed number of bells fit and serviceable for ringing, and how many are the bells which now you have, and whether your number of bells bee diminished or not, if so, then by whom and for what cause?
4. Whether you have a comely deske or seate for your minister, fit seates for the people, and a high pulpit well fashi[o]ned, and strongly built, with a decent cushion or cloath for the same? And is the said pulpit so placed, that all the congregation may best heare the preacher? Is the rooffe of your church, chancell, and chappell well repayred, and are the windowes thereof well glazed, and is the flore of the same kept paved plaine and even, and are the graves decently covered, if not, then what is amisse, and by whose default?
5. Whether you have a register booke in parchment, and one sufficient strong chest for the keeping of the said register booke and other writings and ornaments of the church, with three lockes, and three keyes to the same, are the names of the parents of every childe baptized, orderly written in the said booke, and is the date of every licence for persons married without banes specified therein: have you a sure chest or box to keepe the almes for the poore, furnished in like manner with three lockes and keyes?

¹ Printed in London, 1625 (RSTC, 10205). Valentine Carey was Bishop of Exeter 1621–6 and this is his only known set of diocesan enquiries. The titlepage of the sole surviving copy has been altered for a visitation of Carey's peculiars: 'generall and triennall' is crossed out, and 'in his lordships peculiars' inserted after 'Holden'.

Church-yard

6. Whether your church-yard bee well fenced and kept cleane, or is it any way annoyed and defiled by any beastes or carriage into it, and by whose default? And hath there beene of late cut downe any tree or trees growing in your church-yard, or in the fences of the same, and by whom, and to what use have the same beene employed?
7. Whether any person or persons have used bowling in your church-yard, or hath quarrelled, struggled, brawled, or fought in your church or church-yard, or hath there laid violent hands upon any other, or drawne any weapon, to the intent to strike any body therewith?
8. Whether hath any person excommunicated, or any recusant convicted, or any that hath destroyed their owne life beene buried in your church or church-yard, if so, then who, and by whom, and how long since?
9. Whether your church bee void of an incumbent, or full: if full, then of what yeeres was the said incumbent when he was instituted thereunto, and whether is he resident, and is he a licenced preacher, and doth he performe his dutie in preaching once every Sunday, soberly and sincerely dividing the word of truth, to the glory of God, and to the best edification of the people?
10. Whether your minister weare apparell decent and fit for his calling, as namely, the gowne, tippet, and square cap, the cloake with sleeves, the cassocke and other apparell, enioyned and appointed upon him in the booke of canons, lately set forth?
11. Whether your minister useth the orders, rites and ceremonies of the Church, as namely, the surplesse every Sunday and holy day, and at all other times when he celebrateth divine service, doth he use the ring in marriage, and the signe of the crosse in baptisme, and whether doth hee read the prayers and other divine service prescribed in the booke of common prayer, without adding or diminishing any thing in the matter or forme thereof?
12. Whether your minister hath taken upon him to preach or expound any scripture or matter of doctrine, not being thereunto allowed by the bishop of the diocesse, under his episcopall seale, or doth any use to preach or to be a lecturer, who doth not twice in the yeere at the least read divine service openly in the church, and administer the sacraments of baptisme and the Lords supper in his surplesse.
13. Whether your parson or vicar, being no licenced preacher, hath procured monethly sermons to be preached in his cure, by such as are allowed publike preachers, and whether the names of all such preachers bee noted and written in a booke ordained for that purpose, together with the date of every licence, and the name of the granter thereof?
14. Whether your minister declare upon the Sunday unto the people, the holydayes and fasting dayes in the weeke following?
15. Whether your minister being desired thereunto, hath not visited the sicke persons of the parish, or hath not resorted unto such, to instruct and comfort them in their distresse, or whether hath hee refused or delayed to christen any child, or to burie any such corps, which by law are allowed Christian buriall?
16. Whether your minister hath commonly given himselfe to any base or servile labour, or to drinking and riot, or to playing at dice, cards, or tables, or is he reputed to be an incontinent person, or is hee any way offensive in his