LAUDIANISM IN THE NORTH: THE IMPACT OF LAUDIANISM IN THE ARCHDEACONRY OF NOTTINGHAM

by
Quentin Thomas Adams

A dissertation submitted to the Department of History,
College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in History

Chair of Committee: Dr. Catherine F. Patterson
Committee Member: Dr. Sally Vaughn
Committee Member: Dr. Todd Romero
Committee Member: Dr. Ann Christensen

University of Houston
May 2021
DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this work to my amazing family, friends, and pets who have encouraged me along this often difficult but rewarding journey. This work would not have been possible without your constant emotional, financial, and spiritual support. I cannot thank you enough.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Apart from the support and advice of my advisor, Dr. Catherine Patterson, this work would probably never have got off the ground in the first place. It was through Dr. Patterson’s graduate seminars and our numerous and lengthy subsequent conversations that the questions and ideas behind the project first began to take shape. And it has been through her constant guidance and first-rate feedback that the project has been seen through to completion.

This work was also made possible by assistance from a multitude of archives and archivists, particularly those at the Borthwick Institute at the University of York, the North Yorkshire County Record Office, and the Nottingham Archive Office. Just as integral to the work were the dedicated efforts of the many individuals at the Nottingham University Manuscript Service department who worked to digitize a wide variety of records emerging from the Archdeaconry of Nottingham—a vast amount of useful materials, without which this work would have been totally infeasible.

Similarly critical to the work’s progress were the many excellent studies put forward by Ronald Marchant many decades ago. Especially as regards understanding the inner workings of the ecclesiastical administration and the dynamics of puritanism within the Diocese of York, Marchant’s works have been absolutely indispensable, providing the basic building blocks upon which the present work has been constructed.

Finally, a great debt is owed also to the History Department of the University of Houston and its financial support offered through the Murray Miller graduate fund. These funds made possible the two research trips to England needed to collect materials critical for the project.
ABSTRACT

The early to mid-seventeenth century was a time of great religious tumult and upheaval across Europe, including in England, where the tensions and debates first set in motion by the Reformation period continued to prove a source of disquiet and unease within the established church. This study examines a particular place in the less studied north of England, the Archdeaconry of Nottingham, during a particular period commonly associated with such turbulence, the ascendance of so-called “Laudianism” during the 1620s and 1630s. It aims chiefly to develop a fuller understanding of the ways in which Laudianism materialized at the parish level, and to probe common assumptions that Laudianism was heavily enforced and highly divisive in the large majority of English parishes—assumptions based largely on studies of more southerly localities. Although not principally concerned with the consequences of Laudianism as they may have related to the coming Civil War, many of the work’s findings carry implicit suggestions for future research on that more specific topic.

While the Archdeaconry of Nottingham has been examined in some depth in previous studies, those works have primarily focused on the relationship between the archidiaconal administration and the various puritan ministers who lived and preached within its jurisdictional boundaries. Building on these important findings, this work seeks to focus on the even larger number of non-puritan ministers at work in the region to gain a better idea of the preconditions for Laudianism’s impact in parishes that were more representative of the archdeaconry as whole. From there, the work conducts systematic investigations of continuities and discontinuities between the 1630s and the decades preceding it—especially as regards ecclesiastical discipline, and the financial and material manifestations of Laudianism. These investigations reveal that Laudianism, while clearly a tangible reality for many, was hardly as uniform or disruptive as
many have assumed. In the course of describing these findings, this study also highlights the extent to which local factors mediated the experience of Laudianism in a diverse array of settings, suggesting that further research must be done in order to properly evaluate Laudianism’s impact on the country at large.
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Introduction

As the consequences of modern Papal pronouncements and splits in mainline Protestant churches illustrate, religious change continues to have profound effects on people well into the twenty-first century. If this is true today, it was doubly so in Stuart England, a kingdom that as of the early seventeenth-century compelled attendance at an established church under the firm hand of the Stuart monarchs and their secular and clerical allies. Religion suffused nearly all aspects of life for English men and women, with weekly services, prayers, public sermons and exercises, and a regular round of other celebrations such as the ringing of the church bells on the fifth of November. Parishioners were also subject to daily scrutiny by their ministers, churchwardens, and other agents of the ecclesiastical justice system—including their own neighbors. With the Church itself already founded on a series of highly contested compromises, changes to the system at any point in the early Stuart era were almost guaranteed to have major ramifications for all involved: for Church and state as well as local communities and their parishioners. This study intends to examine the lived experience of religious change in one such period, one associated most famously with the “Personal Rule” of Charles I and his chief ecclesiastical officer, Archbishop of Canterbury William Laud, and one frequently the subject of intense academic debate.

While developments from this period are highly significant in their own right, it is undoubtedly true that the eruption of the English Civil War in the 1640s augments their importance in substantial, though controversial, ways. Historians of early modern England have long pondered the ways in which, and the extent to which, religious factors played a role in precipitating the Civil War. Well into the twentieth century, many historians continued to place
most of the blame on puritans, casting them as the primary disrupters of an “Anglican” *via media* in the Church. From the 1970s, however, works by Nicholas Tyacke, Patrick Collinson, and others began to reshape understandings of, and debates around, early Stuart religion as well as its connections to the English Civil War. Most significantly for the present study, Tyacke’s work emphasized the disruptive effects of Arminian theology and doctrine on a church and state that had allegedly been unified around a shared adherence to Calvinism well into the Jacobean period. The rise of Charles I, he insisted, “meant the overthrow of Calvinism” and subsequently the “genesis and working out” of the “Arminian Revolution.”¹ Notwithstanding important critiques by Peter White and others, who dispute the idea of a “rise” of Arminianism², Tyacke’s arguments have proven quite influential and pervasive. Robert Tombs’ popular *The English and Their History*, to give one notable example, goes as far as to compare the impact of Arminianism to the “social upheavals and cultural intrusions…of Islamism today.”³

Given the pervasiveness of Tyacke’s arguments, it may be wondered why one should summon up this topic once again, two decades into the twenty-first century. Firstly, and most broadly, many works in recent decades have continued to echo White in calling Tyacke’s focus on doctrine and theology into question. The large majority agree with Tyacke as to the disruptive

---


² “Arminianism” broadly speaking refers to the teachings of Jacob Arminius, a Dutch theologian who critiqued Calvinist theology, especially in relation to the doctrine of predestination. However, when applied in a specifically English context, “Arminianism” typically refers to a broader set of beliefs and practices—largely rooted in a desire to return to the “true” ways of the ancient church and a correspondingly dim view of the perceived excesses of Reformed Protestantism—that actually predate Jacob Arminius and of which critiques of predestination are only one component. The apparent similarities between “Arminianism” and Catholicism made “Arminian” a useful term of abuse for puritan writers like William Prynne.

nature of Caroline religious developments but suggest that the material and ceremonial changes associated with Archbishop Laud’s policies were of more significance than specific doctrinal issues. As a result, many works, including this one, employ the term “Laudianism” in order to better recognize the wider potential ramifications of the religious policies of the 1630s. Though discussions of the debates surrounding specific aspects of Laudianism have been disaggregated and reserved for the chapters that follow, most scholars agree that it still makes sense to speak of Laudianism as a coherent set of ideals, beliefs, and policies that found their fullest expression and broadest reach under Archbishop Laud and his clerical and secular allies. Undergirded by teachings from churchmen like John Hooper and, later, Lancelot Andrewes, about the visible church, the necessity of receiving divine grace through the sacraments, the sacredness of the physical, and the elevated status of the clergy, Laudianism was experienced by most people, not in terms of anti-Calvinist sermons, but in terms of changes to the physical aspects of worship that emerged as a consequence of Laudian ideals and policy decisions. The need to examine these material and ceremonial changes that in large part constituted Laudianism, as well as their potential consequences, has led some scholars to pursue more localized studies.

At stake in such studies, as in this one, is the extent to which conflict or consensus characterized the 1630s. Historians have disagreed sharply on this problem. Tyacke and other major figures like David Cressy see the decade as full of sharp discontinuities and conflict—

---

4 Scholars sometimes use the terms “Laudian” and “Arminian” as synonyms, often clarifying beforehand a broader understanding of “Arminianism” in the English context. That said, certain scholars have noted that a clergyman could have been an Arminian without being a Laudian. Usually, this meant the man in question rejected Calvinist predestination, but did not align with the wider network of Laudians for one reason or another.

5 Even Tyacke came to question his emphasis on theological considerations. See Nicholas Tyacke, Aspects of English Protestantism, c. 1530-1700 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001), 2. For further discussion on terminology, see below and Ch. 1.

6 Whether the “changes” brought about by Laudian policies, and the ideas undergirding them, constituted conservative, traditional churchmanship, or were truly “innovations,” has been a key point of contention. See Andrew Foster, “Church Policies of the 1630s,” in Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics, 1603-1642, eds. Ann Hughes and Richard Cust (London: Longman, 1989), 213.
largely, it is argued, the fault of Archbishop Laud and Charles I.\textsuperscript{7} By contrast, White, Christopher Haigh, Kevin Sharpe and G.W. Bernard are among the most prominent promoters of the notion that the 1630s was \textit{not} a period of widespread conflict. White, for instance, claims that there were only a handful of prosecutions against “Arminian” ministers per county and that evidence for parochial complaints against “Arminian” clergy is “scant” at best.\textsuperscript{8} Bernard, for his part, charges Tyacke with underestimating survival of enthusiasm for traditional parish life and ceremonial practices.\textsuperscript{9} Perhaps even more important for the purposes of this project is the charge that Tyacke relies too heavily on printed sources and therefore offers too little discussion of the actual impact of Laudianism at the parish level.\textsuperscript{10}

Indeed, despite a number of local studies of Laudianism appearing in the 1990s and early 2000s, J.R. Mawdesley and Christopher Spencer could claim as late as 2014 that historians “still lack a real understanding of Laudianism at the parochial level.”\textsuperscript{11} If this claim is to be believed, one cannot help but wonder how historians can make such bold and sweeping claims about the impact of “Arminianism” and/or “Laudianism” on the country at large. It is one thing to claim, as Marc Schwarz does, that Arminians were a “cadre of generals without battalions,” as this only requires apathy or indifference on the part of English parishioners.\textsuperscript{12} It is quite another thing to


\textsuperscript{8} Peter White, \textit{Predestination, Policy, and Polemic: Conflict and Consensus in the English Church from the Reformation to the Civil War} (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 309.


suggest that Arminianism and/or Laudianism were so despised that it “increased friction to the sparking point.” More than probing the extent of unrest as it relates to the coming of civil war, however, this work is interested in uncovering the ways in which and the extent to which these religious phenomena played out at the parish level. This study will show that, in the case of the Archdeaconry of Nottingham, the local experience of Laudianism was more variegated, less disruptive, and provoked less resistance than appears to have been the case elsewhere. The work also illustrates the extent to which local factors and individuals could and did play important roles as conduits for, and/or impeders of, Laudianism’s manifestation in particular areas. Therefore, though not strictly speaking a “microhistory,” the project draws on what Francesca Trivellato defines as microhistory’s main point of departure: “that a variation of scales of analysis” can lead to “new interpretations of commonly accepted grand narratives.” Complicating the broader perception of the impact of Laudianism, this study’s findings indicate that Laudianism materialized differently in the northern province of the church than in the south, recommending the value of further research into the nuances of Laudianism’s materialization in areas as yet unstudied or understudied.

The question of specific regions and localities thus offers a second key rationale for the work. Whereas this work explores the Archdeaconry of Nottingham in the northern Province of York, nearly all previous major local studies have concerned dioceses within the Province of Canterbury, in the southern parts of England. The work of Margaret Stieg quoted above, for example, examines the Diocese of Bath and Wells, while those by James Galloway and Mary

---

14 For an introduction to the basic structures and particularities of the Archdeaconry of Nottingham, see Ch. 1.
Millicent Egan—which also recommend Tyacke’s view—look at London, Middlesex and Essex, respectively.\textsuperscript{16} Egan implicitly provides a central reason for the imbalance in geographic representation in describing how the dynamics of Early Stuart puritanism and Laudianism are “nowhere…better documented than for the county of Essex.”\textsuperscript{17} Galloway likewise appears to have had access to a wide array records, and this allowed him to dig deeply into questions of, for example, parishes’ financial decisions during the 1630s. It should therefore be admitted from the outset that, at least broadly speaking, the northern province simply does not offer the breadth and depth of sources to be had in many regions of the south. While this has created avenues for potential research, it obviously poses difficulties to the interested historian. Yet, especially as the work of Ronald Marchant demonstrates, certain regions in York Province do offer a substantial body of relevant evidence. Primarily for this reason, the present work focuses on the Archdeaconry of Nottingham, an ecclesiastical jurisdiction within the Diocese of York that, as of the early seventeenth century, roughly approximated the borders of Nottinghamshire, the most southerly county within the northern ecclesiastical province. A study on this region benefits not only from the extensive research of Marchant, but also, as of fairly recently, a nearly fully digitized collection of archidiaconal visitation presentment bills dating from the late Elizabethan period into the 1640s and made available by the University of Nottingham. The Borthwick Institute at the University of York also maintains records of Episcopal and Archiepiscopal visitations, including most of the corresponding visitations of the Archdeaconry of Nottingham.

While local studies of any regions or jurisdictions that currently lack them would be of value, what is particularly intriguing about the north is, firstly, its status as a distinct province

\textsuperscript{17} Egan, “Laudians, Puritans and the Laity in Essex,” 2.
within the Church of England, governed by its own Archbishop and diocesan and local officials. Granted, Archbishop Richard Neile, who served from 1632 until his death in 1640, was generally of the same mind as Archbishop Laud. Yet, the reality that his directives and officials had more direct impact on northern parishes than Laud’s means that one cannot assume that what transpired in 1630s Somersetshire or Sussex or Suffolk also came to pass in Nottinghamshire. Secondly, one must consider that studies of southern regions have found evidence of legitimate support for Laudian ministers and beautification efforts amongst the laity, even in the heartlands of puritanism, Essex and London. If popular support for Laudianism existed even in these areas, it is well-worth exploring how Laudianism and Arminianism played out in the less studied north of England, an area of the country which put up stouter resistance to the initial changes of the Reformation, had more persisting problems with Catholic survivalism (“recusancy”), and tended toward Royalism when the Civil War came about. In short, it is hoped that a local study of Laudianism based in the northern province will not only fill in important gaps in the national picture of the phenomenon; it may also recommend serious qualifications of the widely held view that Laudianism was a chief source of nationwide disruption and discontent in the 1630s.

In examining the northerly Archdeaconry of Nottingham, this study builds especially upon the aforementioned research of Ronald Marchant. While Marchant’s work does touch upon the experience of Arminianism and Laudianism at the local level, he primarily examines the interaction between the ecclesiastical hierarchy and the diocese’s fairly substantial network of puritans. Still, Marchant’s in-depth investigations of the inner workings of the administration, an essentially top-down history, have proved invaluable to subsequent works on the Diocese of

---

18 To some extent, then, this work explores the notion put forward by Christopher Haigh and later taken up by Alexandra Walsham: that “parish Anglicans” formed a popular base of support for Caroline ecclesiastical policies. See Alexandra Walsham, “The Parochial Roots of Laudianism Revisited: Catholics, Anti-Calvinists and ‘Parish Anglicans’ in Early Stuart England,” *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 49, no. 4 (1998): 621.
York, and on the Archdeaconry of Nottingham more specifically. David Marcombe’s study of East Retford also touches upon the local experience of Laudianism, providing an example of how Laudianism admittedly did infringe upon the lives of some given the right set of factors and circumstances—for example, the presence of an overtly puritan minister. Nevertheless, even here, Laudianism’s impact does not strike one as particularly oppressive, especially given East Retford’s status as a prominent town with a well-entrenched puritan tradition.

Along with Marchant, the other major study that looks at the Archdeaconry of Nottingham as a whole is that of S.B. Jennings, dating to 1999. Following in Marchant’s footsteps, Jennings focuses primarily on puritans and puritanism, his central contribution being an interpretation of the development of that phenomenon over the whole seventeenth-century—carrying the analysis beyond the early and mid-seventeenth century in a way Marchant had not. Jennings’ examination of the 1630s does include some analysis of Laudianism’s local impact—especially in terms of church restorations—but his primary aim in this is to push forward his argument about the growing levels of dissent in subsequent decades. That is, in part, he attempts to explain the escalating manifestation of dissent from the 1640s-1650s by pointing to Laudianism’s allegedly broad and deep impact on the archdeaconry. While Jennings is surely right to note that Laudianism brought significant changes in some instances—a reality the present study openly affirms throughout—it is less clear that the “full impact” of Laudianism

was felt across the archdeaconry. For one thing, he appears to assume too high a degree of similarity between the experiences of the northern province and the southern one. Claiming that Neile “imitated and enforced” Laud’s ideals is true in a sense, but it is also potentially misleading. Kenneth Fincham, for example, notes how Neile acted to enforce railed altars in some northern towns in advance of Laud. Secondly, some of the statistics that Jennings’ cites also raise questions about how novel the experiences of the 1630s actually were. For example, he notes 32 cases of gadding between 1600-1609 and 36 between 1630-1640. He also admits that, at least among the general population, there were not a great number of “outbursts” or citations for failing to kneel or bow at the proper times during the 1635-1640 period—presumably the period most marked by intense efforts to enforce Laudian directives. Though no doubt having a kernel of truth, his suggestion that the paucity of evidence of resistance can be explained by fear of the hierarchy seems to be rooted too much in his desire to explain the waves of dissent that emerged in the decades after 1640.

The question of evidence from the 1640s and beyond calls for a more specific discussion of this work’s terminological and methodological choices. In both respects, this study owes much to the several aforementioned local studies, especially those by Stieg, Galloway, and Egan. While the inclusive phrase “Arminianism and Laudianism” has been featured in discussing the broader historiographical landscape, this project, like Stieg and Egan’s, is definitively a study of Laudianism—of the variety of ceremonial, behavioral, and physical consequences that can be

23 Ibid., 4.
25 Jennings, “‘The Gathering of the Elect’,” 85. “Gadding” refers to the frequenting of churches not one’s own parish church.
considered outgrowths of a broadly coherent vision for ecclesiastical life. As other historians have noted, “Arminianism” is usefully applied in theological and doctrinal contexts. One fairly serious drawback of using the term in a broader sense, however, is that specifically “Arminian” elements need not have been involved for Laudianism to have made itself felt. Indeed, this work finds very little clear evidence of Arminian doctrines being taught or discussed in Nottinghamshire parishes. This does not mean, of course, that certain aspects of Laudianism, such as the emphasis on repositioning communion tables and baptismal fonts, were not undergirded by Arminian teachings. Yet, “Laudianism” has the advantage of avoiding a potentially misleading emphasis on theological concerns while still recognizing their relevance.

“Laudianism” also puts important emphasis on the decade of the 1630s, and this work seeks as far as possible to analyze sources emerging out of this decade for the purpose of putting forward categories, interpretations, and conclusions. This may seem obvious, but for often understandable reasons, other works have relied heavily on sources from the 1640s or even later to do the same. Egan and Stieg rely especially on such records, and for both they constitute the principal sources by which ministers are sorted into different categories. One critical source for Stieg, for example, is the “vaguely royalist” petition from December 1641. While works like The Sufferings of the Clergy or Walker Revised, to give additional examples, do have their uses, Egan understates their potential problems. More specifically, the entries relating to Nottinghamshire clergy from the two aforementioned sources tend to be somewhat vague and unspecific. 1640s puritan declarations and the like also pose interpretive difficulties. Given the


27 Stieg, Laud’s Laboratory, 77. See Ch. 1 for a fuller discussion on systems for categorizing clergy.

changing of the winds against episcopacy especially by 1642-1643, it is not unreasonable to expect that some clergy previously conformable decided to cast their lot with the puritans, sign the declarations and join the classis, and so maintain their livelihoods. In this sense, the lists of those who joined a classis or signed a declaration against “poperie” and “prelacie” may be less reliable even than sequestration articles or the ejections recorded by Walker and Matthews.

This is not to say that records prior to 1640 are without their problems. Churchwarden presentment bills, for example, sometimes fail to provide any context for their citations, or have names of offenders crossed out or added on the reverse side without explanation. Additionally, though more rarely, churchwardens and ministers can appear at odds in their presentments—refusing to sign the bill, for example—or may submit contradictory or even competing bills. The apathy or connivance of some churchwardens has also ensured that certain episodes of interest cannot be recovered. Yet, insofar as this forestalled any outside intervention or action on the part of local clergymen or the hierarchy, churchwardens’ silence could constitute a principal impediment to the manifestation of Laudianism. This eventuality can often be corroborated by other records from the 1630s, such as the presentment bills listing expenditures on the church that survive for 1635-1637 and 1639. Marchant’s compilation of chancery court records for the 1635-1640 period can also provide corroborating evidence, listing, for example, what court orders (if any) were laid upon a given parish.

Making full but careful use of the available sources in this way, the study lays out its key findings over the course of five chapters. Given that “Arminian” or “Laudian” clergymen are often cast as the main enforcers of Laudianism, the first chapter sets out to investigate the clergymen at work in the Archdeaconry of Nottingham during the 1630s. Using especially the alumni registers of Cambridge and Oxford, the chapter takes a comparative look at minsters’
origins, ages, and educational experiences in an effort to sort ministers into meaningful categories and establish the preconditions for Laudianism’s impact on the locality. Rather than relying on sometimes vague and late arriving petitions or the like, this chapter argues that local sources from the 1630s and 1620s offer the most reliable records with which to build a system of categories expressing a clergyman’s level of sympathy with puritan or Laudian views. Overall, few men who can be identified as sympathetic to Laudianism seem to have been active in the archdeaconry, and few graduate clergy attended well known centers of Arminian or Laudian education. The general make-up of the archdeaconry’s clergy worked against the likelihood of the widespread or intense enforcement of Laudianism.

Understanding that the realization or enforcement of Laudianism need not have required openly Laudian clerics, the second chapter transitions to a more ground-level examination of the archdeaconry’s clergy and churchwardens, the latter also having wielded significant influence as to Laudianism’s impact. Unlike earlier studies of the archdeaconry, attention is paid primarily to the non-puritan clergymen who constituted the largest share of the locality’s ministers. One reason for this predominance, and one factor further limiting Laudian influence, was the seemingly fortuitous decline in the number of puritan ministers active by the 1630s. Especially in prominent towns and parishes, puritan ministers like John Mosley of Newark could attract the attention of the hierarchy, thereby serving as conduits for the importation of Laudian measures. In addition to the growing number of moderate ministers, the chapter also examines other factors that limited the realization of Laudianism, such as the general lack of activist churchwardens, the limited scope of ecclesiastical patronage, and, perhaps more intriguingly, the holding of Nottinghamshire benefices by prominent Laudian clerics.
Having examined key factors that seem to have worked against the manifestation of Laudianism, chapters three through five take a closer look at the ways in which elements of Laudianism did nevertheless impinge upon the archdeaconry’s parishioners and churches. Chapter three takes a broad look at changes and continuities within the sphere of ecclesiastical discipline, specifically as it relates to the behavior of clergy, churchwardens, and parishioners from the early seventeenth-century into the 1630s. Such a long-term study is made possible by the existence of a large body of churchwarden presentment bills dating as far back as the late sixteenth-century. A major overall finding put forward here is that the numbers of people caught up in the ecclesiastical justice system were rarely very high—even in the 1630s. Thus, it is argued that within many spheres of ecclesiastical discipline, though by no means all, only relatively slight discontinuities can be seen, if they appear at all. While churchwardens were more likely than others to be confronted with such discontinuities, even many of these men appear to have enjoyed relatively peaceful tenures.

Chapter four focuses in on a specific sphere of ecclesiastical discipline intentionally withheld from chapter three, but of particular relevance to Laudianism: ecclesiastical costs and payments. The numbers and figures associated with these, while routine and seemingly prosaic, provide critical insight into the material impacts of religious policy on the parishioners of the archdeaconry, as well as the financial impact. That is, the available records allow one to see (for most parishes) how much was being spent on restorative work during the mid to late 1630s, as well as the extent to which the costs imposed by such work were actively resisted. Beginning with William Prynne himself, it has been argued that the costs of Laudianism constituted one of the chief reasons for its disapprobation.29 By employing a detailed study of the 1630s and the

decades preceding it, it becomes clear that, by and large, resistance to ecclesiastical payments did not dramatically spike during the 1630s even where much money was spent on church restoration work. At the same time, the great amounts doled out by at least some parishes reveals the extent to which Laudianism did have appreciable material affects in the archdeaconry—however these changes and “improvements” were received—even as many parishes with Laudian-sympathizing clergy ironically saw little of such work.

Chapter five takes on this reality, looking at the differentiated materialization of Laudianism in the archdeaconry specifically in relation to church yards, church buildings, and church interiors.30 Even more than the associated costs, the changes wrought by Laudian restoration campaigns have been accused of causing widespread antipathy.31 As is emphasized in other chapters, however, even within the single jurisdiction of the Archdeaconry of Nottingham, Laudianism’s impact must be understood in nuanced terms. For some parishes, restorative work seems to have been welcomed as a solution to long term issues with the church fabric, for instance. In other, especially poorer, parishes, restorative work may not have been forthcoming at all. Certainly, significant measures were implemented in a good number of parishes, but comparative analysis of earlier decades reveals that, in many respects, so-called Laudian measures were hardly unprecedented. Even in the case of the translation and railing in of communion tables, generally considered the (especially despised) centerpiece of Laudian policy, the weight of the evidence suggests that conflict and resistance were far from the order of the day in the Archdeaconry of Nottingham. As is illustrated in other chapters, a number of factors—the

30 Andrew Spicer, “The Material Culture of Early Modern Churches,” in The Routledge Handbook of Material Culture in Early Modern Europe, eds. Catherine Richardson, Tara Hamling, and David Gaimster (London and New York: Routledge, 2017), 87-89. Thus, this study touches on both “sacramental” and “non-sacramental” material culture as understood by Spicer.
31 See, for example, Galloway, “English Arminianism,” 193.
apathy or energy of churchwardens and ministers, the practical constraints on, and specific interests of, early modern governance—played a role in muting Laudianism’s “full” impact in the archdeaconry.

Thus, this work challenges the vision of a militant ideological force of Arminian doctrine that both altered the church’s core values and widely alienated local parishioners. It does not, however, discount the reality of ascendant Laudianism, which had tangible—though far from uniform—consequences for parishes and parishioners. As previewed above, this study especially affirms the concreteness of Laudian church restoration efforts and highlights the burdens this put on many churchwardens. At the same time, this project reveals the extent to which detailed examination of Laudianism’s local impact prevents any simplistic generalizations about the breadth, depth, and specific nature of Laudianism’s manifestations in any given parish. Bold, sweeping arguments that “Laudianism destroyed the Church of England” become increasingly difficult to sustain as a result. Moreover, though certainly coherent, unified, and top-down in certain respects, Laudianism is here shown to have been vulnerable to a number of local factors, each of which could mediate Laudianism’s realization in different ways. The large and historically puritan parish of St. Peter’s in Nottingham, for example, clearly felt and experienced Laudianism in ways not seen in less prominent parishes like Screveton. Differences in terms of clerical leadership constitute one important reason for this reality, and it is to an examination of the archdeaconry’s clergy that the work now turns.
Chapter One
The Caroline Clergy of Nottinghamshire: A Prosopographical Study

Following in the footsteps of Nicholas Tyacke, historians who affirm the reality and adverse effects of an “Arminian Revolution” have tended to place much blame on a variety of “Laudian,” “Arminian,” or “ceremony mongering” clergymen. Ministers identified as such are frequently said to have faced widespread opposition and to have stirred up controversy in one way or another, earning the enmity of their parishioners. Across the country in the 1640s, supposed “ceremony mongers” faced charges from “Committees for Scandalous Ministers” like the one set up in Suffolk. Here, clergymen were indicted not only for observing “all the innovations introduced by Bishop Wren” but also for “preachinge Arminianisme; sayeing that man hath freewill to be saved if he will.”¹ The alleged behavior of such clergymen thus constitutes a substantial part of the evidentiary basis for the now widely accepted claim that “Laudianism,” or “Arminianism,” played a key role in creating the conditions for a civil war. Thus, on this view, the number of “Laudian” ministers in a given area presumably had a strong, positive correlation with the concreteness of “Laudianism,” and resistance thereto, in that area.

This and the following chapter propose to test the applicability of this framework for the less studied northern province through a prosopographical study of the clergy within one of its constituent jurisdictions, the Archdeaconry of Nottingham. As noted in the introductory chapter, the northern province’s unique history and jurisdictional status make it problematic to assume, for example, that the religious policies of the 1630s were essentially the same in their content and impact in the Diocese of Bath and Wells as they were in the Diocese of York. In part, this is

so because of the differences in the composition of each locality’s particular body of clergymen. Building on the terminological insights of earlier local studies, these chapters seek to develop a set of categories for the clergy that derives largely from locally produced sources, principally those drawn up during the biannual archidiaconal visitations and which highlight actions and relationships more than theological beliefs.\(^2\) The main goal here is to determine what sorts of clergy were active in the archdeaconry during the Caroline period (c. 1625-1640)—including where they came from, what educational experiences they brought with them, and how they interacted with and experienced contemporary ecclesiastical policies—in order to lay the groundwork for subsequent chapters that dive deeper into lay-clerical relations. In the first of the two chapters, the aim will be to construct a broad-strokes picture of the archdeaconry’s clergy by examining origins, social status, and educational trajectories. In the second, more particular focus will be applied toward analyzing the long neglected non-puritan clergy: men, in other words, who may have been so-called “Laudians” and who received scant attention in previous work on the archdeaconry in this period. Both chapters will also compare these clergymen to those in other jurisdictions, helping build a clearer understanding of how the Nottinghamshire clergy fit into the broader national picture and what ramifications their particular make-up may have had for the archdeaconry’s experience of the 1630s. What will be seen is that the particular characteristics of the 1630s Nottinghamshire clergy, from their geographic and social origins to their educational experiences, worked against the likelihood of clergymen being the key agents of Laudianism in the archdeaconry. While Laudianism could and did concretize in other ways, the limited influence of known Laudian clergymen in the Archdeaconry of Nottingham calls into

---

question the prevailing view that notable numbers of high handed Laudian clergymen provoked widespread resentment.

I. The Archdeaconry of Nottingham: A Brief Overview

The southernmost of the four archdeaconries then within the Diocese of York, the Archdeaconry of Nottingham in the early seventeenth century comprised most of the parishes in Nottinghamshire and also included several parishes in Yorkshire. In all, 182 parishes lay under the authority of the archidiaconal court, with several dozen other parishes in the county being overseen by the Peculiar of Southwell or the Dean and Chapter of York. Owing to the relatively great distance between Nottingham and York, the archdeaconry appears to have enjoyed a fair amount of autonomy and even had its own consistory court in addition to its correctional court. Practical power was typically wielded by the Official of the Archdeacon and/or one of his Deputy Officials, who took the lead in doling out disciplinary sentences, making legal judgments, and granting licenses. More specifically for the purposes of this chapter, the Official or one of his Deputies—along with their clerks—had the task of running the biannual correction visitations at which churchwardens turned in presentment bills that could note a variety of ecclesiastical infractions. These bills were typically drawn up by one or both churchwardens and/or the minister, though sometimes ministers and churchwardens submitted separate (even contradictory) bills. Thus, presentment bills can shed light on a given minister’s leanings in two main ways: through his actions as recorded by the churchwarden(s), and/or through presentments made by his own hand. Also in the latter category can be placed letters to various archidiaconal officials that for one reason or another were recorded on certain presentment bills. Taken
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3 Note that the total number of chapelries, parochial chapelries, curacies, perpetual curacies, vicarages, and rectories comes to 191.

together, these comprise the principal records employed in attempting to sort the clergy into meaningful categories, the rationale and descriptions for which will be delineated in the following section.

In the early seventeenth century, the general religious character of the archdeaconry appears to have been solidly Protestant, with more pockets of puritanism than recusancy. According to the most notable historian of puritanism in this region, this state of affairs owed much to the tolerance or even favoritism shown toward puritans by successive Officials, Archdeacons, and Archbishops of York. For much of the early seventeenth-century, practical power resided with the “orthodox Puritan” Deputy Official Michael Purefy (d. 1627) who generally tolerated a degree of non-conformity. Moreover, despite no known links with puritanism, William Greaves, Purefy’s successor, apparently “made no change in policy when he came to power.” At the same time, while Archbishop Toby Matthew did proceed with some severity against Separatists, he himself had some liking for puritanism and in any case permitted the puritan exercises to continue through his passing in 1628.5

Perhaps the first sign of change was the 1630 order by Archbishop Samuel Harsnett that ended the toleration of parishioners frequenting other churches when there was no sermon in their own (often called “gadding”).6 It was not until 1635, however, that the Laudian policies that had already been seen in other parts of the Diocese truly became manifest in the Archdeaconry of Nottingham. Most significantly, Archbishop Neile was at last able to place a loyal ally, Edward Mottershed, as the archdeacon’s official. Marchant stresses the extent to which Mottershed constituted a “southern eruption” vis-a-vis the traditions and laws of the more northerly parts of

6 Ibid., 186.
the country. More practically speaking, Mottershed would attempt to enforce Neile’s previous orders regarding the railing and turning of communion tables, make changes to the requirements of churchwardens during visitations, and send out commissions (and/or direct orders) to enforce such expectations as bowing at the name of Jesus.\textsuperscript{8} Given these changes, presentment bills from the years of the mid to late 1630s have proven particularly helpful in providing clues as to clergymen’s religious leanings.

\textbf{II. Classifying Clergymen: Terms, Sources, and Methods}

The attempt to categorize clergy, especially clergymen working in England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, has perhaps produced as much heat as it has light, and one may reasonably wonder how useful such efforts are. Margaret Stieg offers a refreshingly brief, but incisive, response to the doubtful: “contemporaries believed that, particularly within the church, parties of different views existed.”\textsuperscript{9} To take just two examples, a Laudian polemicist, Christopher Dow, rebuked puritans in a 1637 tract for misleadingly sorting ministers into the camps of the godly, or the “time servers.”\textsuperscript{10} About a decade prior, Laud himself had drawn up a list of clergy for the Duke of Buckingham that labeled men as either “Puritan” or “Orthodox.”\textsuperscript{11} For better or worse, modern historians have developed their own categorization systems and labels, many of which have been the subject of heated historiographical debates. The most fundamental for the purposes of this chapter is that surrounding the terms “Arminianism,” “English Arminianism,” and “Laudianism.” Sketching these debates helps to clarify why this
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study has chosen to retain the use of “Laudian” and “Laudianism.” In addition, this section will examine the terminological systems of other local studies as a way into outlining the choice of labels employed in the present work.

When Nicholas Tyacke reoriented early Stuart scholarship in the decades from the 1960s, he did so using terms such as “Anti-Calvinism” and more famously, “Arminianism.” While Tyacke would in certain later works admit to putting too much emphasis on the theological implications of the “Rise of Arminianism,” he still generally maintained the significance of changing theological trends, trends that specifically involved the favoring of “Arminian” beliefs and the circumscribing of Calvinist ones. Some scholars, especially Peter White, responded to the “Rise of Arminianism” thesis by essentially denying that there was any such rise, or that there was a coherent “Arminian” party driving changes within the church or universities. Notwithstanding the efforts of White and others like G.W. Bernard, most historians have come to agree that something like a “Rise of Arminianism” did occur in the late 1620s and 1630s. James Galloway’s favored term, “English Arminianism” thus represents a sort of synthesis of labels. He argues that simply using “Arminian” fails to indicate that many of the practices of the “English Arminians” were “anathema” to the Dutch Remonstrant Arminians. At the same time, he finds that the older term “Laudian” does not capture the extent of theological affinity between the two groups.
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Nevertheless, it is this latter term, “Laudian,” that has been most commonly employed in the modern historiography. For many historians, part of the appeal of this term is that it urges a conceptual shift away from theology and predestination, and toward ceremonial, liturgical, and behavioral developments. Much earlier in the twentieth-century, H.R. Trevor-Roper spoke of “Laudianism” in terms of a coherent program aimed at restoring the former place and power of the church and its clergy. More recent historians also conceive of a “Laudian programme” but tend to put more stress on its sacerdotal and ceremonial emphases than its purported clericalism. Peter Lake, for example, insists that “Laudianism” was a “coherent, distinctive and polemically aggressive vision of the Church.” In considering religion at the parish level, a term that best signifies the potentially broad scope of changes in religious experience would be preferred, and this constitutes the main rationale for retaining “Laudian” and “Laudianism” as opposed to “Arminianism” or “English Arminianism.” This is not to suggest that Arminian theology bears no relation at all to Laudianism, as it is clear that many well-known Laudians did indeed oppose ideas like irresistible grace. Laudianism still recognizes a degree of affinity with certain theological positions but also effectively decenters them; one must take into account, for example, that even a high level Laudian like John Cosin appears not to have preached on predestination or the like in his rural benefices. Likewise, there is little surviving evidence of Arminian theological ideas being propounded in Nottinghamshire pulpits. By contrast, changes to the church fabric—the railing in and turning of the communion table, for example—or new

16 Trevor-Roper, Archbishop Laud, ix.
expectations for proper worship and the like would have been much more widely felt. What must be kept in view, however, is that Laudianism was not necessarily experienced as an all-or-nothing phenomenon. Rather, the exact composition of Laudianism differed between jurisdictions, and certain aspects of the wider Laudian program concretized in certain locales in different ways, at different times, to different degrees, and with variable effects. Thus, in light of Archbishop Neile’s specific timetable and “restoration” agenda, there is some value in conceiving of a “Neileanism” peculiar to the northern province. Notwithstanding, “Laudianism” more accurately signifies what was perceived by many at the time to be a national phenomenon, whatever the differences in its local manifestations.

The aforementioned reality has been tacitly acknowledged by most studies of Laudianism’s local impact, but not necessarily fully incorporated into their systems of categorization. Jana Pisani’s study of Ely Diocese, for example, employs the term “Arminian” to refer to the practices introduced by Laud, as well as the supporters of those practices, with little discussion of the specificities of “Arminianism” in the region. At the same time, she sets this group in apparent contrast to puritans and “moderate clergy,” with at least some clergy in this latter group finding it difficult to “remain conformist” in the face of Laud’s changes. While she identifies support for the Book of Sports, the setting of the communion table altarwise and its railing, rituals like kneeling and signing with the cross, and emphasis on prayers and sacraments over sermons, as markers of an “Arminian,” no such markers are given for the “moderate clergy” group. Mary-Millicent Egan’s terminological framework for Essex is even more simplistic, delineating only two “camps” of Laudians on the one hand, and puritans on the other. Aside from
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brief “definitions” of each term, little explanation is offered as to their selection. “Laudianism” is defined primarily in reference to the altarwise placing of communion tables, emphasis on bodily reverence, prayer and the sacraments and the beautification of churches. Drawing especially on Collinson and Lake, Egan defines “Puritanism” as emphasizing preaching and the Bible, reverence to God through the mind versus the body, ex tempore prayer, and the unnecessary and potentially offensive nature of certain ceremonies.21 As alluded to above, James Galloway prefers the label “English Arminian” to Pisani’s “Arminian,” and also assigns clergy to “Calvinist Episcopalian,” “Moderate Puritan,” and “Radical Puritan” groupings in line with Patrick Collinson’s Religion of Protestants. Having laid out these categories, however, Galloway ends with important reminders: specifically, that his categories should not be seen as exclusive, that some men changed groups over the course of their careers, and that at least several held apparently contradictory positions.22

Though still imperfect and rooted largely in records from the 1640s, a more satisfactory labelling system can be found in the work of Margaret Stieg. While she does include a single puritan category, noted under the ‘P’ heading, she also denotes six other groupings. The puritan category seems to have the widest definitional latitude. Stieg lists general reputation, presentation for certain offenses in church courts, and the signing of certain documents in the mid to late 1640s as criteria for selection to the ‘P’ group.23 With one exception, the rest of Stieg’s groups are more narrowly defined. Three of them, ‘R’, ‘SR’, and ‘RO’, include clergy who signed the December 1641 petition in defense of Church and King, a petition Stieg describes as “vaguely royalist.” The ‘SR’ group comprises those who would be listed by John

23 Ibid., 76.
Walker’s *Sufferings*. The ‘RO’ group includes those who would continue to serve a benefice after 1643, and the ‘R’ clergy were those who terminated their service by 1643. Another group, the ‘S’ group, did not sign the 1641 petition but were nonetheless listed by Walker. As Stieg and others have noted, Laudianism was just one of the more common reasons that a clergyman may have “suffered.” The final group, the ‘O’ group, noted as the largest, comprises those who ‘did not distinguish themselves by any action, merely continuing to serve their benefices under ecclesiastical authorities of various opinions. Thus, while several of Stieg’s categories could be applied in other jurisdictions—particularly the ‘O’ and ‘P’ groups—she does not present a clear-cut “Arminian” or “Laudian” category. This is slightly odd given the emphasis Stieg places on Laudianism’s destructive impact on the Diocese of Bath and Wells but makes sense in light of Stieg’s sources and methodology. Signing a “vaguely royalist” petition or suffering at some point in the 1640s-1650s, in other words, cannot be decisively taken as proof of Laudian churchmanship. As will be made clear in what follows, the present study will employ a Laudian classification, but will also attempt to follow Stieg in utilizing categories that speak more clearly to the specific manifestations of Laudianism in particular jurisdictions.

This discussion of categories raises the question of methodology. With the partial exception of Pisani’s, each of the works just reviewed takes as a basic point of departure that actions are a more reliable indicator of belonging than specific theological views, which in any case are often difficult to ascertain. Stieg, for instance, deems the vast majority of writings by Bath and Wells clergy in the period fundamentally pastoral in purpose. James Galloway perhaps states the methodological insight in the most straightforward terms, arguing that “the
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religious affiliations of individual clergy are as accessible to analysis through their actions and relationships as through their ideas.” 26 This still leaves open the question of what actions to put under examination and what they are taken to signify. For Stieg and Egan especially, a central difficulty lies in the fact that the average clergyman’s behavior may not have left much trace in the evidentiary record before the early 1640s—the time by which many were forced to take some sort of stand. 27 This helps explain why Stieg, Egan, and to a lesser degree Galloway, rely largely on sources from the 1640s to determine their clergymen’s classifications.

One obvious problem with this approach is that at least some clergymen working in parishes in the 1630s died at some point during that decade or very early in the 1640s. Beyond that, there is the more concerning methodological question of the reliability of sources produced in the heightened polemical context of the Civil War and Interregnum periods. Christopher Haigh has shown that at least in some cases, complaints against ministers were clearly shaped by the prevailing religious atmosphere. For example, in 1636 some villagers were astute enough to know they could get their minister in trouble by accusing him of Puritan activities. Yet in 1641, the same vicar, Robert Kenrick, was accused by the same parishioners of “Laudianism.” 28 David Cressy has noted a similar bias in the evidence of the later 1640s for Huntingdonshire. Previously “anodyne estimations were revised to make them much more critical” and the “county [now] appeared to be riddled with unworthy hunters and tipplers and Arminians enmired in religious error.” 29 Such concerns appear also to inform Ian Green’s distrust of depositions collected by various “committees for scandalous ministers” or recovered by John Walker’s The

27 Stieg, Laud’s Laboratory, 76.
Sufferings of the Clergy. Green has suggested that the similarity of language used in such articles across counties reveals a concerted effort by local gentry to compel “reluctant parishioners into signing or repeating pre-written depositions expressing discontent with their ministers which they did not, on the whole, feel.” By way of reply, Egan makes a reasonable case for the utility of 1640s records, pointing out for instance the similarity of wording in most such official records, and adding that accusations about favoring of ceremonies and the like could only have been phrased in so many ways. At the same time, she provides examples of six or so cases of complaints relating to the communion/communion table that were in fact phrased differently. One vicar was said to have “railed in the altar before others,” while another was described as “froward to set up the communion rails” and yet another accused of setting the communion table altarwise “with steps into it and rails around it.” In short, while records from the 1640s pose clear interpretative difficulties, it will not do to dismiss them altogether.

Thus, though this study has made use of some sources produced during or after the 1640s, excluding records for committees for scandalous records which apparently do not survive for York Diocese, it relies primarily on records from the 1620s and 1630s. While this helps avoid certain methodological pitfalls and increases the likelihood of getting at the true feelings of the time, it still leaves open the question of what the bills might say and how that information should be interpreted along with additional information in order to place ministers into meaningful categories. Here, the insights of Galloway and Egan have proven especially important. Galloway argues quite sensibly that it is rare for the evidence for any given minister to point entirely in one direction, and that the categorization of any individual must therefore be based on the “aggregate
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Equally important, Egan provides historians with an excellent model for considering what does, and what does not, qualify as Laudian. Though perhaps erring on the side of caution, Egan disallows royalism, support for the Book of Sports and/or accusations of delinquency or favoring ceremonies as criteria that can be taken in isolation as evidence of a “Laudian” minister. By contrast, actions that Egan labels as “unambiguously Laudian” include taking the initiative in setting the table altarwise and railing it in, compelling reception of the sacraments at those altar rails, bowing to them, using “illegal” or “superstitious” innovations, writing in support of “Laudianism,” and voicing approval of known “Laudian” officials. It should be noted here that Egan does not include conflict between clergymen and parishioners as a symptom of Laudian churchmanship, as many historians seem to do subconsciously or otherwise. This is something the present study will strive to replicate.

At the same time, this study argues that for all that clergymen with Laudian leanings might have shared in terms of actions or beliefs, Laudianism might be better understood in terms of a spectrum than as an all-or-nothing phenomenon. That is, while some ministers in the archdeaconry can be shown to have met more than a few of Egan’s criteria, others appear to have engaged in only one or two of the relevant behaviors. This aligns with what will be demonstrated in subsequent chapters: namely, that Laudianism concretized in different parishes in different ways, at different times and to different degrees and effects. Part of this variability can be connected to the choices and actions of individual clergymen.

These clergymen have therefore been sorted into a total of seven different categories, the main criteria for which have been determined as far as possible in keeping with the specificities

of locally produced sources. On one end of the spectrum, those classified as ‘L’ (Laudians) constitute a rather small group of fewer than ten men. An even smaller number have been classified as ‘CL’ (Canons-Laudian) indicating overt evidence of upholding canons known to be unpopular with some puritan ministers—such as reading divine service on Wednesdays and Fridays or enforcing requirements to kneel and bow at the proper times—as well as some sign of sympathy with Laudian practices. After the ‘CL’ group comes the much larger ‘CNL’ group (Canons-Non-Laudian), boasting over sixty ministers. These men share with the ‘CL’ group evidence of having enforced potentially controversial canons but left behind essentially no sign of having enacted explicitly Laudian ideals. For example, many ‘CNL’ clergymen would be presented for not wearing a hood—some as late as 1638-1639, by which time the requirement would almost certainly have been widely known. A similarly large group, those labeled as ‘NL’ (Non-Laudian), are primarily marked by the latter evidence, but cannot also be seen to have stood up for the aforementioned canons.

**Table 1.1 Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Nottingham**[^1]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clergy Classification</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laudian (L)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canons Laudian (CL)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canons Non Laudian (CNL)</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Laudian (NL)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^1]: These numbers reflect the total number of clergy who could be determined to have served in a parish under the authority of the Archdeacon of Nottingham between 1630 and 1640. 1630 has been chosen as a fitting start date as this was the year when one of the first potentially major changes was introduced by Archbishop Harsnett, as noted above. 1640, on the other hand, marks the beginning of a turning of the tides against the Laudian administration.
The next two categories concern puritanism. Perhaps the most well-known historian of the Diocese of York, Ronald Marchant, did historians a great favor in the 1960s by developing a more or less definitive list of puritans active in the diocese from the late sixteenth century into the mid seventeenth century. Marchant was under no illusions that his list was perfect. Nevertheless, it has served as a useful sorting mechanism to separate out those clergy who were either presented for puritan offenses in the ecclesiastical courts or were determined by their associations or what was written about them to have had puritan tendencies. That is to say, not every puritan on the official list was presented for specific puritan misdemeanors, and there are more than likely men included on the list who probably should not be. At the same time, the digitization of many archidiaconal records, including the presentment bills, has allowed the present study to be based on a fuller examination of the same than would have been possible for Marchant. As a result, a category for potential puritans, ‘PP’, has been created to make room for a small number of men who did not earn a spot on Marchant’s list but who notwithstanding left evidence of seemingly puritan activities. For example, some of these six or so ministers were presented for not reading prayers on Wednesdays or Fridays, not wearing the hood, and/or teaching scholars in the chancel of the church.35 The ‘P’ category has been reserved for clergymen on Marchant’s list, some of whom, for example, were presented for attending conventicles, refusing to use the sign of the cross in baptism and/or refusing to wear the surplice.

35 For an example of an entry on Marchant’s list, see Marchant, The Puritans and the Church Courts, 306.
Others may have even faced ejection or suspension at various points. Thus, as in the works of Stieg, Galloway, and Egan, the ‘P’ category is somewhat broader than the others. The final category, the ‘I’ group (Indeterminate), comprises those roughly seventy clergymen for whom the available information does not point in any particular direction, much like Stieg’s ‘O’ group.

While each of the categories outlined above will receive more particular attention in the next chapter—especially the L, CL, and CNL groups—what follows offers a broader analysis of various aspects of the Nottinghamshire clergy as a whole, while also paying attention to certain patterns within categories when relevant. Standing out are several important similarities and differences between other parts of the country, each of which have significant implications for understanding the progress of Laudianism in the archdeaconry.

III. Clerical Backgrounds: Geographical and Social

This section seeks to explore where the archdeaconry’s clergymen came from and, as far as can be determined, the social status they carried with them into their respective colleges and thence into their livings. Broadly speaking, a clergyman’s origins may have played some role in determining his future loyalties, whether to the traditions of his place of birth or, if he were to find a living farther afield, perhaps to an ideology like Laudianism which offered a sense of empowerment. Moreover, it seems that well-born clergymen tended to remain more committed to the Crown and the established Church, though not necessarily to Laudianism, and were also more likely to hold livings in plurality. As will be seen, while the Archdeaconry of
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36 See Appendices A and B for a full list of classifications of the archdeaconry’s clergymen by parish.
37 While some “pensioners” can be found in the ‘P’ group, the majority of Puritans for whom information survives entered university as either sizars or plebeians. By contrast, most higher status men fall within the NL, CNL, CL and L groups. Pluralism refers to the holding of multiple benefices at the same time, and was often a means of attracting and maintaining high status and/or highly educated clergymen. See pg. 93 below for further discussion.
Nottingham’s clergy were not as homegrown as the clergy of other localities, neither were there many “outsiders” with shared interests or men from well-to-do families. These realities appear to have limited the presence and impact of Laudianism in Nottinghamshire.

Based on biographical data largely derived from university alumni registers, counties of origin were determined for sixty-nine ministers at work in the 1630s. The largest number came from within Nottinghamshire itself, with Leicestershire and Yorkshire sending nearly the same number of men. Next in total numbers were Northamptonshire and London/Middlesex, the rest deriving from a total of seventeen other counties. To some extent, the top three counties being either Nottinghamshire or a contiguous county is in keeping with the results from other jurisdictions. Stieg determined that 40% of the clergy in her study had roots within Somerset (roughly coequal with the Diocese of Bath and Wells), with an additional 28.5% from bordering counties.38 Ian Green’s study of clerical careers also found that many young ministers sought to, and in fact did, return to serve in their native counties or an adjoining one.39 In this sense, the Archdeaconry of Nottingham and Bath and Wells stand in some contrast to London and Middlesex clergy: Galloway determined that almost 70% of London and Middlesex clergy had origins outside of the region.40 According to Stieg, the contrast between an area like Bath and Wells and London is not insignificant. She theorizes that the presence in Bath and Wells of so many native sons forestalled the process by which, in other parts of the country, the clergy merged into a separate clerical “caste” and thereby lost touch to a greater or lesser extent with the wider body of laymen. This helps explain, for Stieg, why very few of the Bath and Wells clergy supported the “Laudian” efforts. It should be noted, though, that Stieg also assumes that a

38 Stieg, *Laud’s Laboratory*, 65.
majority of the clergy for whom origin information was not available probably hailed from within the diocese.\textsuperscript{41} Without making this assumption, it is difficult to reach such firm conclusions for Nottinghamshire. On the other hand, it seems clear that the phenomenon of “immigrant” clergymen in London/Middlesex banding together to pursue increased tithes saw no parallel in the Archdeaconry of Nottingham.\textsuperscript{42}

\begin{center}
\textbf{Table 1.2 Counties of Origin for Clergy in the Archdeaconry of Nottingham}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|l|c|}
\hline
\textbf{County of Origin} & \textbf{Total} & \textbf{County of Origin} & \textbf{Total} \\
\hline
Nottinghamshire & 11 & Staffordshire & 2 \\
\hline
Leicestershire & 10 & Cumberland & 1 \\
\hline
Yorkshire & 9 & Hampshire & 1 \\
\hline
London/Middlesex & 6 & Worcestershire & 1 \\
\hline
Northamptonshire & 6 & Cambridgeshire & 1 \\
\hline
Lincolnshire & 4 & Herefordshire & 1 \\
\hline
Derbyshire & 3 & Lancashire & 1 \\
\hline
Oxfordshire & 2 & Devonshire & 1 \\
\hline
Kent & 2 & Norfolk & 1 \\
\hline
Cheshire & 2 & Suffolk & 1 \\
\hline
Berkshire & 2 & Wales & 1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{41} Stieg, \textit{Laud’s Laboratory}, 69. \\
\textsuperscript{42} Galloway, “English Arminianism,” 56.
The social origins of clergymen have also been of concern to earlier local studies of Laudianism, not simply out of some antiquarian interest, but because of the implications a given cleric’s social status might have had for his educational and career trajectory. Stieg, for example, determined that those of lower status were noticeably more likely to only obtain the BA degree, even as the MA degree was increasingly the norm for many clerical posts.\(^{43}\) Moreover, she found that those who were sons of gentry, for example, would prove far more likely to be pluralists.\(^{44}\) On the other hand, as Galloway has demonstrated, interpreting the terminology used in the biographical data relating to social status can be a somewhat precarious endeavor. The two universities used different terms, and these terms were not always meticulously applied. Notwithstanding, Galloway concludes that Oxford’s terms, effectively separating men between plebeian and non-plebeian categories, are fairly unproblematic. Even at Cambridge, he continues, there are still grounds for “equating ‘sizar’ with the lower ranks, while ‘pensioner’ and ‘commoner’ bear some relation to the higher status ranks of gentry and clergy.”\(^{45}\) Broadly speaking, then, the majority of clergy in the present study entered university as part of the lower ranks, that is, as sizars at Cambridge, or plebeians at Oxford. In all, 59 men matriculated sizar at the former, and 15 as plebeians at the latter. At the same time, however, fully 41 men entered Cambridge as “pensioners,” while two Oxford matriculants were the sons of gentry and two others the sons of clergy.\(^{46}\) These figures are roughly similar to those calculated by Galloway and Stieg. Although the precise number of pluralists among the archdeaconry’s clergy has been difficult to ascertain, it does appear that a majority of those who have been identified as having

\(^{43}\) Stieg, *Laud’s Laboratory*, 71.

\(^{44}\) Ibid., 73.


\(^{46}\) The status of “pensioner” during the Early Stuart era seems to indicate that a student paid for his tuition and board, while a “sizar” probably performed tasks to pay his way and/or received money from his institution.
high-status origins did in fact hold livings in plurality. It is telling, for example, that the only clergyman of the study who entered Oxford as the son of an armiger, Gervase Neville, was also the Rector of Grove and the Rector of Headon during the 1630s.

Though not a central concern for most of the local studies closely examined thus far, clergymen’s ages have also been of some concern to historians of Laudianism. J.R. Mawdesley and Christopher Spencer, for example, have suggested that, at least in some cases, Laudianism was a deliberate choice on the part of a minister heading into a potentially new and/or difficult setting. One can easily imagine that some young ministers, having just earned an MA at some point in their mid 20s, might have been searching for some set of norms to have at hand for dealing with difficulties and provide a sense of belonging. On the other hand, Galloway speculates that a number of young London ministers who would adopt Laudianism did so primarily as a means of advancing their careers. Turning to Laudianism, particularly in the London and Middlesex region, offered access to critical networks of clerical patronage at the highest levels, including Archbishop Laud himself. The difficulty, however, lies in determining exactly how old ministers were upon obtaining their degree(s) and their parochial livings. In some cases, the alumni registers actually record a year of birth, but this is a relatively rare finding. A more practical method, though less precise, would be to examine the dates by which ministers obtained their degree(s). Two caveats must be kept in view. One is that in a few cases, the time from matriculation to degree reception could be rather longer than normal. Another is that some ministers came back later in life to earn degrees, either for the first time or to earn their MA after some years of parochial service. As most ministers who would go on to obtain the BD

or BD and DD degrees were already in possession of livings before the latter were awarded, this study looks specifically at the dates of BA bestowal in making calculations, or MA bestowal if a minister went on to attain that degree as well. Among those clergy who only obtained a BA for which the date is known, the mean date of graduation was between 1619 and 1620, and the median date between 1622 and 1623. Many more ministers went on to obtain an MA degree. Among these men, the average date of graduation was right about 1617, and the median about 1618. If one disaggregates the figures for puritan and non-puritan clergymen, the latter’s average and median date of MA graduation rise very slightly. By contrast, both the average and median dates of MA graduation for known puritans were slightly lower than the overall numbers, at about 1615. As the following section will demonstrate, that most non-puritans were younger should not be too surprising, given that a majority of colleges at both universities allegedly maintained a Calvinist orientation into at least the second decade of the seventeenth century.49

IV. Clerical Education

If the question of when ministers received their degree(s) has attracted scholarly attention, that of where they were taken has proved even more compelling. While the particular college a future minister attended did not necessarily forecast his religious leanings, religious education and religious opinions were not confined only to those pursuing degrees in divinity (the BD and DD degrees). Evidence from early seventeenth-century Oxford, for instance, demonstrates that certain colleges did have particular religious sensibilities. Over the winter of 1607-1608, students at William Laud’s alma mater, St. John’s College, Oxford, put on a collection of entertainments called “The Christmas Prince,” inspired by James I’s visit in 1606

and notable for their anti-puritanism. As Jill Ingram describes them, these plays celebrated “exactly the sort of festive ritual that puritans excoriated” and were intended as “a challenge to the religious and political status quo” vis-a-vis the Calvinism that was then predominant at both universities.\textsuperscript{50} Not only were St. John’s undergraduate actors and authors involved with the “Christmas Prince,” students from Christ Church, for one, were aware of the play’s messages and, in fact, produced a play of their own in response: a comedy called “Yuletide,” which, given that this is the reformed term typically used for Christmas, can be seen as “an explicit corrective to the traditionalist St. John’s “Christmas” entertainments.”\textsuperscript{51} This is not surprising given that the Dean of Christ Church at the time was the solidly Calvinist John King. Beyond contemporary students, however, the “Christmas Prince” also “elicited factional sympathies” more broadly, as indicated by the list of those offering financial support toward the play. Based on subsequent events, Ingram traces back the connections of “avant garde conformists” among these supporters to the earliest years of James I’s reign, demonstrating that, at least at Oxford, the debates and ideas that would come to be associated with “Laudianism” were already at issue in the early seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{52}

Yet, Ingram’s article also makes clear that students of different colleges were exposed to different opinions and attitudes based on a variety of factors. One important factor, as already indicated, was the nature of a college’s leadership. Dean King’s strident anti-Catholicism would have made it highly unlikely that Christ Church students were as exposed to Catholic ideas as much as St. John’s students seem to have been. Laud was certainly of the opinion that leadership was highly consequential. Considering Cambridge and certain influential men at Sidney Sussex


\textsuperscript{51} Ibid., 362.

\textsuperscript{52} Ibid., 363.
and Emmanuel Colleges, he derided these institutions as the “nurseries of puritanism.” Indeed, as Tom Webster notes, Emmanuel “was the college which became identified with such [godly] ministers more than any other.”

Similarly, Mark Curtis has shown that whatever “Arminianism owed for its ascendancy to official interference from outside Oxford and Cambridge, the movement had its principal source within the universities.” This was the view of William Prynne, who blamed Laud for carrying his “superstitions” first to Westminster, then to the universities, and “from thence to Canterbury, Winchester, and most other Cathedralls in England, and from them to our Parish Churches and Chapels.”

Curtis has also demonstrated that from at least the Elizabethan period moving forward, royal control over both universities was accelerating. One important result of this, he argues, is that heads of colleges thereby became increasingly powerful. This seems especially to have been the case at Cambridge, where Master of Trinity College John Whitgift’s struggles with puritan divinity professor Thomas Cartwright prompted the Crown to grant college heads more power.

Another potentially important factor was the tutor-pupil relationship, which appears to have taken on an increased significance at both colleges over the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Curtis insists that by the early seventeenth century, tutors tended to be the “most important influence” on a young man’s education. Twig concurs with this, adding that

---

56 William Prynne, *Canterburies doome, or, The first part of a compleat history of the commitment, charge, tryall, condemnation, execution of william Laud etc.* (London, 1646), 59.
58 Ibid., 107.
so significant became the role of tutors that, for parents, “the choice of the right tutor” became “more important...than the choice of a college.” Furthermore, tutors appear to have been the primary conduit for the propagation of religious ideas and ideals.59 Certainly at Emmanuel College, some fellows and alumni took an active role in all aspects of their pupils’ education. Well known puritans like John Cotton, who had obtained his MA from Emmanuel and served as fellow there for a number of years, were instrumental in creating “household seminaries” whereby more advanced students and recent graduates could receive hands-on, practical vocational training while living with ministers like Cotton. Students were also occasionally taken into Essex to witness “godly” preaching and/or to preach themselves.60 Fellows at Queen’s College, Cambridge, are also known to have taken such active roles. Herbert Palmer, puritan and fellow of Queen’s in the 1620s, apparently kept many pupils performing disputations and other exercises privately in his chamber.61 Puritans, however, were not alone in undertaking such hands-on tutorship, and it appears that for many colleges, the wider body of fellows was rarely unified in their religious predilections. Christ Church, Oxford, for example, saw infighting among factions centered around Daniel Featley and Walter Browne, the latter considered “among the earliest Oxford theologians conversant with continental Arminian thought.” While these factions were not at odds over purely religious issues, fairly distinct theological lines may still be drawn. In fact, it appears the dispute was sparked by conflict over the assignment of scholars to college tutors, as Browne purportedly instructed one of the fellows in his camp to attempt to remove a certain student from Featley’s care.62

60 Webster, *Caroline Puritan Movement*, 24.
61 Ibid., 21.
Before more specific discussion of the connections between Nottinghamshire clergy and the universities can commence, however, it must first be established what proportion of these men actually entered one of the universities and which college(s) they attended once there. One difficulty in calculating these figures precisely is that for some clergymen, it has been impossible to determine any aspect of their educational background. This is particularly true of the archdeaconry’s curates. Nevertheless, even if one assumes that the 17 beneficed clergy for whom education information is missing were in fact non-graduates, the large majority of beneficed clergy, over 80%, still attended some college. The vast majority of these men went on to obtain degrees, indicating that Nottinghamshire shared in the general national trend of an increasingly graduate clergy. As noted above, the most common degree held was the MA. Of the 156 men for whom the dates of degrees are known, 101 obtained the MA as their last degree, compared to 34 with a BA, 10 with a BD, and 11 with a DD. If one includes those men known to have obtained an MA at an unspecified date, the share of those with a terminal MA rises even higher.

*The University of Oxford*

As a way into examining the potential impact particular colleges may have had on the archdeaconry’s clergymen, the educational career of likely Laudian William Clough serves as a good example. Clough originally matriculated at Magdalene College, Cambridge, but moved on to take both degrees from Brasenose College, Oxford. While it is not clear exactly why he made this switch, a discussion of its potential significance offers a useful way into the question of colleges and their respective particularities and reputations. At least one, admittedly unsympathetic, contemporary, Peter Heylyn, took issue with the purportedly strident Calvinism at Magdalene. Heylyn traced it back to Lawrence Humphrey, a Marian exile who had taken strongly to Calvin’s teachings while in Zurich and subsequently brought these principles to
Cambridge as president of Magdalene, chair of divinity and vice chancellor until 1596. By contrast, Brasenose had developed a rather different reputation and had historic links with the more conservative northern and western parts of the country, especially Cheshire and Lancashire. While several Nottinghamshire puritans did pass through Brasenose, most of its graduates do not appear to have distinguished themselves in any obvious ways. Two of them, William Sharpe and Robert Bruen, graduated around the same time as puritans Richard Ash and Richard Hargreaves, c. 1600. Sharpe must have been fairly adept at reading the changing ecclesiastical winds, as he retained his living at Wysall from 1603 to 1654 with apparently very few issues. The only case in which Sharpe was specifically cited came in 1610, when the churchwardens noted that Sharpe taught school but expressed some doubt as to his license to do so. Nothing was presented save for one case of fornication from 1630 through 1634. Moreover, aside from one case of non-payment of church dues and one excommunicant, the only substantive problem noted with the church from 1635 through 1642 was the lack of a Bible in the largest volume noted in April 1635. Thus, the evidence suggests that even if some of its graduates, like Clough, turned to “Laudianism,” Brasenose was certainly no “Laudian” headquarters with respect to Nottinghamshire.

In numerical terms, however, it was Lincoln College, not Brasenose, that produced the largest batch of the archdeaconry’s admittedly small number of Oxford graduates. The majority of Lincoln graduates for whom origin information is available came from either Leicestershire or Lincoln, two of the counties which supplied the greatest number of Nottinghamshire clergy.

63 Peter Heylyn, *Cyprianus Anglicus* (London, 1671), 51.
65 AN/PB 295/1/104.
66 AN/PB 315/1/104.
67 AN/PB 315/9/55.
overall. Four of the six livings to which Lincoln graduates were sent were held by one or another ecclesiastical constituency within Lincoln Diocese, a region generally considered to have been outside the national “Arminian” networks.\(^{68}\) William Chantler, curate of Balderton from 1629 to 1635, was presented by a Prebend of Lincoln Cathedral, as was Thomas Fukes, vicar of North Clifton from 1634 to 1638.\(^{69}\) The chancellor of Lincoln presented Richard Rhodes to East Stoke in 1628,\(^{70}\) and John Musson, vicar of Orston from 1624 to 1638, was presented by the Dean and Chapter of Lincoln.\(^{71}\) Musson earned his MA in 1615, right about the time, that is, when factionalism was on the rise in some corners of Oxford. Two presentment bills from 1628 are actually letters from Musson to the deputy registrar, Hatfield Reckles, that shed some light on Musson’s churchmanship. One asks the deputy to beware of the bill being submitted by the Orston churchwardens, who, Musson feared, might try to conceal issues with the churchyard fence. They were, in any case, apparently willing to “winke at faults of an higher nature.”\(^{72}\) Another letter sees Musson ask the deputy to help him “terrifie, if not punish” those responsible for the decayed fence. Yet, in this same letter Musson pleads with the deputy on behalf of an excommunicate a woman, seeking that “what is done may be reversed” and that Reckles will “pity her.”\(^{73}\) Further evidence of Musson’s ties with the parish can be seen in a churchwarden presentment of April 1638, which records that Musson himself took on the role of schoolmaster.\(^{74}\) He also seems to have followed directives to obtain those items commanded by

\(^{68}\) Galloway, "English Arminianism,” 111.


\(^{70}\) Thoroton, "Parishes: Stoke by Newark,” 345-351.


\(^{72}\) AN/PB 314/8/7.

\(^{73}\) AN/PB 314/8/111.

\(^{74}\) AN/PB 315/14/30.
the canons and insisted on by the “Laudian” authorities, for nothing is reported regarding the rail for the communion table, and in 1639 the churchwardens alleged that the chalice, surplice, hood, cushion for the pulpit, flagon, and cloth for the communion table had all been stolen.75 A similarly pliant demeanor shines through in Whatton parish, where Martin Silverwood (BA 1616) served. Although he does not appear to have been in any hurry to set up the communion rail, still missing as of late 1637, the orders given to do so were certified within a few months, and no other particularly serious infractions appear.76

Table 1.3 Oxford Attendees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Total Attendees77</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Total Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln College</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Corpus Christi College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magdalen College</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Christ Church College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brasenose College</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>University College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s Hall</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Oriel College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balliol College</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>St. Edmund Hall</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magdalen Hall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>New Inn Hall</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Souls College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Trinity College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester Hall</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Broadgates Hall</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merton College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadham College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

76 Marchant, “Restoration of Nottinghamshire Churches,” 90.
77 Note that an attendee did not necessarily finish his degree at a given college
If Lincoln College does not seem to have produced clergy with particularly distinctive views or practices, what might be said of other Oxford colleges? If any Oxford college has the reputation of having been the “headquarters” of “Arminianism” or “Laudianism” it is Laud’s own alma mater, St. John’s. The college was founded in 1555 as a purposively Catholic institution. Tyacke records that dissatisfaction with Elizabethan policies in 1573 led to a “mass exodus” of some of St. John’s members, raising further suspicions about the college’s religious views and loyalties.\textsuperscript{78} Unsurprisingly, the college’s anti-puritan tradition certainly predates the aforementioned “Christmas Prince” productions of 1607-1608, and as of Laud’s initial enrollment in 1589, St. John’s was employing admirers of Lancelot Andrewes like Laud’s tutor, Dr. John Buckeridge. Hugh Trevor-Roper alleges that Laud’s influence within the college by the second decade of the seventeenth century was such that its influence began to “seep” into the whole of Oxford. For instance, Catholic documents of the church fathers began to replace the more recent Protestant abridgements.\textsuperscript{79} Other changes during this decade included the 1617 Royal Directions to Oxford which in practice entailed “the effective abandonment...of the Oxford catechetical statute, of 1589, which had specified the Heidelberg Catechism and the Institutes [of Calvin], among other works, as yardsticks of orthodoxy.”\textsuperscript{80} Galloway found that many of the “English Arminians” holding posts in London and Middlesex did, indeed, hail from St. John’s. More specifically, he determined that nine of the twelve St. John’s graduates had strong links with Laud and his policies and would go on to attain posts as royal or episcopal chaplains. Galloway adds that this was “the largest single bloc of ‘English Arminian’ clergy that

\textsuperscript{79} Trevor-Roper, Archbishop Laud, 49.
can be traced to any College in either university.” It is significant to note, then, that not a single clergyman considered in the present study passed through St. John’s, as far as can be determined, for any length of time. Thus, as in the case of Bath and Wells, the absence of St. John’s graduates ought to be understood as a factor limiting the degree of Laudian influence in the archdeaconry.

Similarly, the other Oxford colleges that rank just after Lincoln College numerically speaking—Magdalen College and St. Mary’s Hall—do not appear to have had a predetermined influence on the archdeaconry’s graduate clergy. Magdalen produced basically moderate puritans like John Foxcroft, Rector of Gotham from 1619-1662, more hardline puritans like Dr. John Moseley, Vicar of Newark from 1629 to 1642, and a few CNL clergymen like Thomas Savage, Rector of Sutton Bonington St. Anne and St. Michael from 1622-1662. It is probably significant, however, that a majority of Magdalen’s non-puritan graduates received their BA and/or MA no earlier than 1612, whereas Moseley had proceeded MA in 1605. John Hull, for example, Rector of East Bridgford from 1629-1658, received his MA in 1612 and would demonstrate consistent concern for the established laws of the Church. In 1632, he was upset with the churchwardens for delaying their accounts “longer than the time appointed by the canon,” for providing communion wine that was “full of filthie and sluttish dregs,” and for not presenting late-comers. Furthermore, Hull demanded a new Bible, the reformation of two men who wore their hats in service time, and the reparation of holes over the windows and leads. Although the absence of presentment bills for 1637 prevents any unequivocal conclusions, there were no chancery cases brought against Hull or the churchwardens in the 1630s, and no mention is made of lacking a communion rail.

---

82 AN/PB 315/4/6.
The historian of East Bridgford, Arthur Du Boulay Hill, describes Hull as a congenial “country parson” who “took a great interest in his church and parishioners during the troublous times of the Civil War and Commonwealth,” a period which, notwithstanding, Hill describes as largely “undisturbed” for the parish. Ostensibly, no major work was carried out on the church from the time of the Reformation through the Civil War. Given, then, the similarities with other ministers and parishes that seem to have complied with, but not embraced, “Laudianism,” it may reasonably be concluded that Hull and East Bridgford fit this same pattern. It may shed more light on Magdalen’s complexion as of the early Caroline period, then, to learn that the college was responsible for presenting Hull to the living in 1629.

St. Mary’s Hall also appears to have sent neither puritan nor “Laudian” ministers into Nottinghamshire parishes during this period. Little commentary has been made as to the reputation of the college in the secondary literature, and Stieg points out that St. Mary’s Hall was not even one of the ten biggest colleges at Oxford, though it is nevertheless overrepresented amongst Somerset clergy graduates. Graduate Thomas Bent’s time as Curate of Hickling from 1630 to 1639 was fairly uneventful. Bent does not appear in any presentment, and hardly anything outside of fornication and the occasional absentee stands out. Such restoration work as was done was likely carried out in 1636 and 1637, when £20 and £25, respectively, were expended on church repairs. The career of Robert Bruen, Rector of West Markham from 1620-1636, also illustrates the indeterminate influence of St. Mary’s Hall. Probably the most controversial known episode in which Bruen was involved took place in 1634, in which year

84 Arthur Du Boulay Hill, *East Bridgford Nottinghamshire*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1932), 87. Hill also notes that a puritan parishioner apparently reported Hull to the authorities in the 1650s, though nothing seems to have come from this.
86 Stieg, *Laud’s Laboratory*, 55.
87 AN/PB 315/11/19; AN/PB 315/13/19.
Bruen and his churchwardens presented an excommunicant man for sneaking into the communion and receiving the sacrament from Bruen while somehow concealing his identity. Generally, however, Bruen was content to present recusants, chancel repair issues, and the occasional excommunicant parishioner for failing to be absolved. In brief, St. Mary’s Hall signifies what is more broadly true of the other Oxford colleges attended by Nottinghamshire clergy. By and large, these colleges appear not to have sent highly polarized clergymen into the archdeaconry, and this constitutes another reason for its relative lack of notably Laudian or puritan ministers in the 1630s.

The University of Cambridge

Yet, as with the London and Middlesex clergy, a notably higher proportion of Nottinghamshire graduate clergy passed through Cambridge than through Oxford. To some extent this is in keeping with Cambridge’s proximity to the county and the simple fact of its larger number of students. Cambridge also seems to have been the university of choice for the majority of northerners who went on to hold livings in London and Middlesex. While Cambridge has often been closely associated with puritanism, especially in light of its location in the “heartland” of puritanism and the establishment of colleges like Emmanuel in 1584 as distinctly puritan institutions, at least several colleges would come to have reputations as supportive of Laudianism in one way or another. St. John’s, Oxford, in other words, may have been the “headquarters” of Laudianism in the university context, but it was certainly not alone in its close associations with that brand of churchmanship.

Of the archdeaconry’s future clergymen, the greatest number of graduates hailed from Trinity College. Trinity’s ambiguous relationship with puritanism and, later, Laudianism, was foreshadowed in the first instance by the contest between Thomas Cartwright and John Whitgift at Trinity c. 1570. Even before the Presbyterian writings came to the fore, it is known that in 1565 some Trinity College men had left off wearing the vestments at Cartwright’s instigation. As has been shown, this prompted future Archbishop Whitgift to appeal to the Crown, and his recognition of the potential puritan threat proved persuasive; the Crown granted new powers to the college heads, of which Whitgift was one. Nevertheless, Trinity was not among those colleges, like St. John’s, Oxford, which developed a clear reputation fairly early on in the seventeenth century. Twigg notes that Trinity, although home to early anti-predestinarian writers like John Overall, did not introduce Laudian changes into their chapel until 1636-1637, at least several years later than a handful of other colleges.

Aside from John Richardson (1615-1625), who Tyacke speculates may have been somewhat sympathetic to Arminian views, the masters of Trinity appear to have been basically orthodox Calvinists until 1629 when Samuel Brooke took over that role. Brooke stirred controversy shortly thereafter by publishing explicitly anti-predestinarian and anti-puritan writings, but does not appear to have fundamentally changed the college’s ethos. His relatively late arrival likely lessens the impact he might have had on Nottinghamshire graduates, given that 1622 was the median date of degree bestowal for the non-puritan clergy. In fact, only one non-puritan minister, George Robson (MA 1635), vicar of Walkeringham, graduated after 1629.

---
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while puritan William Hewitt, curate of Annesley in the 1630s, graduated in 1632. Galloway similarly found that only one London/Middlesex clergyman had attended during Brook’s time.\textsuperscript{94} Robson owed his placement in Walkeringham to Trinity, who held the advowson at this time. His predecessor, Thomas Vicars also attended Trinity sometime in the 1580s, but apparently did not take a degree.\textsuperscript{95} Robson’s time in the parish seems to have been largely quiet, and this was perhaps because much of what restorative work needed doing was ostensibly carried out in 1636, for which year the churchwardens record £76 13s 8d in expenses.\textsuperscript{96} A scan of Marchant’s full list of puritans reveals, moreover, that at least a handful of puritans active in Yorkshire in the 1630s received their Trinity degrees after 1629 as well. Further evidence suggests that Trinity did not lean too strongly one way or the other when it came to religious views. At least three future Yorkshire puritans active in the 1630s started their university careers at Trinity but migrated fairly quickly to other colleges. In 1591, William Chantrell entered Trinity but by the end of that year had moved over to Emmanuel, from which he would subsequently receive his degrees.\textsuperscript{97} Likewise in 1607 William Carte Jr. entered Trinity but wound up by 1608 at Sidney Sussex, recognized alongside Emmanuel as the most puritan college in the land.\textsuperscript{98}

\textbf{Table 1.4 Cambridge Attendees}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Total Attendees</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Total Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trinity College</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Queen’s College</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John’s College</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Magdalene College</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{94} Galloway, “English Arminianism,” 75.
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\textsuperscript{97} Marchant, \textit{The Puritans and the Church Courts}, 238.
\textsuperscript{98} Twigg, \textit{University of Cambridge}, 28.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christ’s College</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>St. Catherine’s College</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembroke College</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Jesus College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corpus Christi College</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Peterhouse College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuel College</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>King’s College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonville &amp; Caius College</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sidney Sussex College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare College</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following behind Trinity in numerical terms was St. John’s College. Scholars have disagreed as to the reputation of this college. Pisani claims that, at least in the 1560s and 1570s, a man who attended St. John’s “might well have become a Puritan.”

Apparently, Laud considered the “ultra-Protestant influences...notorious enough” at the college, and Tyacke speaks of Neile “emancipating” himself from his years spent there after about 1600. Stieg, however, insists that it “does not have any particular reputation.” Twigg, by contrast, lists St. John’s along with several other Cambridge colleges as among the “most fervently Laudian colleges” and the “earliest innovators” in terms of alterations to chapels and patterns of worship. It appears that with the end of William Whitaker’s mastership in 1595, anti-predestinarian and anti-puritan views rose in esteem “fairly rapidly” at St. John’s. At least one future bishop, Valentine Carey, passed through St. John’s about this time, and was praised as “doctrinally sound” and “one of the firmest against our [Puritan] faction” by Richard Montagu in 1625.
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Notwithstanding, though several fellows were, like John Price, sympathetic to Laudianism, it appears that the overall tenor of the college was orthodox until the mastership of William Beale from 1634 to 1644. Galloway did not find a single London/Middlesex clergyman who graduated from St. John’s after 1633, and among the Nottinghamshire graduates, only one, George Mason, can be said with certainty to have done so. Mason’s predecessor at South Scarle and Girton, Simon Read, had apparently not seen to a number of defects, and although it is not exactly clear how much influence Read, and subsequently Mason, possessed relative to the churchwardens, the lapse of two and a half years between the court order to obtain a cover and a poor man’s box and certification for the same certainly does not signal Laudian proclivities.104 Among the other graduates, two puritans served Nottinghamshire livings after 1633. One of these men was Thomas Cranage, curate and lecturer in St. Mary’s, Nottingham from 1633 to 1640. Cranage received his BA from St. John’s in 1620 but went on to get advanced degrees at Brasenose, Oxford. In any case, Cranage’s puritanism was of the mild and moderate variety. The other minister, William Westerby, left a much larger footprint in the ecclesiastical records, being cited on several occasions from 1615 through 1634 for a variety of offenses, such as refusal to wear the surplice, to sign with the cross while baptizing, and to kneel to receive communion.105

The majority of graduates, by contrast, do not appear to have led lives nearly as interesting. Ralph Hansbie (MA, 1611) was vicar of St. Mary’s Nottingham from 1617-1635, and as was the case with his predecessors, carried out duties as curate of Sneinton. He was also rector of Barton in Fabis during this period.106 At Sneinton, most of Hansbie’s issues appear to have revolved around the chancel, and it seems some confusion developed as to whose
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responsibility this was. No other presentment bills record distinctly Laudian concerns, and ostensibly no Sneinton churchwardens were pursued by the authorities either. Similar circumstances prevailed for Hansbie in Barton in Fabis. In Clayworth, where Robert Topham (MA, 1604) served after 1630, no presentments mention the said minister, although the churchwardens did report not having a hood in 1637. Neither does evidence remain of any prosecution of Clayworth churchwardens. Despite arriving to serve Skegby chapel in 1635, the year of Mottershed’s initial campaign, Rowland Revill (BA 1631) passed his few years there in peace, and seems not to have been troubled by the lack of a communion rail, which had to be ordered by the court two years after his passing.

Paul Sherwood (BA 1624), vicar of Radcliffe-on-Trent from 1633 to 1638 likely led the most eventful tenure of any non-puritan St. John’s graduate. The churchwardens of Radcliffe had expressed concern over obtaining the canonical items already in 1630 when it was reported that the parish lacked a pulpit cloth, a hood and the table of prohibited degrees of marriage. While Sherwood’s early years passed without serious incident, in 1635 tensions with the churchwardens overflowed into their respective presentments, the latter accusing Sherwood of failing to wear the hood. In turn, Sherwood in October reported that his wardens had failed to present the need for repairs to the chancel and the bells, and had not provided a decent cloth for the communion table. It seems likely, then, that Sherwood played a role in having the court order correctives on those counts in December, as well as the orders to the farmer of the tithes in
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September 1637 to address the chancel issues. A similar pattern unfolded in 1637 and 1638, the churchwardens in the former year alleging that Sherwood had failed to perform prayers at certain times. In April 1638 the accusation was that Sherwood had neglected service for an entire Sunday. Sherwood in the same month cited both churchwardens, and no others, for refusing to pay their offerings. While it cannot be known for certain, the above presentments appear to indicate interpersonal conflict rather than disagreement over serious theological or liturgical issues.\textsuperscript{115} Another St. John’s graduate, Marmaduke Moore (MA 1632) rector of Ordsall from 1631 to 1650 also appears to have run into problems with his churchwardens, though to a lesser degree. In April of 1638 Moore presented the churchwardens for failing to present the decay of the churchyard fence. In September, the churchwardens fired back, alleging that Moore failed to catechize on Sundays and holidays. Rather than deny or confront the charge as a Laudian might have, Moore simply claimed that he did not catechize because the children “do not come” and “will not be catechised.”\textsuperscript{116} Moreover, neither Moore nor any of the churchwardens of the latter 1630s appear to have shown initiative regarding the communion rail, which had to be ordered by the court as late as September 1638.\textsuperscript{117} Thus, among the handful of St. John’s graduates who were in attendance in the 1630s—those, in other words, who would be most expected to have developed Laudian sympathies—the evidence does not demonstrate any particular trends as to religious leanings. Even if some type of Laudian “indoctrination” had been occurring at St. John’s during this period, it did not manifest itself in any notable way in the presentment bills by and/or regarding Nottinghamshire ministers. Westerby’s apparently strident puritanism could be
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tied to his relatively early graduation date (1604) but with only one other graduate from the same period, and a non-puritan at that, such a conclusion can only be tentative.

Christ’s College follows just behind St. John’s in its number of Nottinghamshire-bound graduates, which means that, as in London and Middlesex, Trinity, St. John’s and Christ’s stand as the three largest producers of clergy for the archdeaconry.118 Twigg lists Christ’s alongside Trinity as one of the colleges that was late to make Laudian changes to their chapel and service structure, and likely did so reluctantly.119 At least two well-known puritans, John Shaw, who worked in the north in the 1630s, and was in fact cited by Neile’s visitation in 1636, and William Perkins, author of A Golden Chain, had links with the college. Shaw notes, however, that early in his time at Christ’s, he became enamored of a certain puritan preacher, Mr. Weld, and from that time on “was much taken notice of in the colledge and much opposed for a Puritane.”120 It is also known that the notable Laudian William Milbourne, who served as curate for one of Cosin’s many livings in Durham, received his MA at Christ’s, and that two lifelong enemies of puritanism, Richard Bancroft and Thomas Legge, emerged from Christ’s in the late 1560s.121 Galloway found, furthermore, that several of the most adamant Laudians serving London and Middlesex cures attended Christ’s, and that the dominance of Calvinism came into question fairly early, about 1609. At least one conspicuous Arminian theologian, William Chappell, best known as the tutor of John Milton, held a fellowship at Christ’s, as indicated previously.122 The college was, moreover, second only to St. John’s, Oxford, in producing London and Middlesex
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clergy that would go on to attain higher offices.\footnote{Galloway, “English Arminianism,” 115.} Setting aside Tyacke’s assuredly misleading calculation of only twenty-five Arminian parish clergy, it is nevertheless interesting that Christ’s supplied the most of any single college, granted this was only four.\footnote{Tyacke, Anti-Calvinists, 195. Recall that Galloway (p. 53) determined forty-one “English Arminians” in London and Middlesex alone.}

Among the Nottinghamshire clergy graduating from Christ’s College, four degrees were earned by future puritans and twelve by non-puritans.\footnote{Note that Table 1.4 lists 17 Christ’s attendees. The discrepancy can be explained by the fact that not all men who attended a given college went on to obtain degrees therefrom.} If, as Tyacke insists, Laudianism and Arminianism dominated the universities in the 1630s, one would suspect graduates of this decade to have been more likely to develop Laudian sympathies. Only two Nottinghamshire men, however, Adam Hunt (MA 1634) and Samuel Lightfoot (MA 1635), attended Christ’s at this time. Hunt became vicar of Hucknall Torkard in 1634, and his first five or so years appear to have passed without major incident. No presentments were made, nor do any court cases remain, that involve the communion table or rail.\footnote{Marchant, “Restoration of Nottinghamshire Churches,” 74.} Such work on the church as was done involved the repairing of a loft in the steeple in 1637, and in 1640, repairs to the vicarage house and other houses belonging to it.\footnote{AN/PB 303/501; AN/PB 298/18.} It is true that Hunt wrote a letter to the deputy registrar in 1640 asking for the citation of a man who refused to pay his tithes, but no other evidence remains of Hunt citing or being cited for Laudian related issues.\footnote{AN/PB 298/5.} This does not, of course, preclude the possibility of Hunt having been sympathetic with Laudianism in some sense, but this cannot simply be assumed on the basis of concern over tithes. He was, moreover, cited by the episcopal visitation in 1636 for not reading prayers on Saturday afternoons or Holy Days.\footnote{R. VI. A. 24, fol. 511v} In brief, it
seems that Hunt, like many other Nottinghamshire ministers in this period, was more concerned with the quotidian tasks of daily ministry than with deeply theological or liturgical issues, Laudian or otherwise.

Most puritans emerging from Christ’s fit among the more moderate clergy on Marchant’s list. Richard Mustion (BA 1613), vicar of South Leverton from 1620 to 1643, in fact was never formally prosecuted by the authorities and owes his place on the list to Parliament’s later nomination of him to a living in Warwickshire as well as his ejection in 1662. Henry Langley (MA 1606), rector of one mediety of Treswell from 1610 to 1636, only came under scrutiny once, in 1613, when it was alleged that he did not usually wear the surplice and that he had omitted the Litany on various Sundays. In the same presentment, however, the churchwardens note that Langley did, in fact, use the sign of the cross in baptism, an element of the sacrament that more strident puritans could not abide. Perhaps unsurprisingly, neither Mustion nor Langley appear to have been overly concerned with the Laudian “beauty of holiness” initiatives enforced from 1635. The court had to order boarding of the stalls at Treswell in 1635 and the railing of the communion table in 1639. At South Leverton, Mustion had apparently allowed, or simply not been aware of, the selling of one of the church bells in 1637, the same year that the court ordered the communion rail. The court also had to command the churchwardens to mend the stalls and pave the north aisle in 1638 and eventually excommunicated the churchwardens for

130 Marchant, The Puritans and the Church Courts, 309.
131 The Rectory of Treswell was divided into two halves, or “medieties” or “moieties,” with each half served by a different rector.
132 AN/PB 295/4/104.
133 Marchant, “Restoration of Nottinghamshire Churches,” 87.
failing to comply. In 1639 it was the farmers of the tithes’ turn to appear before the court, this time for failing to pave the chancel.\footnote{Ibid., 84. AN/PB 341/7/28.}

The same sort of indifference appears to have been the order of the day for the non-puritan Edward Barwell (MA 1599) who was parson of Keyworth from 1606 to 1639. In 1625 Barwell was presented along with two other men for refusing to pay an assessment for the repair of the church of Kingston-on-Soar.\footnote{AN/PB 314/5/10.} In 1636, the episcopal visitation determined that “the Communion Table standeth a yard and a halfe from the wall” and that the stalls were “not decent and uniforme in the Church.”\footnote{Marchant, “Restoration of Nottinghamshire Churches,” 75.} It appears Barwell may also have allowed a puritan minister, not, however, listed by Marchant, to serve the cure at this time. In 1638 the churchwardens presented a Mr. William Smith for “not catechising upon Sundays and holy days and for not reading prayers on Wednesdays and Fridays” though Smith does not appear anywhere else in the presentment bills.\footnote{AN/PB 315/14/23.} The churchwardens of Clarborough, where Robert Hurst (MA 1628) served from 1631 to 1645, found much amiss with the church in 1638. The churchyard fence needed mending, the stalls in the church were “generally un-uniform,” there was no cover for the font, and the leads were in decay. Indeed, the court had to issue orders for the mending of the seats and the provision of a font cover, for lack of which the churchwardens were eventually, albeit temporarily, excommunicated. The fence was still in decay several months into 1639.\footnote{AN/PB 341/7/10; AN/PB 341/8/10; Marchant, “Restoration of Nottinghamshire Churches,” 68.} There is some reason to think, then, that Christ’s College did not send graduates with particularly strong ideological commitments into Nottinghamshire.
The evidence left by two Christ’s graduates serving successively in Holme Pierrepont, however, again prevents any deterministic associations being made, in this case, between Christ’s College and some variety of casual churchmanship. Puritan Reuben Easthorpe (MA 1621) held the rectory from 1626 to 1629, during which time he managed to be presented for

> omitting to read a great part of divine service and common prayers on Sundays and holy days, omitting to bid fasting days and holy days, omitting to wear the surplice on Sundays and holy days, and many times omitting to wear the surplice in the time of his ministration of the holy communion and baptism.\(^\text{139}\)

Easthorpe was further cited for not maintaining his parsonage house and the buildings belonging to it, and for apparently withholding the register book from the churchwardens, preventing them from making certificates of the parish’s weddings, burials, and baptisms. By contrast, Henry Cooke (BA 1618), who held the living from 1629 to at least 1641, presided over an ostensibly peaceful period. The pattern of expenses recorded by the churchwardens—£5 for 1635, £8 for 1636, and £14 for 1637—suggests that neither Cooke nor his successive churchwardens were in any hurry to mend or “beautify” the church.\(^\text{140}\) Yet, no mention is made of any issues with the church fabric, either with the communion table or the seats, or anything else. No court cases, moreover, remain detailing any such issues or other shortcomings of the churchwardens.\(^\text{141}\) In short, as in the case of Trinity and St. John’s colleges, Christ’s cannot be seen to have had an obvious or decisive impact on the future religious predilections of Nottinghamshire clerical graduates.
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It is nevertheless worth exploring if the Nottinghamshire graduates of colleges yet to be discussed, though with some reputation for Laudianism, can shed any more light on the subject. Peterhouse and Pembroke stand as the Cambridge institutions that developed the greatest known associations with Laudianism. Peterhouse’s Laudian reputation stems largely from its association with John Cosin, who became master of the college in 1635 and was on the cutting edge of introducing new “beauty of holiness” schemes, as he had been at Durham. Even before Cosin, however, Peterhouse had been in close contact with Laudianism, Matthew Wren having served as master from 1625-1635 and constructed a new chapel—complete with a dressed altar—for the college in 1633. Pembroke’s associations stretch back even further. The man many scholars believe to have been the intellectual father of Laudianism, Lancelot Andrewes, served as master of the college from 1589 until 1605, and Wren continued as a fellow thereafter, even though “a small discontented party with a puritan bias” remained. Wren apparently played an active role in the formative years of at least one well-known Laudian, Richard Drake, whose churchmanship was so unpopular he was forced to desert his living in 1643. Pembroke was, furthermore, home to John Tourney, one of the six preachers investigated by a parliamentary committee in 1641 for allegedly teaching “that it was not faith alone, but faith and works together” that brought justification.

Among the Peterhouse graduates who may have come under Wren’s influence, Edward Barnes (MA, 1627) has ultimately been classified as part of the CNL group, but in fact also demonstrated a penchant for teaching scholars in the chancel, reading prayers in the body of the church and allegedly not catechizing at certain times. Thomas Wright (MA, 1626), curate of
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Carlton in Lindrick from 1636 to 1638, and Stephen Primatt (MA, 1629), curate of Weston in 1637, also could potentially have come under the influence of Wren. If Marcombe is indeed right in arguing for the Laudians’ concern for attendance, it may be significant that the only presentment made by a Weston clergyman over the 1625 to 1640 period was drawn up by Primatt in 1637, citing a man for negligent attendance.\textsuperscript{145} Like Primatt, Wright also appears to have held some concern for attendance. In 1636 he cited several men for hosting drinkers on the Sabbath and/or allowing their households to work at unlawful times.\textsuperscript{146} As the broader body of presentments make clear that ministers of all stripes produced such citations, such evidence cannot be taken in isolation. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that none of Marchant’s puritans working in Nottinghamshire during the time period hailed from Peterhouse, though approximately ten such men had found employment in Yorkshire.

Pembroke produced about the same number of puritan graduates as Peterhouse, with Edward Kidd being the sole Pembroke puritan serving in the archdeaconry. Kidd, rector of Hawton from 1612 to 1641, was essentially moderate for most of his tenure, only appearing once in the presentment bills, in 1613, for not reading the canons, not reading the service according to the Book of Common Prayer, and sometimes not wearing the surplice.\textsuperscript{147} Kidd would, however, find himself facing the High Commission Court in London in 1639-1640 regarding a matrimonial cause.\textsuperscript{148} On the other hand, two of the most well-known Laudians in the land, Matthew Wren and John Neile, also passed through Pembroke in the early seventeenth century. Neither man, however, appears to have been especially involved with their respective Nottinghamshire livings. Wren, rector of Bingham from 1624 to 1635, evidently did employ a
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curate, Robert Rockold, who had been ordained by Laud while the latter was Bishop of St. David’s. He also employed another Pembroke graduate, Edward Wethered (MA 1625), as curate beginning in 1634.\textsuperscript{149} Even so, in 1625 the churchwardens presented Wren for not providing service the “first Sunday in Lent.”\textsuperscript{150} In 1631, it was alleged that a non-ordained man, not having lawful orders, was reading service.\textsuperscript{151} Wethered, moreover, was presented in 1635 for not wearing a hood while reading divine service, “according to his degree.”\textsuperscript{152} Another minister who passed through Pembroke around the same times as Wren was John Scarlett, rector of Thorpe from 1615 to 1639. For the most part, Scarlett seems to have led a peaceful life at Thorpe, and to have complied with the Laudian restoration campaign after 1635. As was noted in an earlier section, the churchwardens of Thorpe spent approximately £280 to mend issues with the church fabric or provide hitherto missing items. Thus, in 1637 they were able to claim that “the church steeple and all the seats are newly made; there is a new pulpit and a new rail for the communion table and all the church ornaments are fitting and decent.”\textsuperscript{153} Whether owing to age or otherwise, however, Scarlett was presented in 1639 for not reading prayers “on Wednesdays and Fridays out of Lent.”\textsuperscript{154} Taken together, then, the evidence concerning Peterhouse and Pembroke College graduates does not demonstrate a clear case of reputedly Laudian institutions sending recognizably Laudian graduates into the archdeaconry. It is worth reemphasizing that even the prominent Pembroke Laudians—including perhaps the most zealous Laudian of all, Matthew Wren—seem not to have been especially concerned with imposing Laudian ideals in their Nottinghamshire parishes.
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The facts of attendance to this point thus tend to corroborate Stieg’s assertion that “the outlook of a college is an undetermined influence” and that their “reputation[s] may be overstated.”\textsuperscript{155} This finding casts some doubt on Pisani’s position, which perhaps sets forth too deterministic a view of the impact certain colleges had on future clergymen’s religious leanings.\textsuperscript{156} What must be kept in view is that even if some colleges evidently did produce certain “types” of ministers, as appears to have been the case for Emmanuel, Cambridge and St. John’s Oxford, these colleges did not send enough graduates to Nottinghamshire livings in the 1620s-1630s to have played a notable role in the concretization—or circumscribing—of Laudianism in the archdeaconry.

\textbf{V. Conclusion}

Sustained examination of the ministers of the Archdeaconry of Nottingham has revealed several important findings. Broadly speaking, this investigation has demonstrated that the general backgrounds and characteristics of this body of clergy were such that the sort of parish clergy-led Laudianism seen in Essex, and to a lesser degree in London and Middlesex, was notably less likely or forthcoming in Nottinghamshire. While there were fewer known puritans holding Nottinghamshire livings by the 1630s, these men do not appear to have been replaced by anything like the “immigrant” clericalists Galloway saw in London. One main reason for this, this chapter has argued, was the limited influence of colleges with known Laudian links. It is worth repeating here that the headquarters of Laudianism in the university setting, St. John’s Oxford, does not appear to have supplied any of the archdeaconry’s parish clergy at work in the 1630s. Particular colleges aside, in the short term the Laudian visionaries seem simply to have
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had too little time to effect the changes they wished to see. Laudian influence in most colleges was limited before the Caroline period, and it was really only in the 1630s that some institutions saw decisive changes. Yet, the reality is that the large majority of Nottinghamshire’s graduate clergy took their degrees at least ten years before this. Another factor working against a wider parish clergy-led Laudianism in the archdeaconry was the relatively large share of lower-status men compared to the smaller number who may have been sons of nobility or gentry. Given that the latter seem to have been more likely and able to pursue the advanced degrees often needed for advancement to higher office, the predominance of lower-status clergy seems to have limited the extent of pluralism and thus, with a few notable exceptions, the degree of influence possessed by more prominent Laudians. As will be described in the following chapter, the relatively limited scope for patronage open to the latter constituted an additional limiting factor, especially when one compares Nottinghamshire to a region like London and Middlesex. Nevertheless, that only a small number of known Laudians was active in the 1630s does not mean that all elements of Laudianism were completely absent from parish life. The following chapter seeks to investigate how clergymen interacted with and occasionally had recourse to seemingly Laudian choices and standards at the parish level. Unlike previous works concerning the Archdeaconry of Nottingham in this period, special attention will be paid to the non-puritan clergymen, including the handful of men who would face ejection or sequestration in the 1640s or 1650.
Chapter Two
The Caroline Clergy of Nottinghamshire: A View From The Ground Up

The year is 1636, and the place, the parish church of Attenborough in the county of Nottingham. In what must have been a recurring episode in the 1630s, Mrs. Ireton and her son, the future regicide, hear their Laudian Vicar Gervase Dodson summon them to receive the elements at the rails of the altar. Unmoved, the two remain in their seats, simmering with resentment, perhaps reproaching Dodson with an icy glare. Not to be outdone, Dodson and his churchwardens arrange for the two to appear before Archbishop Neile’s correctional court later that year.¹ Since being presented to the living in 1625 by Sir Francis Fuliambe, Dodson had not hesitated to exploit the system of ecclesiastical discipline to achieve his ends. He lamented in April 1631 that “much ungodliness abounds amongst us” and later that year upbraided his churchwardens for failing to present the disrepair of the vestry and for allowing the congregation to be “irreverent” during divine service, “neither kneeling at confession nor standing up at the Creed, nor at any time once opening their mouths either to praise God or say Amen, nor to join in with the minister in the saying of the Lord’s prayer, the Creed, nor in [any part of] God’s service.”² With similar presentations littering Attenborough’s other 1630 presentment bills, it is likely that the Ireton family—and probably other parishioners—wished that they had been able to select a minister and churchwardens more in line with their religious leanings.

This episode from Attenborough during the alleged “high-tide” of Laudianism raises a number of important issues to be explored in this chapter. That Gervase Dodson appears to have provoked controversy fits neatly within the prevailing view of the impact of Laudianism at the
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parish level. Yet, important questions remain. How is it, exactly, that Dodson can be classified as a Laudian? Is it primarily owing to the presence of controversy? And how representative was Dodson’s experience compared to the other ministers so categorized? In the previous chapter, it was shown that few Laudian clergymen served the archdeaconry in the 1630s. It was also suggested that Laudianism concretized in different ways in different parishes, with ministers playing a potentially important role in this regard. As will be demonstrated, this could be as true within the L (Laudian) group as it was without it. Similarly, churchwardens played varying roles in the concretization of Laudianism in their respective parishes, for example, taking the initiative in introducing repairs and reforms in the face of clerical passivity. The fact that the Laudian Dodson was presented by a relatively obscure baronet also raises important questions, especially in light of what is known about patronage in other parts of the country. Did lay patrons control the lion’s share of livings in Nottinghamshire as they did in the Diocese of Bath and Wells? Or did ecclesiastical patronage make a notable impact as it did in London and Middlesex? In contrast to previous works on the Archdeaconry of Nottingham, what follows will pay attention to these and other issues with particular regard to the non-puritan clergymen. Taking this approach makes it easier to avoid simply assuming that the purported “Laudian versus Puritan” contest was of central concern to the majority of the archdeaconry’s ministers, or that Laudianism was essentially an all or nothing phenomenon during the 1630s. From this more balanced perspective, it becomes clear that the archdeaconry did not quite feel “the full impact” of Laudianism in the way that S.B. Jennings describes. The timely reduction in the number of
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beneficed puritan ministers, the relative dearth of actively engaged Laudian ministers and meticulous churchwardens, and the conspicuous lack of ecclesiastical patronage available in the 1620s and 1630s each played a notable role in this regard.

I. The Puritan Clergymen

As indicated in the previous chapter, Ronald Marchant’s “List” of puritans has proven a useful, though not problem-free, tool by which to denote those puritan ministers at work in the archdeaconry in the 1630s. Marchant himself admits that at least a number of clergymen are included who never actually saw presentation for puritan offenses. Some, for instance, were added as a result of having been part of puritan classes or the like in the 1640s and 1650s, or for having known links with ministers who did have ecclesiastical “rap sheets.” At the same time, there is a roughly similar number of men whom Marchant did not include, but who nevertheless left evidence of puritan inclinations. Even if one could determine the number of puritans with absolute accuracy, however, that would not necessarily provide a fool-proof guide as to the actual concretization of Laudianism in a given parish. To give one example, it is well-known that the puritan minister of Nottingham St. Peter’s, George Coates, was ultimately pressured (to the dissatisfaction of many parishioners) into compelling reception at the altar rails in 1638—an ostensibly Laudian action. Yet, as this and cases like that of John Moseley at Newark demonstrate, the presence of certain puritan ministers increased the likelihood of outside intervention becoming the primary source of Laudianism’s concretization—particularly if the puritan in question was not especially moderate. In light of this, the number and “type” of
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puritans holding livings in the 1630s likely did have implications for the archdeaconry’s wider experience.

According to Marchant, one primary reason for the spread of puritanism in Nottinghamshire was the relative paucity of licensed preachers here in the Elizabethan period. Elizabethan divines in the northern province seem to have faced more resistance to the “Protestantization” of the Church than their southern counterparts, and this provided opportunities for puritans to spread their churchmanship while ostensibly forwarding the Crown’s religious aims. This general trend received another boost with the passing of the Ecclesiastical Canons of 1604, a new requirement of which was that parishes be supplied with monthly sermons. Once again, it was frequently puritan preachers who met this heightened demand.⁷ In part a result of the fairly free spread of puritanism in the county, especially within a few years of the accession of James I, the ecclesiastical authorities had a potentially dangerous situation on their hands: the spread of Separatism. Nevertheless, Archbishop Toby Matthew’s determined drive against Separatist leaders like John Smyth and John Robinson should not be understood as a wider attack on puritanism. Rather, Matthew and others likely saw Separatism as a direct threat to the positive puritan influence Matthew wished to see continue within the church—especially with regard to the preaching of the Word.⁸ Whether Archbishop Matthew was aware of it or not, it appears that the success of the anti-Separatist effort did not lead to a simultaneous diminution of more mainstream puritanism. For the most part, “only the most militant puritans” were removed.⁹ Thus, it was really only with the passing of Archbishop

⁸ Ibid., 159.
Matthew in 1628 that certain aspects of puritan influence in the county came under potential threat.

Whether by accidents of death, departure for other jurisdictions, or the politics of patronage, the fact remains that at least twelve parishes passed out of puritan hands between the accession of Charles I and the early years of the 1630s. In some of these parishes, a puritan minister had presided since the 1580s if not before. William Alred (d. 1627) had served Colwick since 1569, while George Higgin had held Eakring and Richard Barton, Edwinstowe, since 1586. The even more influential Brian Barton had served at South Collingham since 1590. With very few exceptions, however, the men who took the puritan ministers’ places were not Laudians, but men who may be classified within the CNL (Canons-Non-Laudian) or NL (Non-Laudian) headings. What this appears to have led to in practice was a general muting of religious tensions in parishes that, had their puritan ministers continued in charge, might have seen a greater degree of hierarchy-directed Laudian impositions. At Colwick, for example, the clergyman from 1628 was the NL Robert Theobalds. Though neither he nor the churchwardens had seen to the railing of the table, the same was done within a few months of the court order in 1636. Moreover, the churchwardens recorded only small sums spent on the church between 1635 and 1639. At the same time, some parishes that went from having puritan clergymen to having an L or CL (Canons-Laudian) clergyman tended to experience the sort of fireworks typically associated with notorious Laudians like Richard Drake.

---

Notwithstanding, it is still the case that nearly 30 puritan ministers served Nottinghamshire livings in the 1630s, a sizable enough group to have potentially caused Neile and Mottershed major headaches. According to Marchant, however, only ten of these men would face court action at some point during the decade, and only two, David Chovan and Lemuel Tuke, appear to have put up sustained resistance.\textsuperscript{12} Moreover, a number of potentially puritan (PP\textsuperscript{13}) clergy occupied livings that might otherwise have been in the hands of more ideologically committed men. Peter Coates, Vicar of Arnold from 1631-1642, serves as a good example of this type of cleric. While problems with the chancel seem to have presented the most pressing issues he faced in the first years of his tenure, Coates was promptly presented in April of 1635 for failing to read prayers on Wednesdays and Fridays.\textsuperscript{14} Bills from 1637 also reveal that he had not been wearing the required hood, had not seen to the installation of the communion rail, and had continued to put off reading Wednesday and Friday prayers.\textsuperscript{15} As a result, an assistant of Mottershed, Francis Parker, found much amiss in the church according to what was likely an entry in the 1638 archdeaconry-wide survey.\textsuperscript{16} Even so, little action seems to have been taken to address these shortcomings; the churchwardens do not record more than £5 being spent on the church in any single year between 1635 and 1639.\textsuperscript{17}

While some puritan ministers undoubtedly ran up against dedicated churchwardens during the 1630s, this was not always the case. The puritan John Watt, Vicar of East Retford, serves as an example of the former group, his churchwardens having presented him in May 1635

\textsuperscript{12} Marchant, \textit{The Puritans and the Church Courts}, 146.
\textsuperscript{13} N.B. As described in the previous chapter, men in the PP category were \textit{not} included on Marchant’s list of puritans.
\textsuperscript{14} AN/PB 303/722.
\textsuperscript{15} AN/PB 303/484.
\textsuperscript{16} AN/PB 303/573.
\textsuperscript{17} Marchant, “The Restoration of Nottinghamshire Churches,” 64.
for “suffering the chancel to be unbeautified and for not repairing the stalls and not wearing a hood,” alongside presentations about the absent communion rail and an unmended window. In addition to spending large sums of money, the churchwardens for 1637-1638 also presented Watt for failing to read prayers on Wednesdays and Fridays and claimed that the chancel was still decayed and in want of seats. By contrast the churchwardens of Annesley during William Hewitt’s time (1630-1638) were decidedly more passive. Those serving in 1635 made no mention of the absent rail, leaving those for 1636 to face citation for the same at the episcopal visitation. As further court records reveal, there was still no rail as of late September 1637. Hewitt, moreover, was only cited for puritan offenses in his last year, 1638, and the largest expense recorded by Annesley churchwardens in the 1635-1639 period was the meager £2 10s laid out in 1637. Similarly, the churchwardens at Hawton, where Edward Kidd presided from 1612-1641, concerned themselves hardly at all with Kidd during the 1630s. This comes into sharper relief when one sees that churchwardens from decades before had, in fact, found Kidd’s puritan ways problematic. In 1613, for example, churchwardens had cited Kidd for “not reading the book of constitutions according to the first article, and for not reading service according to the prescribed form set down in the book of common prayer [sic].” In short, the presence of relatively passive churchwardens working under at least some puritan ministers played a part in limiting the scope and scale of Laudianism in certain parishes.

---
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23 AN/PB 295/4/16. While it is often difficult to determine churchwardens’ precise motives for not presenting certain faults, it is probably reasonable to suppose that Kidd’s long tenure may have brought many into line with his views by the 1630s.
With hindsight, one can see that patronage realities also served to limit both the number and type of puritan ministers in the county by the 1630s. Some historians have suggested that, generally speaking, possession of the rights of presentation was too fragmented for any particular group or ideology to make special use of patronage opportunities. Even so, this should not be taken to suggest that patronage was not important. As Stieg asserts, “collectively, the patrons can be said to have controlled the parish churches of England.”24 Contemporaries certainly appreciated the significance of patronage. This was especially true of Archbishop Neile, who became the lead patron of the overtly Arminian “Durham House” group as well as a key patron for William Laud in the early years of King James.25 Another controversial bishop, Thomas Dove of Peterborough, used the powers of episcopal patronage to build up a substantial “power base” of “Arminians” within the church court structures of his diocese—a force that would prove useful to the string of Laudian bishops that succeeded Dove in the 1630s.26 Perhaps more familiar are puritan organizations like the London-based Feoffees for Impropiations, an association that actively sought to buy up patronage rights in order to place godly and able preachers.27 It does not appear, however, that such an organization was at work in Nottinghamshire in the 1620s or 1630s. In fact, the Crown stands out as the single largest patron of puritans active during the period, and two of these placements were nominally made by Charles I. While John Mosley did run afoul of the Laudian authorities for removing his

24 Stieg, *Laud’s Laboratory*, 100.
communion table from the rails, the latter of these two men, Rector of Winthorpe John Chapman, possesses a record quite similar to that of Peter Coates noted above.\textsuperscript{28}

Overall, patronage of puritans was fragmented among mostly large landowners, from gentlemen like Gervase Pigot to noblemen like William Cavendish, 1st Earl of Devonshire. Cavendish comes in second place numerically speaking, having been patron to three puritans compared to the Crown’s four, though it is also true that the Crown was the largest single source of patronage of the archdeaconry’s ministers in the period. While three out of four of the Earl’s placements were or would become puritans in their time, it is not exactly clear what his motivations were in every case. He does not appear to have been particularly religious, though perhaps he was influenced by his stepfather, George Talbot, Earl of Shrewsbury, who had served as a custodian of Mary Queen of Scots for some time during William’s adolescence. Shrewsbury had supported Jane Grey but was considered by Queen Elizabeth moderate enough to trust with such an important inmate.\textsuperscript{29} The only other entity that placed more than one puritan in the period was the Dean and Chapter of the Collegiate Church of Southwell. As patron of the parish church of Kneesall, the Dean and Chapter presented Luke Bacon to the living in 1626.\textsuperscript{30} Bacon does not appear to have been especially radical, but he would be presented in the same year for not reading prayers or conducting churching services.\textsuperscript{31} Other bills from Bacon’s time reveal, however, that the Dean and Chapter may not have been sufficiently attentive to the living. Bacon himself joined the churchwardens in 1628 in presenting the “Chapter of Southwell” for allowing the chancel to be “likely to fall upon our heads.” The chancel was still out of repair as of April

\textsuperscript{28} AN/PB 328/9/41; AN/PB 328/14/5.
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1630.\textsuperscript{32} The Chapter’s apparent lack of a clear “camp” or set of motivations is further revealed in looking at their subsequent placements. The Laudian William Clough was instituted in 1633, only to be followed by puritan William Hewitt in 1638. Hewitt, moreover, was no radical, and seems to have gained his place on Marchant’s list as a result of his long imprisonment by Royalist forces in the 1640s.\textsuperscript{33}

Among the remaining patrons of puritans, those who did present ministers who would eventually push back against Laudianism do not appear to have done so intentionally, while those patrons one might expect to have presented radicals seem not to have done so at all. Sir Gervase Clifton has the somewhat dubious distinction of having presented David Chovan, one of the only puritans who would become notably intransigent by the later 1630s.\textsuperscript{34} Yet, Clifton also presented two men who did not distinguish themselves in any meaningful way, as well as one CNL minister who would later be sequestered from the Rectory of Clifton.\textsuperscript{35} Long involved in politics, Clifton left behind a lengthy record of service to the Crown, including holding the office of High Steward of East Retford from 1616 until 1647. As far as religion is concerned, Clifton grew up with a recusant stepfather and while at Cambridge was especially influenced by his tutor John Rawlinson—a Calvinist, but one with known ties to then Archbishop Bancroft. While Clifton also had known ties to “anti-Arminian” preachers, which may explain his patronage of the Genevan trained Chovan, he was once described as “very conformable and well affected in religion.”\textsuperscript{36} By contrast, the future regicide Francis Hacker cut much more against the grain of
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his surroundings, becoming a fierce supporter of Parliament despite the rest of his family siding with the King. In 1619, he presented the puritan John Foxcroft to the Rectory of Gotham, though no fireworks seem to have resulted from this.37 Foxcroft’s most notable puritan offense was probably his refusal to wear the required hood as of 1635.38 The cases of Hacker and Clifton, and their respective clerical clients, help illustrate the limited scope and scale of puritan patronage within the archdeaconry, particularly as of the 1620s and 1630s. In combination with the notable reduction in the number of puritans and the presence of certain moderate, possibly puritan, ministers, the realities of puritan patronage helped to limit the number of potential sites of conflict and thereby to circumscribe the likelihood of Laudianism arriving by way of top-down intervention.

II. The Non-Puritan Clergymen

Yet it is important to note that the majority of clergymen in the archdeaconry were not puritans. This is not a particularly stunning revelation, but one that has received less attention than it should have. Judith Maltby has argued persuasively that those ministers who have long been derided as an ungodly “multitude” or blandly grouped as “conformists” ought to be just as interesting to historians as their puritan counterparts.39 Though Maltby’s notion of “Prayer Book Protestants”—a label she applies to ministers and parishioners alike—has some merit, how exactly to conceive of and label “moderates” or “conformists” is still something of an open question. Peter Lake and Michael Questier, for example, criticize Maltby and others for trying to “confer too coherent an ideological identity on disparate practices, protests and political

38 AN/PB 315/9/17.
moments, in the search for a predominant or predominating third term.”  

This critique is particularly important in light of Maltby’s assertion that the majority of “Prayer Book Protestant” ministers comprised the largest bloc of opposition to Laudian reforms—reforms allegedly perceived as an attack on Prayer Book conformity. While there undoubtedly were opponents of Laudianism among those committed to traditional Prayer Book Worship, Maltby’s assertion seems to go beyond the evidence. Calvin Lane points out, for example, that some “Prayer Book Protestants” had “in fact supported the Laudian programme in the 1630s, but, seeing the movement crashing, raced for the life rafts.” In the same way, Christopher Haigh’s suggestion that “Parish Anglicans” and their ministerial equivalents formed the parochial foundations “upon which the Laudian Church was built, and a considerable body of support for Caroline ceremonialism and Arminian doctrine” also overstates the case.

As noted in the previous chapter, the use of locally produced sources from the 1620s and 1630s aids in the formulation of less generic ministerial categories and highlights the extent to which generalizations about “conformists” can be misleading. Marchant, for instance, proposes a tripartite labelling system: (1) Left wing puritans; (2) Right wing reformers who had been placed into positions of power and responsibility, including many bishoprics; and (3) Laudians. Yet at several points, Marchant also refers to certain ministers, like Brian Brittain of Mansfield, as “conformists” or more simply as “not puritans.” Jennings speaks of the consolidation of “conformist puritanism” but is less clear about categorizing non-puritans. Upon closer

---
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examination, however, it becomes clear that the archdeaconry’s non-puritan ministers fall at different points along a spectrum in terms of their relation to Laudianism. Those in the L and CL groups fall toward one end, those in the NL group toward the other, with the CNL group falling somewhere in the middle. Analyzing these men collectively and in comparative contrast by group reveals that, by and large, the presence of a large number of non-puritans also played a role in limiting the materialization of Laudianism in the archdeaconry.

To the extent that their shortcomings became known, some men in the NL group would have faced harsh condemnation from nearly all sides. Alec Ryrie has pointed out how zealous “Arminians” and the hotter sort of Protestants had much in common with regard to ministerial responsibility and propriety, for instance.\(^46\) Perhaps the worst behaved minister during the 1630s, Thomas Holden, curate of Lambley, allegedly assaulted several men inside the church and upon the churchyard, frequently drank to excess, and lived in adultery with a woman who was not his wife. The churchwardens for 1636 felt they had no choice but to present him to the High Commission because citation to the archidiaconal court had proven unsuccessful.\(^47\) Holden’s slackness thus helps explain in part why the church still lacked a communion rail, proper paving, and a hood as of October 1637.\(^48\) Similarly, the neglectfulness of Ralph Watson, Rector of Bilborough, also reduced the scale and pace of Laudian changes in his parish. Watson allowed the parsonage house to continue in decay for at least four years, and during that time had only seen to the installation of a communion rail as of April 1639 and was presented on several occasions for not providing prayers on Wednesdays, Fridays or feast days.\(^49\) By 1641, Watson’s churchwardens had become so dissatisfied with his slackness that they alleged that “he bows and
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cringes to the Alter."\textsuperscript{50} One cannot say definitively whether Watson had or had not been in the practice of "bowing and cringing," but given the sharply anti-Laudian context of late 1641 as well as the other presentments against Watson, it seems fairly unlikely.\textsuperscript{51} In the same October 1641 bill, the churchwardens claim that "we have had no prayers at all on 9, 16 or 23 May last, no prayers at all on 1 and 8 August last, and no prayers at all on the 3rd of this instant October, all these days being Sabbath days; we have had no prayers in the afternoon of 10 October." In short, it does not appear that Watson had even been attending to his basic duties. Moreover, the chancel was in disrepair and the glass windows were broken in various places, shortcomings that Laudian ministers would have been unlikely to permit.\textsuperscript{52}

Occasionally, other ministers in the NL group displayed such foibles, though to a lesser extent. In some of these cases, admittedly, the net result to the parish may have been heavier doses of Laudianism, though this can often be traced back to other factors. James Clayton served as Rector of Fledborough from 1618-1639 and during that period earned presentment for not receiving the communion, allowing the parsonage to be a "tippling house" and in general disrepair, and allowing other deficiencies in the church and churchyard fence.\textsuperscript{53} 1620s bills reveal, however, that churchwarden concern for many aspects of the church clearly predated the advent of Archbishop Neile’s restoration campaign. In 1625, for example, the churchwardens beseeched the court for several more months’ time to complete repairs, and the church was still
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out of repair as of 1630. Compounding the parish’s problems were a series of lackluster curates. In 1630, John Thompson was presented for allegedly failing to provide advance warning of saints’ days and holy days, and in 1631 was cited for “reading false in the church.” In 1638, one churchwarden accused the curate Alexander Lowther of being “a usual alehouse haunter and wrie contentious and quelesome [sic].” Perhaps Lowther and Clayton preferred drinking at the parsonage to attending to their clerical duties. The result, in any case, was that their churchwardens were engaged in costly repair work throughout the decade.

With regard to NL clergymen at least, activist churchwardens seem to have been the exception rather than the rule. At Epperstone, where the NL Jeremy Deacon presided from 1633 to 1640, the churchwardens presented very little aside from a handful of fornicators, and as of late 1637 had still not provided the required rail. The churchwardens of Everton demonstrated a bit more energy at various points during the 1630s, having actually reported the need for paving and the communion rail early in 1635. The men who succeeded them, however, apparently lacked the same dynamism. Those serving in 1638 would actually be excommunicated for “not providing ornaments according to order” and the seats were not brought to uniformity until late 1640. At Finningley, where the NL Daniel Jones presided from 1619-1647, successive churchwardens fell somewhere between these poles. Those for 1635 did present Jones for failing to wear the hood, but those for the 1636 and 1637 presented and spent very little, about £2 10s in each year, compared to the £18 that had been spent during 1634.
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Patronage of NL ministers does not appear to have been concentrated in the hands of any singular person or institution, though the Crown presented more than others. Looking at just these presentations, it may be significant that no NL minister was presented during the reign of James I. In fact, the majority of NL Crown presentees took their Nottinghamshire livings in the late Elizabethan period, such as Roger Jackson at Colston Bassett (1597), William Birkhead at Gamston (1599) or Robert Horberry at Misson (1601).\(^6\) At the same time, several other NL men were presented nominally by Charles I, such as Griffin Spencer at Shelton (1632) and Robert Bee at Strelley (1636).\(^6\) Given that Charles I also nominally presented two puritans around this time, one may wonder whether James I had taken a more active, personal interest in his nominees. A decent number of the latter have been classified as CNL clergymen, indicating a more conspicuous adherence to the canons.

Though presenting fewer men than the Crown, Trinity College Cambridge still was responsible for placing four NL clerics during the period. This is probably not surprising, given that a large share of the archdeaconry’s clergymen passed through Trinity at some point during their education. Despite his relatively late graduation date from the latter (1629), Henry Priest was not overly interested in introducing Laudian measures to his living at Blyth.\(^6\) As of late October 1637, Priest still had no hood, the chancel was in disrepair, and the seats were not made uniform until 1639.\(^6\) Daniel Odingsells, Vicar of Flintham from 1621 to 1650, took his MA at Trinity almost two decades before, and also appears to have been relatively disengaged with

---
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Laudianism.\textsuperscript{65} At least in 1637, he had not been fond of reading prayers on Wednesdays and Fridays and had neglected to wear a hood.\textsuperscript{66} As for the following years, Odingsells and his churchwardens presumably paid most of their attention to a recusant wife of a gentleman and to various verbal squabbles in the church.\textsuperscript{67} Thus, similar to the Crown, Trinity Cambridge seems to have presented fairly moderate NL men into archidiaconal livings, reducing and/or delaying the externalization of Laudianism in these parishes.

On the whole, the evidence suggests that the materialization of Laudianism was also limited in parishes with “I” (Indeterminate) group clergy. Churchwardens often played the decisive role in such parishes, with some falling in step with their minister’s basic passivity and others taking a more energetic approach. The latter constitute a notably smaller group, but such men could still help bring about numerous and expensive changes to their parishes nevertheless. The most obvious example of this is at Warsop. Right away in 1635, the churchwardens reported problems with the floors, though they were unable to carry out the repairs until over a year later. Moreover, in 1637 they were overseeing removal of seats at the east of the chancel, repairs to the roof, the railing of the communion table, and the removal of the reading place out of the chancel, among other changes.\textsuperscript{68} By contrast, in parishes like Rossington, Stapleford, and East Leake, neither churchwardens nor clergymen took much initiative. Under William Plaxton, the churchwardens of Rossington spent only about £11 over the 1635-1639 period and presented few offenses other than fornication.\textsuperscript{69} Likewise, the churchwardens of Stapleford, working under
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Richard Jepson, spent even less on church repairs, while those at East Leake seem only to have overseen minor amendments to the church roof in 1638.\textsuperscript{70}

One might intuitively assume that a stormier story played out for the archdeaconry’s CNL clergy, given their greater penchant for observing the (sometimes unpopular) ecclesiastical canons. This was undoubtedly true in certain cases, such as that of Edward Warren, Vicar at Marnham from 1627-1640, but may have owed more to difficult churchwardens than anything else. At Marnham, Warren’s trouble with the churchwardens began as early as 1630, when Warren accused the latter of being “recess in presenting abuses” such as a “broken” and “rifled” communion table, a case of fornication, and the lack of proper communion vessels.\textsuperscript{71} Again in 1632 Warren was having trouble with his churchwardens, stating in his presentment that “if the churchwardens do not present [the infractions] he [Warren] leaves their reformation to the court.”\textsuperscript{72} As of 1638, it appears that Warren and his churchwardens were competing to make the other party look bad in the eyes of the hierarchy. The churchwardens claimed in September that there was no surplice, nor communion cup, cover, or flagon. Yet, in a November letter to the Registrar John Coombe, Warren retorted that he wore his surplice and had in fact obtained a chalice and flagon, though they had been borrowed from Normanton.\textsuperscript{73} It is probable that the churchwardens’ presentment was followed by a visit from another high ranking member of the archidiaconal administration, Edmund Lacocke, who apparently instructed an already flustered Warren to provide a new cover for the font.\textsuperscript{74} Warren’s case, then, illustrates how conflict between churchwardens and ministers could create avenues through which Laudianism might be
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imported to a given parish—even if those conflicts did not always concern specifically Laudian measures.

Rector William Sarson of Stanford-upon-Soar (1630-1640) had an even dimmer view, at times, of his churchwardens than Warren had. Given the generally negative characterization of Laudianism in the literature, one is tempted to assume Sarson’s Laudianism by his blunt disparagement of his two churchwardens as a “knave” and a “fool” respectively. In a 1639 letter to Coombe, he recounts reading through the entire book of canons in the church and giving due notice “at every canon that was defective” for the churchwardens to take appropriate measures. Ostensibly such were not forthcoming, as one of the churchwardens failed to appear at the visitation, claiming illness but purportedly being seen fishing the very same day. The other churchwarden, the “fool,” did attend the visitation but refused to present any of the defects noted by Sarson: a missing poor man’s box, lack of a chest with three locks, broken down seats in the church and issues with the hedge around the churchyard.75 While Sarson was somewhat exceptional in citing a man for gadding to Stanford-upon-Soar, it is not exactly clear if this should be seen as indicative of Laudian inclinations. In any case, given Sarson’s strictness on other counts, it is notable that there was no rail for the communion table even as of December 1638, and that Sarson had been presented on multiple occasions for failing to resolve issues with the chancel.76 Sarson in this sense typifies the CNL clergyman, having certain overlapping concerns with those of Laudians but apparently lacking in areas the latter considered vitally important. This makes Stanford-upon-Soar’s meager expenses between 1635-1639 more understandable.77
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The Vicar of Orston from 1624-1638, CNL John Musson also faced conflict with his churchwardens during his tenure, though to a lesser extent. In 1628, he wrote to the Deputy Registrar warning him that the churchwardens might fail to present the decay in the churchyard fence, and in another letter asked the Deputy Registrar to “terrifie, if not punish” those responsible for the same. In 1635, a new pair of churchwardens returned the favor, presenting not merely the lack of a hood, but Musson for failing to wear it. At the same time, the churchwardens seem to have been unable to determine who was at fault for the decayed churchyard fence, presenting by late 1638 that the “whole town of Orston” was responsible. Moreover, though the repurchasing of the many church goods allegedly stolen in 1639 likely proved expensive, the churchwardens had not spent more than £10 in any single year since 1635. Thus, Musson seems to have avoided the sort of sustained contest that Warren had engaged in, and thereby avoided too much attention from the administration.

Other CNL clergy had more positive relationships with their churchwardens, and at least several of these men could point to clear churchwarden approval of their conduct. Perhaps the most well-behaved was Gilbert Benet, parson of Bilsthorpe from 1625 to 1663, whose long tenure suggests distinctly pastoral priorities. In 1631, his churchwardens affirmed that “we have not any crimes for which we should present the authoures thereof, and have bin carefull to see Gods worship maintained and conformity to the constitutions and ceremonies of our church performed.” Benet had demonstrated a close working relationship with his churchwardens earlier on in his tenure, as in 1628 when they dutifully searched the town for absentees one
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Sabbath day at his direction. It is possible that Benet had some “Arminian” training while at Christ’s College Cambridge, as a then leading Arminian theologian, William Chappell, was fellow there at the same time. Working against Benet’s being a Laudian, however, is that no communion rail had been provided until 1638. As with Scrooby, it does not appear this was because of churchwarden resistance, as the order given to provide the rail in October 1637 had already been carried out three months later. Luke Mason, rector of Hockerton from 1618 to 1640, also appears to have been on good terms with his churchwardens. In 1633, the latter presented that “the church and churchyard, bells and church appurtenances are in good repair; the minister says prayers every Wednesday and Friday.” Aside from not having the table of the prohibited degrees of marriage in 1630 and not having a hood in 1637, very little seems to have been amiss in Hockerton during Mason’s time. Furthermore, no cases, chancery or otherwise, have been found relating to the rail or any church fabric issues for Hockerton in the 1630s. It would be going beyond the evidence, however, to say that Mason was likely a Laudian, for nothing recorded or implied in the available records signifies explicitly Laudian behaviors.

Notwithstanding, one cannot assume that harmonious clergy-churchwarden relationships always precluded the pursuit of major changes or repairs. At Thorpe, conformity seems to have been the rule of the day under CNL minister John Scarlett, with little being presented even in the 1630s. Yet by the end of 1636, the churchwardens were able to report that the seats of the church were nearing completion, about £100 having been laid out for the purpose. The following May,
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churchwardens proudly reported that “the church steeple and all the seats are newly made; there is a new pulpit and a new rail for the communion table and all the church ornaments are fitting and decent.” This work cost the parish £180, the largest amount reported by any parish for any single year in the latter 1630s. Similarly, under CNL Richard Caldwell at Normanton-upon-Soar, the churchwardens consistently showed themselves attentive to the church’s needs. In 1628 they had quickly seen to the repair of the windstorm-damaged chancel, and over 1635 spent roughly £160 to mend the defective steeple and churchyard walls.

More numerous, however, were parishes with long-lived ministers and mostly moderate churchwardens who did not prove to be vital agents for Laudian measures. Vicar of Beeston Walter Kindersley served the parish from 1604 until 1645 but managed to spend most of that time in relative peace. In 1630, the churchwardens claimed, “our minister is conformable, and our church is in good repair.” It is likely, however, that especially after 1635, Kindersley and his churchwardens had a different understanding of conformity than that of Mottershed’s administration. In 1636, Kindersley appointed a moderate puritan, Emmanuel Knutton, to serve as curate. Kindersley had also managed to go without a hood until the latter half of 1638, and there was no communion rail installed until 1639. Repairs to the church roof did not begin until late 1640. This makes it less surprising that only small expenses were reported by
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churchwardens in the latter 1630s, with the £7 listed for 1636 being the highest for any year, and allegedly no money spent on repairs in 1639.95

Leonard Foster also seems to have led a fairly peaceful life while parson of Screveton from 1602 to 1652. During the first decades of his tenure, the primary concern of Foster and his successive churchwardens appears to have been the repair of the steeple. Already in 1614, it was claimed that over £100 had been spent, yet it was still “not brought to that perfection” the churchwardens desired.96 In 1620 it was still under repair, and only in 1625 does it appear to have been finished.97 Even in 1625, the primary focus of the presentments continued to be on the church fabric, specifically the bells, wheels, and bell frames, which the churchwardens alleged could not be mended “because their parish is poor” and due to the “great charges” spent on the steeple.98 Curiously, the presentment bills from 1630 onward are virtually silent, aside from the occasional case of fornication and a few other isolated incidents such as a man refusing to pay the fee for a burial. Unlike some parishes, however, this apparent conformity does not seem to have been concealing any major ongoing issues. No court cases revealing non-conformity or defects in the church fabric appear in the records, and the expenditures given from 1636 to 1639 show a steady decline from £4 in 1636 to 3s 4d in 1639, indicating that such repairs as were needed were dealt with in a timely manner.99

A similar quietude prevailed in Broughton Sulney under parson Richard Colebrand, who served from 1596 to 1653. Only two cases survive of verbal abuse toward Colebrand, one in 1610 and the other in 1625, when one Edward Urson claimed that he was “as honest . . . and as
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good a man” as Colebrand.\textsuperscript{100} No presentments survive that indicate any neglect or non-conformity on the part of Colebrand. Indeed, he and the successive pairs of churchwardens appear to have been more concerned with sexual immorality than anything else, but even these presentments are rather few in number. As in Screveton, the presentment bills for the early 1630s are peculiarly silent, nothing being presented aside from two cases of negligent attendance from 1629 through 1634. If Colebrand had in fact looked upon the advent of “Laudianism” with much ardor, he likely would have set up the rail before the communion table at some point during these years, but this had not been done by April 1635. The churchyard walls were also presented as defective at this time.\textsuperscript{101} Some indication of remaining church fabric issues emerges in 1639, when the churchwardens recorded an expenditure of £25.\textsuperscript{102} Yet, consistent with the overall tenor of conformity that characterized Colebrand’s tenure, no more is heard of the communion rail, and no court cases survive against either Colebrand or Broughton Sulney churchwardens for slackness or non-compliance.\textsuperscript{103}

Richard Gymney’s similarly long tenure as vicar of East Stoke (1578-1634) was not quite as tranquil as Colebrand’s, but significant affinities can still be noted. The churchwardens presented Gymney in 1612 and again in 1613 for omitting divine service on “divers” days as well as not visiting the sick.\textsuperscript{104} From the May 1614 presentment, made by Gymney and the churchwardens together, one learns that Gymney had been licensed to preach by Archbishop Matthew. This corroborates the presumption that Gymney’s absence from the collegiate alumni registers indicates his non-graduate status, keeping in mind that Gymney began his tenure at East
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Stoke in 1578 and Matthew did not become Archbishop of York until 1606. Gymney’s experience of the high tide of English Protestantism comes through clearly in 1628, when he presented the then churchwardens and several others for absenting themselves from divine service at morning prayer on 5 November 1628 appointed for a public thanksgiving for our miraculous preservation and deliverance from the “gune powder treason.” Some concerns over other neglectful habits of the churchwardens, however, were also expressed at this time, as the latter had apparently failed to present absentees and to collect the 12d due from each parishioner “according to the statute.” Moreover, they had not provided “a seemly piece of cloth or carpet to cover the communion table, a cushion for the pulpit” or a suitable communion cup, Gymney describing the latter as a “sillie peece of siluer, and neither fitt nor seemly for that religious and godly use that it is for.” Further appeal to authority was made in presenting a man for his “wilful disobedience and manifest contempt for the ecclesiastical laws in persevering in the sentence of excommunication” for some time.105 Nonetheless, as in Colebrand’s case, the years 1629-1634 seem to have brought little trouble to East Stoke, several cases of fornication and alehouse haunting notwithstanding. Thus, practically speaking, the continued presence of long-serving CNL ministers meant a persisting influence of older ideals of conformity. Though these did butt against Laudian norms at times, their observance more often made for relatively tranquil experiences of the 1630s in Nottinghamshire.

In addition to upholding the canons of the Church, it may be suspected that some CNL clergymen left evidence of a fondness for Sunday sports. David Underdown is one well-known proponent of the notion that during the 1630s, “cultural traditionalism was naturally often
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accompanied by Laudianism.” Christopher Haigh tends to agree with this notion, though he more broadly emphasizes that the “relaxed and sociable” pastor became increasingly common in the Caroline period. By contrast, far from associating Laudianism with community or traditional pastimes, David Marcombe characterizes it as a strategy designed to remedy the apathy and individualism caused by the progress of the Reformation, but one implemented through legal sanctions rather than communal initiatives. In any case, it is clear that for Nottinghamshire presentations for unlawful game playing or other such activities were few and far between. Somewhat unexpectedly, one of these cases occurred in 1633 in Scrooby, when the churchwardens presented the puritan curate Hugh Shaw and five other men for “bowling on the Sabbath.” By contrast, the CNL Vicar of Sturton-le-Steeple Edward Barnes, took a stand against game playing. In 1634, he presented several men for playing football in the churchyard and for using the bell ropes to “draw a plough after the manner of beasts about the Towne and church-yard.” Even without much additional evidence, these examples illustrate that clergymen cannot be simplistically thought of as traditionalist, sociable types or as kill-joys simply by virtue of their status as puritans or otherwise. Nevertheless, the limited records touching games and pastimes in 1630s Nottinghamshire suggest that these tended to be of more concern to certain churchwardens than to ministers. CNL clergymen, then, cannot be held responsible for reviving pastimes often associated with Laudianism to any significant degree.
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Patronage of CNL clergymen, as with NL ministers, belonged to a fairly broad number of individuals, some more prominent than others. The Crown ranks in first place, having presented eight CNL men, mostly during the reign of James I. In fact, the only CNL man instituted by King Charles was Robert Aynsworth at Bulwell in 1627.\textsuperscript{112} Similarly, among the three CNL clergymen presented by the Archbishop of York, two had been placed by Archbishop Matthew and the other by Archbishop Harsnett in 1630. Trinity College, Cambridge, presented two CNL men, both before the Caroline period, and the only other individual patrons of more than one CNL minister were Sir Hardolph Wasteneys, who served as High Sheriff of Nottinghamshire in 1635, and William Herbert, third Earl of Pembroke. The case of Wasteneys yields another example of puritans losing a possible patron, as his forebears had presented several ministers between c. 1580 and c. 1620 that were either deprived or who would resign.\textsuperscript{113} Neither was Pembroke much interested in the godly sort, having spent most of his time in the court of James I’s, and considered moderate enough to be named Chancellor of Oxford in 1624. His presentee to West Markham in 1620, fittingly enough, was another moderate Oxford man, Robert Bruen, whose principal concern throughout his sixteen-year tenure was recusancy.\textsuperscript{114}

Although men from nearly every category faced ejection or sequestration at some point in the 1640s-1650s, CNL men make up a substantial portion of the whole. In all, at least nineteen Nottinghamshire ministers are listed as having suffered or been ejected in the 1640s and 1650s. Most of these men had at least an MA degree, while three had a BD, and two a DD. No decisive trends appear in terms of the colleges these ministers attended. Trinity College, Cambridge, St.
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John’s College, Cambridge, and Magdalene College, Oxford, each produced three future sufferers. No other institution sent more than one, and perhaps unsurprisingly, Emmanuel College, Cambridge and Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, did not contribute any. One might expect that many of the suffering CNL clergy would be at least accused of holding to Laudian positions, but in fact even some known L clergy did not face this charge.\textsuperscript{115} In the case of Barnaby Barlow, for example, A.G. Matthews’ listing only records that Barlow was sequestered for “delinquency.”\textsuperscript{116} More common for CNL clergy was the charge of royalism and/or ill-will toward the Parliamentary or Cromwellian regime. Matthews records that Edward Bigland, rector of East and West Leake from 1621 to, was “a prisoner for long at Nottingham” and ultimately died in 1650.\textsuperscript{117} The historian of East Leake, Sidney Pell Potter, describes that, after the elderly Bigland declared for the king, he was forced to endure a chilly night in an uncovered wagon on the way to prison in Nottingham. Potter posits that this experience caused Bigland to become palsied, thus hastening his death.\textsuperscript{118}

Other CNL men would be accused of some form of “delinquency,” the specific infractions resulting in this charge not always being specified. Marmaduke Moore, Rector of Ordsall from 1631, was sequestered in 1650 for “playing cards with his wife three times.”\textsuperscript{119} Similarly, John Stock, Rector of Lowdham from 1625, suffered sequestration in 1646 as a “common drunkard and swearer” and appears to have been a non-graduate.\textsuperscript{120} Stock apparently came to be considered an “unsatisfactory vicar,” though such a conclusion cannot necessarily be
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deduced from the surviving presentment bills. More seriously, the non-graduate Vicar of Edwinstowe, George Rigges, faced charges in 1648 of being “very unfit for ministry owing to his weake parts and ignorance in learning.” It is possible that these charges were in some part motivated by a tithe suit Rigges had brought against several parishioners, but Rigges would fly the parish in any case, perhaps recognizing a general drive against ministers lacking sufficient education or preaching ability.

By contrast, ministers in the CL and L groups were almost all sufficiently learned, and some notably so. John Neile, Matthew Wren, and William Robinson, for instance, all had or would attain the DD degree. Pluralism was another trait shared by many in the L group. Though never aspired to for its own sake, pluralism by the early seventeenth-century had simply become a fact in and for the Church. In part, as Stieg notes, this state of affairs owed to the existence of “many benefices of little value,” which in turn created a greater need among some clergy for additional resources. At the same time, some system of rewards and remuneration was needed to motivate the clerical elite, many of whom had spent long years obtaining multiple degrees while also filling university posts and other offices. The Canons of 1604 had recognized the reality of pluralism but also attempted to regulate it. The pluralist had to hold at least the MA degree and be licensed to preach in the appropriate jurisdictions. Furthermore, he had to spend some time resident in each of his benefices each year, which livings could be no more than 30 miles apart, and had to make provision for a licensed preacher in the living he was normally absent from. According to Galloway, as of the early seventeenth-century, these stipulations would have applied to roughly 1/6th of the English clergy, though in London and Middlesex that figure was
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closer to 1/3rd. Precise figures for pluralism are difficult to determine for Nottinghamshire, in part due to its bordering counties lying within different dioceses or even a different province. Yet, excluding men who held livings and served as curates at nearby chapelries, it has been possible to ascertain at least 23 ministers who could be called pluralists for one reason or another. Five of these men belong to the L category.

At least among these L clergymen, pluralism was a reality that helped limit the concretization of Laudianism even in parishes held by those seemingly most dedicated to Laudian ideals. That is to say, the five men in question include the likes of John Neile, nephew to Archbishop Neile; Matthew Wren, future commander of the “Laudian blitzkrieg” in Norwich; and William Robinson, no less than the half-brother of Archbishop Laud. Wren was the first of the five to obtain a living in the archdeaconry, having been presented by the Crown to the Rectory of Bingham in 1624. As of 1625, among other posts, Wren would hold the Mastership of Peterhouse College, Cambridge, and from 1628 a royal chaplaincy, and the Deanery of Windsor and of the Collegiate Church of Wolverhampton. In practice, these offices made Wren’s presence in or attention to Bingham rather unlikely. In fact, in 1625 the churchwardens presented Wren for not providing service the “first Sunday in Lent.” Several years later, in 1631, it was alleged that a non-ordained man, not having lawful orders, was reading service. Wren employed a fellow Pembroke graduate as curate, the NL Edward Wethered, who does not appear to have been particularly interested in emphasizing Laudian scruples. At least in 1635, he was
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accused of not wearing the hood while reading divine service.\textsuperscript{130} This state of affairs did not see much alteration once fellow Laudian and pluralist William Robinson gained the Rectory in 1635. While also Archdeacon of Nottingham from the same year, Robinson was already a prebend of Westminster (since 1608) and would become a prebend of St. David’s in 1635 as well. The largest amount recorded by Bingham churchwardens toward repairs in the 1635-1639 period was a mere £6 in 1636.\textsuperscript{131}

At Barton in Fabis, John Neile did not gain the living until 1635. He was nearly as rank a pluralist as Wren, holding prebendal stalls in Southwell, York, and Durham cathedrals, serving as a chaplain to his uncle, and holding a fellowship at his alma mater, Pembroke College, Cambridge.\textsuperscript{132} In practice, this would have made it rather difficult to attend to Barton in Fabis from 1635-1637, even though the presentments do not mention any curates. The churchwardens note £1 6s 8d spent on the church in 1635, much less than the average for this year (about £10), and very much less than some parishes were spending. No note is made concerning the railing of the altar, suggesting that this had likely been completed without incident—perhaps before 1635 or even earlier. Nor did churchwardens note the lack of supplies, or problems with the building of any sort; only £1 is recorded for repair expenditures in 1637.\textsuperscript{133} These circumstances do not appear to have altered much when another chaplain to Archbishop Neile and prebend of Southwell, Barnaby Barlow, replaced John Neile in 1637. The penance bills reveal that Barlow was employing Richard Hickman as curate in 1638. Nothing more on Hickman can be known, though unsurprisingly he is not included on Marchant’s list of puritans. It may be that Hickman
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felt compelled to remedy some faults with the church fabric during his tenure, as the
churchwardens record £16 spent on repairs in 1639. The Barton-in-Fabis expenditures, thus, go
against the general bell curve trend, with 1636 and 1637 seeing the highest average expense for
the majority of parishes.\(^{134}\)

Overall quietude is also apparent in Langar parish during John Fairclough’s tenure,
beginning in 1638.\(^{135}\) The most direct evidence for Fairclough’s Laudianism comes from a 1635
sermon he preached at Southwark entitled “A sermon of obedience and submission.” “Religion is
forced,” Fairclough argues, “into a melancholike dejection, if not supported by Lawes provided
for her content. Shee’s at least obscured where not countenanced with authority; and languishes
in a consumption where she despaires of regard.”\(^{136}\) To some extent, his views should not be
surprising. Stephen Wright notes that John’s uncle, Daniel Featley, was a well-known critic of
non-conformity, who also wrote books against Catholicism and the doctrine of transubstantiation
in particular. Intriguingly, Daniel Featley also wrote works against Arminian theology, including
a book titled *Pelagius redivivus. Or Pelagius raked out of the ashes by Arminius and his
schollers.* For his part, John seems to have had a refreshingly restrained view of puritanism—the
moderate variety albeit—calling such churchmen those who “better relish our doctrine than our
discipline.” Yet even they, he continues, must “stoope low enough to enter in at the gate.”\(^{137}\) As
with Neile and Barlow, the presentments during Fairclough’s time give little indication of
struggle or rigid enforcement. Penance bills reveal that Fairclough employed two different
curates for 1638 and 1639, and it is likely he was rarely in Langar, given his elevation to a royal
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chaplaincy in 1639. The apparent tranquility of the parish seems to owe also to dutiful churchwardens, as demonstrated by the fact that the September 1635 court order to provide a rail for the communion table was certified already by February 1636. In short, the fact that many of the archdeaconry’s Laudian clergy were prominent clerics actually helped to circumscribe Laudianism in parishes that might have otherwise encountered quite different experiences.

By contrast, the tenures of two CL men illustrate how ministers in more humble circumstances may have appropriated certain Laudian concerns to better establish their positions. J.R. Mawdesley and Christopher Spencer, for example, have suggested that some clergy grasped onto Laudianism as a source of strength in new and/or potentially difficult environments, such as parishes that either had substantial puritan elements or were bordered by those that did. Henry Pratt, Curate of Shelford from 1635-1637, did have an MA and the standing of an esquire’s son, but perhaps this only made him more determined to have his way. Already concerned in 1637 about parishioners gadding to other parishes on Sundays and holy days, Pratt later that year took the rare step of presenting his churchwardens for other shortcomings: failing to provide for “good seats in the church” or obtain a hood, even though money had been allocated for the same. Perhaps Pratt had the misfortune of coming up against particularly stubborn churchwardens, as the two men would have to undergo excommunication and fines in order to admit their fault. Even so, the seats remained unmended into 1639, and it is not clear if or when the seating issues were remedied.

---
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The pluralist Rector of Cromwell, Henry Truman, appears to have spent most of his time at his other living at Walesby, leaving his curates to handle most of the day-to-day clerical duties. From 1637 to 1638, that man was John Hague, who was possibly a non-graduate. What is clear, however, is that by early 1638, Hague was feeling somewhat defensive about his ministerial competency. In an unprecedentedly long presentment bill from February, Hague began by complaining of a certain woman who “reviled” him, and of another woman for “finding fault with his burial of the dead.” Hague chalked her discontent up to a corresponding disapproval of the Prayer Book, which rubric, by implication, he had followed to the letter. Next, Hague called out a man whom he had not been able to prevent from sleeping during divine service, along with a woman for her “irreverence in not saluting him” during a burial ceremony, and several men who claimed they would continue their “superstitious ringing for the dead. . . whether the curate wills it or not.” More seriously, perhaps, Hague concluded with charges against his churchwardens, that they had provided neither a book of canons, a flagon of pewter for the communion, nor a rail before the communion table.\textsuperscript{143} At any rate, Hague’s long tirade appears to have led to some positive changes, for in April of the following year, the churchwardens could claim that “the church and churchyard are in very good repair.”\textsuperscript{144} It seems fair to say that Hague’s success owed at least in part to a broadly shared awareness of both the hierarchy’s goals and its disciplinary capabilities.

As the case of CL George Greene demonstrates, however, such an awareness did not necessarily elicit conformity or compliance. Even more than Hague, Greene faced serious challenges both to his legitimacy and to his ministerial methods. This becomes less surprising
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when one recognizes the history and character of North Collingham, being in an area with strong nonconformist roots.\textsuperscript{145} In 1610, for example, a man had been presented for claiming that those who kneel to pray “offereth the sacrifice of fooles and [their] prayer is abominable.”\textsuperscript{146} About a decade later, a man complained that the puritan minister, George Longden, taught too harshly against the Brownists and Anabaptists in his sermons.\textsuperscript{147} North Collingham’s proximity to South Collingham, a parish with even stronger puritan links, also exacerbated the situation upon Greene’s arrival, providing as it did a place for disaffected North Collingham parishioner to attend and hold up as a counter-example to their own church and minister.\textsuperscript{148} Tensions flared in 1625, for example, when a man allegedly laid hands upon Greene’s wife in the church, causing Greene to attempt to pull the man from his wife’s seat.\textsuperscript{149}

Notwithstanding Greene’s continued presentations against nonconformity or other lay misbehavior from 1624, he had to draw up quite similar presentments well into the following decade, including the citation of twelve persons in 1635 who had failed to pay Greene their Easter offerings.\textsuperscript{150} Later in the same year, fully 24 parishioners had to be cited for not coming to prayers, many of them likely venturing to parishes more suited to their taste.\textsuperscript{151} Further evidence suggests that by the 1630s, Greene was indeed appropriating certain Laudian concerns as a means of controlling his unruly congregation, or even his churchwardens. In May 1635, Greene cited the recently departed churchwardens for “suffering lay juries to be in the church and to make their orders at the communion table and to be of the jury themselves.”\textsuperscript{152} It seems likely
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that Greene was behind the court order for the communion table to be railed in September 1635—earlier than most parishes so directed—for he must also have been behind the concomitant case against the churchwardens who misused the table.\footnote{Marchant, “The Restoration of Nottinghamshire Churches,” 80. Apparently the churchwardens so cited appeared before the court in October but were dismissed.} While far from the norm in Nottinghamshire, Greene’s tenure nevertheless highlights the extent to which the right combination of factors and circumstances could lead to the sort of fireworks typically—but misleadingly—associated with Laudianism more generally.

Among the L group ministers, only two men saw “fireworks” on anything like the same scale as Mr. Greene in North Collingham. Gervase Dodson was introduced at the outset of this chapter, having had the misfortune of presiding over the church attended by Henry Ireton and his equally intractable mother. As Egan would have it, the primary reason to call Dodson a Laudian, as opposed to placing him in the CL group, is that there is clear evidence that he compelled reception at the rails of the altar without being directly forced to do so.\footnote{Mary-Millicent Egan, “Laudians, Puritans and the Laity in Essex c. 1630-1642,” (PhD diss., University of London, University College London (United Kingdom) 2001), 36.} Yet like Greene, Dodson faced serious misbehavior on the part of many in his congregation, and chose to confront it head on. His presentment bill of May 1632 has been reproduced in full below, in large part to highlight the variety of indiscipline displayed:

[T]he vicar presents Richard Granger and Umphray Rabye of Chilwell for their neglect in coming to the church on Sundays and holy days, and particularly for their absence on Sundays at evening prayer, and for not ordering themselves in the time of divine service according to the 18th Canon; Thomas Reclis, Wm Leanard alias Bostock and Robt Foster
of Chilwell, and Richard Brownley, Widow Kinge and John Dore of Adenborough for sleeping in the church in time of divine service and sermon, and for their unreverent carriage, never joining with the minister or clerk at the end of prayer in saying 'Amen', nor in the confession of sin or the articles of faith, nor in the repetition of the Lord's Prayer with any audible voice as is required by the 18th Canon; Wm Leanard alias Bostock for his unreverent going out of the church before the sermon was ended on Sunday 15 April, and scoffingly reporting in the alehouse that 'he would stay noe longer to heare the ministers raylinge'; Thomas Heb of Adenbrough for causing the bells to be confusedly and disorderly rung on 3 May, and in the ringing the great bell was thrown over at least 3 or 4 times to the hurt of both the bell and the frame; Elynor Ireton, John Ireton, Elisabeth Carter and Thomas Heb for usually going from the parish church at evening catechism, exposition, service and sermon both in the time of Lent and at other times, and for not applying themselves in divine service according to the 18th Canon; Thomas Cooke and Thomas Keywood, the old churchwardens, for not presenting these things despite being admonished to do so by the Court and the minister; the said churchwardens because the church windows are in decay and unrepaired.155

At the same time, aside from the Iretons in 1636, the main targets of Dodson and his churchwardens from 1635 seem to have been a handful of recusants, with a few fornicators and negligent attenders also scattered through the presentment bills of the late 1630s.156

156 AN/PB 303/441; AN/PB 303/683.
Such was not quite the luck of William Clough, Vicar of Kneesall from 1633-1638, who likely had a more irascible personality, but also inherited a parish with stronger puritan roots. His position was not strengthened by the fact that puritan minister Luke Bacon had just presided for the previous seven years. Even before Bacon’s time, at least some had seen fit to frequent other churches on Sundays, with 15 persons cited for this offense in 1625 alone.\footnote{AN/PB 326/9/36.} Gadding continued under Clough, unsurprisingly, and parishioners like Theophilus Nicolson, Richard Hickson, Daniell Britten and others were reproved by Clough as “continual runner[s] abroad to other churches” such as Kirton, Mansfield, Papplewick and Norwell. Others refused to stand up at the reading of the Gospel, bow at the name of Jesus, or properly kneel to say their prayers.\footnote{AN/PB 328/7/42.} More famously, in 1635 one disgruntled woman referred to divine service in the Church of England as “a company of shitten prayers.”\footnote{AN/PB 328/9/24.} As in the case of Dodson, the primary reason for Clough’s inclusion in the L group is not the presence of controversy in his parish, but because of direct evidence that he enforced reception at the rails of the altar. In fact, for at least two years, the same man refused to receive at the rails unless Clough could “show him either canon or article for it,” which evidence Clough was presumably either unwilling or unable to provide.\footnote{AN/PB 328/11/19; AN/PB 328/13/19.} Thus, as in the case of Greene, a combination of factors resulted in the concretization of Laudianism becoming particularly acute in Kneesall in much the same way as it had in North Collingham. The presence of an ideologically committed minister was an important factor in both cases, but not the only factor.

Nevertheless, it stands to reason that Nottinghamshire would have experienced heavier doses of Laudianism had men like Greene, Clough and Dodson been in greater supply. Several

\footnote{AN/PB 326/9/36.\footnote{AN/PB 328/7/42.\footnote{AN/PB 328/9/24.\footnote{AN/PB 328/11/19; AN/PB 328/13/19.}}}
partial explanations have been provided thus far as to why this was not the case in the 1630s. The nature of Nottinghamshire’s relationship to the two universities and their respective colleges played a key role, as did the fact that patronage was fairly widely distributed across the archdeaconry, being held largely by fairly well-to-do lay landowners. One other important factor was the relative lack of patronage held by ecclesiastical bodies who may have shared Laudian sympathies. Two consecutive Deans of Lincoln Cathedral, Roger Parker and Anthony Topham, presented men to Nottinghamshire livings: the puritan Richard Mustian at South Leverton in 1620, and Robert Topham at Clayworth in 1630, respectively.\(^{161}\) Even had Dean Topham had more patronage at his disposal, it is unlikely he would have preferred Laudian ministers, especially given Lincoln Diocese’s generally non or even anti-Laudian bent under Bishop John Williams, perhaps Laud’s most implacable foe.\(^{162}\) The Collegiate Church of Southwell had a bit more patronage, including four appointments in the 1630s alone, but did not use these occasions to place L or CL type clergymen, saving for William Clough. In fact, the other three 1630s placements involved puritans or potentially puritan ministers. Somewhat bizarrely, then, Southwell presented the puritan Luke Bacon in 1626 and a mere seven years later presented the quite different William Clough, both to Kneesall. In 1638, they presented yet another puritan to Kneesall, William Hewitt.\(^{163}\)

The Archbishop of York technically had presented more clergymen at work in the 1630s than Southwell, but it must be noted that Archbishop Matthew placed half of these, and that another spot went to Edmund Kemp, whom Archbishop Harsnett presented in 1630. This means

\[^{161}\text{Richard Mustian, } CCEd\text{ Person ID 120421,}\text{ Clergy of the Church of England Database 1540-1835,}\text{ http://theclergydatabase.org.uk, 10 Feb 2021.}\]


\[^{163}\text{William Hewitt, } CCEd\text{ Person ID 118166,}\text{ Clergy of the Church of England Database 1540-1835,}\text{ http://theclergydatabase.org.uk, 10 Feb 2021.}\]
that, as far as can be determined, Archbishop Neile directly presented only two clergymen to Nottinghamshire livings during his tenure: his nephew John Neile and another pluralist, Barnaby Barlow, both to Barton in Fabis in 1635 and 1637, respectively.\textsuperscript{164} This is a far cry from London and Middlesex, where the Bishop of London presented to 13 livings, and the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul’s, a further 17 livings.\textsuperscript{165} Neile’s paltry sum was matched by Charles I, who also presented two L clergymen, William Robinson to Bingham in 1635, and John Fairclough to Langar in 1638.\textsuperscript{166} As has been demonstrated above, Neile and Charles I’s placements were not only few in number, but also had little noticeable impact on their respective parishes—largely due to their extra-parochial responsibilities. One significant difference is that Charles at least theoretically had more opportunities to place Laudian sympathizers in Nottinghamshire livings, but for whatever reason did not do so. Thus, whereas elsewhere royal and episcopal patronage constituted a principal source of Laudian ministers, this was not the case in the Archdeaconry of Nottingham.

III. Conclusion

Broadly speaking, then, certain underlying preconditions and circumstances in the archdeaconry worked against the “full” weight of Laudianism being experienced here. While a number of parishes did have puritan ministers as of the 1630s, there were certainly fewer than had been present only several years prior. Moreover, a solid majority of those puritans who remained proved basically moderate and at least a fair number had churchwardens who were not especially willing to present puritan offenses or take the initiative in implementing Laudian

\textsuperscript{164} Certainly, Neile would have had some influence in other presentations, such as those made by the Crown. Nevertheless, two presentations is quite a small figure compared to other dioceses. See John Neile, \textit{CCEd Person ID 111243, Clergy of the Church of England Database 1540-1835}, http://theclergydatabase.org.uk, 10 Feb 2021.

\textsuperscript{165} Galloway, “English Arminianism,” 90.

measures. Activist churchwardens were even rarer sights in parishes with non-puritan ministers, and particularly in the case of I and NL clergy, often neither ministers nor churchwardens made notable efforts in any direction. Elements of Laudianism were more likely to concretize in parishes with CNL or CL ministers, but even these parishes were relatively few in number and unrepresentative in their assemblage of circumstances and personalities. It also bears repeating that a majority of the already meager number of L group ministers were rank pluralists and appear to have spent little, if any, time in their Nottinghamshire livings. Thus, somewhat ironically, this fulfilled stereotype actually worked to diminish the concretization of Laudianism in the archdeaconry. The realities and accidents of patronage also contributed toward this end. Elizabeth I, James I and Charles I each presented similar numbers of ministers still active in the 1630s, and Charles I appears not to have been especially interested in presenting committed Laudians despite having had the opportunity. Unlike other regions, the archdeaconry possessed hardly any singularly-minded puritan patrons with large numbers of livings. Nor did individuals or ecclesiastical bodies with Laudian sympathies hold much patronage. Archbishop Neile had long been among the most important patrons of the Laudian interest, but managed only two presentations during his tenure, both confined to the single living at Barton in Fabis. In short, conditions were not ideal for the flourishing of Laudianism in the archdeaconry. Clearly, however, elements of Laudianism still impacted parishioners and churches alike during the 1630s. Analyzing its effects in detail will constitute the primary aim of the chapters that follow.
Chapter Three
Laudianism and Ecclesiastical Discipline

In the mind of polemicist William Prynne, Laud and Laudianism were scarcely
distinguishable from the Plague. “Popery and superstition,” Prynne asserted, traveled with Laud
to Westminster, to the universities and “from thence to Canterbury, Winchester, and most other
Cathedralls in England; and from them to our Parish Churches and Chapels, all which he
miserably defiled, corrupted with Popish superstitious Crucifixes, Altars, Bowings, Ceremonies,
Tapers, Copes, and other Innovations.”¹ Prynne’s sentiments have found their modern echoes in
the works of Nicholas Tyacke and Patrick Collinson, which go as far as to call Laud “the greatest
calamity ever visited upon the English Church.”² As previously noted, early efforts at more
localized studies, such as that of Margaret Stieg on Bath and Wells, reached similar conclusions:
Bishop Piers’ glowing reports of his diocese, Stieg contends, were utterly out of touch with the
“deep and broad resistance” to Laudian policies and churchmanship at the parochial level.³
Moreover, suggestions that some degree of residual Catholicism, or at least apathy to
Protestantism, helped form a parochial basis for Laudian efforts have been rejected by Judith
Maltby and others who argue for clear distinctions, if not open opposition, between “Prayer
Book Protestants” and Laudians.⁴ As Archbishop Laud was tried and found guilty, so, it seems,
have been the clergy and churchmanship that bear his name.

¹ William Prynne, Canterbury’s doome, or, The first part of a compleat history of the commitment, charge, tryall, condemnation, execution of william Laud etc. (London, 1646), 58-59.
While the previous chapter outlined important factors that circumscribed Laudianism in the Archdeaconry of Nottingham, it remains to be seen in what more specific ways and to what extent Laudianism impinged on the lives of everyday parishioners. Did Laudianism, its limited materialization notwithstanding, provoke widespread resistance among the laity in Nottinghamshire as it is said to have done here and elsewhere? The present chapter proposes to approach this and related questions through the lens of ecclesiastical discipline and by means of a data-driven methodology not often employed in studies concerning Laudianism. Though not a perfect record of the archdeaconry’s ecclesiastical history, when combined with court and other visitation records, an extensive base of archidiaconal presentment bills dating from the 1590s to the early 1640s allows examination of changes in the scale, scope, and content of ecclesiastical discipline over the early seventeenth century. This permits closer investigation of common assumptions about the novelty and disruptiveness of Laudian policies in comparison with earlier drives for conformity, especially pertinent in light of claims that these alleged disruptions helped provoke the English Civil War. While presenting and analyzing evidence in a categorical fashion, this chapter argues that, though several important shifts stand out in the Laudian period, discontinuities regarding ecclesiastical discipline were not as extensive as some, like Tyacke, would presuppose. In terms of disciplinary action, the most notable shifts concerned church restoration work, and therefore tended to be felt most acutely by churchwardens, some of whom would be cited to appear before the archidiaconal court. By contrast, those discontinuities that clergy and lay persons most widely experienced with regard to ecclesiastical discipline

---

related largely, though not exclusively, to issues of pre-Laudian conformity. Given evidence from throughout the early Stuart period of lay interest in, and knowledge of, contemporary religious concerns, the paucity of blatantly anti-Laudian speech or actions in the archdeaconry strengthens the conclusion that what Laudian measures did concretize here were not as despised or unsettling as many might presume. A fuller understanding of the experience of Laudianism, however, will require approaching the topic from other angles and asking different sorts of questions, particularly with regard to the costs and material changes that Laudian measures effected across the archdeaconry. Such measures may have primarily implicated churchwardens in the eyes of the court but could be felt by the laity in other ways. These issues will be pursued further in chapters four and five.

To be sure, the findings previewed above are not unprecedented. Other historians’ conclusions have also given cause to question the prevailing wisdom on the experience of Laudianism. Mary Millicent Egan’s study of Laudianism in Essex has notably uncovered not only a much broader Laudian presence in this supposed Puritan heartland than is typically conceived—41 Laudian ministers working in 50 different parishes—but also a fair amount of lay support for the Laudian changes that derived as well from “Prayer Book Protestants.” Some parishioners, for example, found themselves accused of joining their Laudian ministers in Sunday games considered unbecoming by the hotter sort of Protestants. James Galloway’s study of “English Arminianism” in and around London also found that “at least some elements of the laity . . . were prepared to go along with the innovations of the 1630s.” Importantly, Galloway
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7 Still, scholars like Peter White, Kevin Sharpe, and Julian Davies—emphasizing relative continuity and consensus during the 1630s—have proven to be outnumbered by the followers of Tyacke, Collinson and others.


further discovered that support for Laudian initiatives and/or for individual Laudian ministers—for example, those beleaguered in the 1640s—did not necessarily or even usually indicate “Arminian” beliefs on the part of supporters and patrons. Rather, such men presumably saw in the Laudian refurbishing and beautification campaign much overlap with their own sense of piety. This means that one need not uncover lay “Arminianism” to argue against the notion of Laudianism’s essentially universal disapprobation. In other cases, furthermore, laymen appealed to the Bishop against attempts by their parishes’ select vestries to install puritan preachers and lecturers.10

The question of the “concreteness” of Laudianism in different parts of the country has also recently been reexplored. Peter Smart and William Prynne had certainly assumed and lamented Laudianism’s pervasive reach, and modern historians have sought to test the veracity of their fears. Margaret Stieg took the reality of Laudian policies at the parochial level as a main point of inquiry in the 1980s.11 More recent works have sought to revisit this issue as well. Even David Cressy, who has by and large stood by his assertion that “Caroline religious thoroughness wrecked both church and state,” acknowledges that in many areas of the country “there was silence and peace,” and that “Charles I’s quieter subjects lived, as did ordinary people in most periods, with a mixture of custom, accommodation, and indifference.”12 One might assume that in poor and marginally populated regions, apathy, indifference and even outright resistance to any organized religion prevailed. Sylvia Watts hypothesized along these lines as she set out to study Laudianism’s impact on parishes in Staffordshire and North Shropshire. Despite the

10 Ibid., 262.
11 Stieg, Laud’s Laboratory, 282.
12 David Cressy, Bonfires and Bells: National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1989), 44.
relative isolation and poverty of these counties, Watts found that Laudianism was indeed “a phenomenon appreciable at the local level” even in parishes considered “poor, remote and sparsely populated.” Recognizing that this was also the case in Nottinghamshire, what follows will aim to move the conversation forward by paying special attention to when, where, and how Laudianism became “appreciable” at the parish level, specifically as it relates to ecclesiastical discipline. Laudian measures did lead to some changes across the archdeaconry in this regard, but the evidence will demonstrate that the extent of these discontinuities has been overstated, and areas of continuity overlooked. In many parishes, concerns characteristic of NL (Non-Laudian) and CNL (Canons-Non-Laudian) churchmanship remained predominant during the 1630s.

I. Ecclesiastical Discipline Procedures in the Archdeaconry of Nottingham: An Overview

Historians have differed on the efficacy and esteem of the ecclesiastical disciplinary system within the Church of England. An older view saw the church courts as in a state of progressive decline following the Reformation period. Martin Ingram has argued, in response, that, for much of the post-Reformation, the courts did in fact retain their usefulness in the eyes especially of parish elites, most of all owing to the courts’ “pursuit of notorious sexual offenders.” Yet, Ingram adds, such cases appear to have declined after 1620, the courts turning to focus on “matters which aroused less heartfelt support in the parishes.” Nevertheless, Ingram insists that, at least through the 1630s, the Church of England “proved remarkably successful in containing both Catholicism and Protestant sectarianism.” By contrast, in Stieg’s estimation,
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14 S.B. Jennings, “The Gathering of the Elect,” 114. Jennings admits that “outbursts” or instances of resistance to Laudianism were uncommon.
16 Ibid., 85.
the church courts in Bath and Wells were not only incredibly unpopular, but also profoundly ineffective and corrupt.\textsuperscript{17} Whatever the personal views about the system held by Nottinghamshire pastors and parishioners, an earlier chapter demonstrated that at least a fair number of clergymen had seen the utility of working with the hierarchy.\textsuperscript{18} Even the puritan curate of Saundby, Ephraim Tuke, appealed to the official of the archdeaconry. In a presentment drawn up by Tuke in 1635 against a man and his brother in law for allegedly calling Tuke a “base rascally priest lowsye slaue,” Tuke describes replying that he would “have the Official deal with them.” To this, the men allegedly replied, “‘the deuills turd in the officialls teeth and a plague of god goe with you both.’”\textsuperscript{19} There is also reason to believe that clergymen continued to see the efficacy of working with the hierarchy into 1640 and even later.\textsuperscript{20} These instances serve as a helpful reminder that even men as seemingly far apart as Tuke and Mottershed still shared some common ground—and that some parishioners would likely have rejected any sort of oversight by the Church.

Descending the hierarchy, and leaving alone for now the local clergyman, the closest and most familiar representatives of ecclesiastical discipline were the churchwardens. Historians have diverged in how they describe the specific roles of churchwardens, and in how they evaluate the esteem or desirability of the office. David Marcombe, writing specifically about Retford, claims that the position was “one of the offices to which elements of the ‘commonality’ could aspire to help influence local affairs.” The churchwardenship often served as a stepping

\textsuperscript{17} Stieg, \textit{Laud’s Laboratory}, 279.
\textsuperscript{18} AN/PB 294/2/308. Herein it can be seen that Hugh Osborne, parson of Cromwell, appealed to Mr. Purefey, the Official of the archdeacon, asking him to bring the persons named in the presentment to court, “for if such prophane persons be not restrained by some punishment we shall have open profession of Athisme and all impietie.”
\textsuperscript{19} AN/PB 341/1/41.
\textsuperscript{20} AN/PB 298/5.
stone to the offices of chamberlain or bailiff.\textsuperscript{21} Similarly, Stieg portrays the office—to which one was generally elected for one year—as typically taken by substantial yeomen, adding that the office itself conferred some degree of status and social distinction. Nevertheless, there appears to have been, at least in theory, a tacit agreement that the yeomen churchwardens would not present their genteel social superiors.\textsuperscript{22} In contrast to these basically positive views of the office, John Addy claims that the position was quite unpopular and frequently avoided, given all the responsibilities it involved.\textsuperscript{23} A glance at the presentment bills drawn up for the archidiaconal visitations reveals that “abuse” of the churchwardens was not uncommon. Indeed, a majority of parishes appear to have witnessed at least one or two such instances in the Caroline period, and some a good deal more.

Whatever the general perception and desirability of the office, churchwardens did have a significant number of tasks to attend to. In most parishes, they maintained certain parts of the church fabric and ornaments, including the nave, steeple, churchyard, cups and flagons for the communion wine (typically also their burden to provide), the mending of the leads and windows, and significantly for the 1630s, the communion table itself.\textsuperscript{24} More controversially, the churchwardens took up the awkward and occasionally hazardous assignment of collecting dues assessed for keeping and/or repairing the church. Perhaps unsurprisingly, many parishes had at least a few men and women who refused to hand in their dues. In 1630, for example, the churchwardens of Everton presented a man for delivering “unreverent speeches in the

\textsuperscript{21} David Marcombe, \textit{English Small Town Life: Retford, 1520-1642} (Department of Adult Education: University of Nottingham, 1993), 237.
\textsuperscript{22} Stieg, \textit{Laud’s Laboratory}, 226.
\textsuperscript{24} Ibid., 20.
churchy whole the churchwarden when he demanded his church lay for the good of the town.” Churchwardens also occasionally brought suits against parishioners for unpaid assessments.

Just as fraught with difficulties was the churchwardens’ duty to hand in presentments to the representatives of the archdeacon at Easter and at Michaelmas each year. For a variety of reasons, churchwardens occasionally handed in presentments at other times. This was not the typical practice, however, and usually indicated some sort of tension, either between the churchwardens themselves, or between them and the minister. In the latter case, a vicar or curate might hand in a bill shortly after the churchwardens to explain that they had failed to present one or more defects. In 1626, for example, the curate of Staunton presented the churchwardens for failing to provide enough wine on the last communion day. Churchwardens only infrequently presented themselves for such shortcomings but may have hesitated even more to present their neighbors or family members. Christopher Haigh contends that “most wardens—and many ministers—wanted to be sure of community support for their presentments” and therefore tended to focus their efforts on “the persistent offenders” and other persons generally held in low regard in the community.

Churchwardens drew up presentments in response to a book of visitation articles obtained, for a fee, from one of the archdeacon’s representatives on an appointed day. Although
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25 AN/PB 340/2/4.
27 AN/PB 314/6/57/1.
28 Christopher Haigh, The Plain Man's Pathways to Heaven: Kinds of Christianity in Post-Reformation England, 1570-1640 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 10. It is worth reiterating, therefore, that, like essentially any source used by historians, the presentment bills are not a perfect record of the period. It is fortunate that in the case of the Archdeaconry of Nottingham, a decent number of clergymen were attentive enough to present such negligence, just as many churchwardens were prepared to present negligent ministers. Nevertheless, some incidents of relevance to the historian have surely slipped through the cracks.
visitation articles for the archdeaconry—saving for 1639—appear to have been lost for the period, the practice of the archdeacons in the Diocese of York was to divide articles into four categories: those concerning the condition of the church and churchyard; those regarding the “conduct of public worship and the behaviour of the incumbent”; those respecting church goods, lands and property; and those touching the moral standards and behavior of the laity. Answers to the articles were turned in before the “visitation proper,” at which time visitors interviewed both clergymen and churchwardens, and issued orders depending on the extent and nature of the faults uncovered. These were typically dealt with at the correction courts which directly followed the visitation, although some issues, such as lay rectors denying liability for certain defects, necessitated recourse to the diocesan courts.

The figures who had the greatest hand in shaping ecclesiastical discipline in the archdeaconry were not the various archdeacons, but their Officials or Deputy Officials. For much of the early seventeenth century, this was the Deputy Official Michael Purefey, who came from a puritan sympathizing gentry family and apparently “lightly regarded” what he saw as “mere non-conformity.” While his successor William Greaves did not possess Purefey’s puritan sympathies, neither does he appear to have altered much in the way of the archdeaconry’s administration or disciplinary approach. Major alterations awaited the arrival of Neile’s man, Edward Mottershed, who finally entered office in 1635. At this point, the administration of the archdeaconry, hitherto fairly autonomous in its operation, was “brought directly under the control of York.” One of Mottershed’s initiatives immediately impinged on the churchwardens’
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29 Addy, The Archdeacon and Ecclesiastical Discipline, 9.
31 Ibid., 166.
32 Ibid., 195.
work: they could no longer get by submitting their presentments on some scrap of paper. Now, a court official examined the presentments and approved them himself. Churchwardens were also put on guard by Mottershed’s new policy of carrying out personal church inspections and bringing charges for negligence and/or withholding presentments.\(^{33}\) Briefly put, Mottershed’s Laudian efforts appear to have peaked in 1638, with fewer presentments made and less money spent thereafter. The “Little Doctor,” as Marchant dubs him, died early in 1641, and though the ecclesiastical courts continued to function for some time thereafter, by the end of the year, the correction and consistory courts appear to have become essentially impotent.\(^{34}\)

II. Offenses and Infractions: Continuity or Discontinuity?

Prior to their demise, however, the ecclesiastical courts had been a relatively constant presence in the lives of everyday English men and women, playing host to variety of adulterers, fornicators, recusants and other offenders throughout the late Elizabethan and early Stuart periods. A systematic investigation of the surviving presentment bills across these decades allows one to discern how the concerns of the archidiaconal court may or may not have changed over time. For instance, it may be asked whether the period just after the enforcement of the 1604 canons witnessed a spike in presentations against ministers for certain nonconformist practices, or whether Archbishop Matthew’s drive against Separatist pastors a few years later was accompanied by a coterminous drive against lay nonconformity. As this chapter principally concerns the impact of Laudianism on ecclesiastical discipline, special attention will be given to comparing the type and number of presentations made in the 1630s to those made during the preceding decades. According to David Cressy, “winking” at certain faults had been the “order

\(^{33}\) Marchant, *The Puritans and the Church Courts*, 191.

\(^{34}\) Ibid., 200.
of the day” in the church courts prior to the Caroline period—at least to some extent.35 By contrast, Cressy and others have found that opposition to the church courts became more vocal in the latter 1620s and 1630s, in part because of a purportedly notable rise in the scale and scope of presentations.36 Broadly speaking, when examined across a series of categories (churchwardens, lay nonconformity etc.), the evidence from Nottinghamshire complicates this somewhat simplistic binary. Laudian expectations were neither uniformly enforced nor, therefore, uniformly felt or resisted.

Although the leadership of the archdeaconry certainly shaped the experiences of parishioners in important ways, the churchwardens had a foot in both worlds, so to speak, and were the sine qua non of the hierarchy’s programs and policies.37 In counties like Sussex and Somerset, the churchwardens appear to have been generally aloof from the Caroline bishops’ schemes. Fletcher, for example, found that the diligent churchwarden in Sussex was the exception rather than the rule.38 In Bath and Wells, Stieg asserts, even if someone with Laudian sympathies was elected to a churchwardenship, he would have to be circumspect in the actions he took.39 One route into the views and actions of Nottinghamshire churchwardens is to look at the extent of infractions grouped under the heading “faults of churchwardens.” Such faults could include failing to present certain offenses, or failing to maintain or repair the churchyard fence, or, as in the case of the East Retford churchwardens in 1626, illicitly selling goods belonging to

37 Stieg, Laud’s Laboratory, 306. She points to the Laudians’ overreliance on churchwardens as a main reason for their failure in the diocese.
39 Stieg, Laud’s Laboratory, 306.
the church. If the Nottinghamshire churchwardens were as aloof from or resistant to the policies of the hierarchy in the 1630s as Stieg or Fletcher might suspect, one would expect to see a notable increase in the number of presentments for churchwarden misconduct, particularly after 1635. Moreover, one would also expect to see such presentments implicate a greater number of specifically Laudian issues, as Egan has emphasized. This exercise must be done with due caution, however, considering other visitation and court records. This is particularly true in the case of considering how many archidiaconal presentments concerning churchwarden faults exist for any given year. During the years of metropolitical or diocesan visitations, the numbers of presentations for any offense are typically smaller than for other years. Often for these years (1627, 1629, 1633, 1636, 1640) only one (rather than the usual two) archidiaconal presentment bill survives for a given parish. This was true under Archbishop Matthew and Archbishop Harsnett as well as Archbishop Neile. Thus, while in 1626, six presentment bills record churchwarden offenses, only three do so for 1627, two for 1636 and one each for 1629, 1633, and 1640. Even for these years, however, one can still glean some sense of the issues and concerns of the day. In looking at the wider period, much continuity may be observed into and through the 1630s where churchwardens were concerned. Nevertheless, as will be seen, church restoration efforts spearheaded by Archbishop Neile did result in novel challenges for at least some churchwardens.

To begin with non-church building related churchwarden faults, no notable shift appears in numerical terms by or after the mid-1630s, though some changes regarding the nature of the faults should be noted. The highest number of presentments against churchwardens comes in

40 AN/PB 339/7/53.
42 In the case of Episcopal and Archiepiscopal visitations, subordinate jurisdictions were temporarily suspended.
1626, with nine presentment bills detailing such infractions. In second place is the year 1635, which is in keeping with the initial hypothesis, given Mottershed’s installation that year. For most years, excepting those witnessing the external visitations, roughly five to six presentment bills per year record churchwarden faults. What, then, of the specific infractions involved? Of the nine incidents reported in 1626, two involved churchwardens who had failed to make certain presentments: in one case, an instance of fornication, and in the other, a case of recusancy.43 Two other cases concerned churchwardens who had failed to provide supplies.44 Among the other instances, men were presented for failing to mend the churchyard fence, retaining church money owed to the parish, and failing to draw up accounts. Referencing the description of churchwardens’ work given above, one can see that the presentations for 1626 basically correspond to standard expectations.

This was also largely, but not entirely, true of the related presentment bills of 1635. As in 1626, several churchwardens for 1635 were presented for not properly drawing up their accounts.45 At Sutton Bonington and Kneeton, ministers presented one or both of their churchwardens for not making up the churchyard fence adequately.46 Not seen in 1626, on the other hand, was the infraction reported by the rector of Langar for 1635, that the churchwardens had suffered “divers children on Sundays and holy days to run playing up and down in the church . . . so that divine service is greatly disturbed.”47 While this fault in and of itself does not rise to Egan’s threshold for being specifically Laudian—misbehavior in church was doubtless frequently presented before the 1630s and after—a high concentration of such presentments may
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be illustrative of the alleged Laudian concern for reverence in and toward the church. For example, the vicar of North Collingham in 1635, George Greene, a likely Laudian, presented his churchwardens “for suffering lay juries to be in the church and to make their orders at the communion table and to be of the jury themselves” though the vicar had demanded otherwise.

With regard to the more specific faults regarding the church building and service items, the failure of some churchwardens to maintain the church fabric and/or supply church items like communion ware, tablecloths, and font covers does stand out more for the 1630s than for previous decades. Yet, while Laudians absolutely believed in the “recovery of the church and churchyard as holy spaces,” it should be noted that not all church restoration work was necessarily undergirded by Laudian ideals; active restoration efforts had been ongoing since at least the reign of James I. Discerning the precise motives behind such work is not always possible. Yet, one main indication of specifically Laudian influence is that very often the project(s) involved the east end of the chancel, with, for example, pews being removed from this area so that none sat above the communion table. This makes the lack of presentments against churchwardens who either refused or neglected to provide a rail for the communion table, perhaps the most notorious of Laudian policies, somewhat surprising. In fact, only one case, arising in Cromwell in 1638, survives among the presentment bills wherein the churchwardens themselves were presented for the communion table remaining unrailed. This should not be taken to indicate that all save the Cromwell churchwardens had promptly complied with
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directives to provide the rail. Rather, the “want” of a rail seems generally to have been presented in neutral terms, not blamed on specific individuals, beginning with the archidiaconal visitation of 1635. In fact, one can see some churchwardens in 1635 explaining in their bills that they had no order to provide a rail, presumably until the present visitation. Yet, also of interest is that the “want of a rail” was only presented in slightly more than 20 parishes in the presentment bills of 1635. Proof that silence on the issue cannot be taken as indicative of preemptive or prompt compliance comes in 1637, when the number of parishes reporting lack of a rail rose to over 30. In 1638, this number climbed even higher. By contrast, some parishes did not see any presentations related to railing the table at any point during the 1635 to 1642 period. A more in-depth discussion of the railing of Nottinghamshire communion tables will be conducted in a subsequent chapter.

The chancery court records transcribed by Marchant reveal that some churchwardens were excommunicated for slackness or resistance to railing and/or repositioning the communion table, while others were being held liable for seeing to alterations to the seating, paving of the floors and the like. In the majority of parishes before the latter 1630s, rectors (lay or clerical) and/or farmers of the tithes had been presented for such infractions. While Marchant stresses the overall compliance found in the archdeaconry, the chancery and visitation records show that in at
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least 37 of the roughly 180 parishes under study, the churchwardens faced some level of pressure from the court to take corrective actions. In at least some of these cases, specifically Laudian restoration work was at issue. Moreover, S.B. Jennings has demonstrated that between 1635 and 1640, at least 97 parishes had at various times not provided rails for their communion tables. In nearly 25 of those parishes, one or both churchwardens were excommunicated at least once. The churchwarden of Bradmore chapel in Bunny was excommunicated twice: once in December of 1638 and again in April 1639, for publicly refusing to build a wall on the south side of the chapel yard or provide a rail. The churchwardens of Gringley were excommunicated in May 1635 for failing to “pave or flagge” the church, to make the stalls “decent and uniforme” or to “beutify their Church with sentences of Scripture.” It should be added that in a number of parishes, prosecutions had been initiated for such faults, but for one reason or another no further record of the case survives.

Churchwardens could also be presented for failing to present certain offenses. As Stieg has suggested, such omissions could have been detrimental to the entire system of ecclesiastical discipline, especially if others had not been willing to call negligent or deceitful churchwardens to account. Thus, while Marchant is right to suggest that much puritan activity must have gone unnoticed, he does not pay enough attention to the parishioners and ministers who were willing to partner with the hierarchy. For example, the churchwardens of Sheffield, who found themselves before the Chancellor’s Court in 1635 for failing to present “manifest defects” in the services at their church, were likely to have been reported by a layman or woman. Likewise in
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the Archdeaconry of Nottingham, some presentment bills were drawn up anonymously, such as one for North Wheatley in 1626 that reported the churchwardens for failing to present a known case of fornication. More seriously, a man from Arnold parish in 1639 reported a churchwarden and the minister of Greasley for administering the sacrament to people who sat.

Questions remain, however, as to the relative frequency of cases against churchwardens who failed to present faults, as well as the nature and circumstances of these cases. Two trends can be noted here. First, while the number of such presentments never exceeded four for any given year, they do appear more consistently beginning in 1630 and through 1639. While the episcopal visitation returns for 1636 reveal rather few cases of churchwarden delinquency, and while the returns for the 1632-1633 visitation do not survive for the archdeaconry, there is strong reason to believe that the latter focused much more on churchwarden behavior. Foster notes that in York Diocese as a whole, the 1632-1633 visitation revealed large numbers of churchwardens “making false or inadequate presentments.”

Secondly, several exceptions aside, the contents and circumstances within the 1630s presentments do not appear terribly different from what had gone before. Disorderly behavior was left alone at Attenborough in 1612 just as it was in 1632. Failure to present unlicensed preaching actually appears more frequently before the 1630s, somewhat surprisingly given the Laudians’ reputation vis-a-vis preaching and lecturers. One potential novelty of the 1630s—to be examined in chapter five—were presentments for failing to report decay or other problems with
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the churchyard wall or fence. While this may be understood in terms of Laudian preoccupation with sacred space, it is also true that churchwardens were surely not eager to self-incriminate. Nevertheless, at least two instances survive that suggest churchwarden antipathy, or at least apathy, toward the Laudian restoration efforts of the latter 1630s. In 1635, the churchwardens of Radcliffe on Trent handed in an *omnia bene* for their bill, but as their vicar would make clear, the former had failed to note needed repairs to the chancel and the bells, and the need of a new cloth for the communion table. Even clearer is the case at West Retford in 1638, in which year the churchwardens allegedly failed to present

that the church aisle and font are unevenly paved, the minister's seat is not decent and the pulpit not sufficient, Mr Spivall's seat is not uniform, the windows are not sufficiently glazed, the east side of the churchyard is not fenced, the poor box without a lock or key, [there is] no pulpit cloth or cushion, no pewter flaggon or bible of the last translation, there is no book of homilies or book for the names of strange preachers, the carpet for the Communion Table is made of old buckram, there is no Register book in the church, the north porch is in decay.

Thus, while in many ways the expectations concerning churchwardens appear to have remained fairly consistent over the period, this was not true with regard to church restoration efforts. Such a finding proves in step with Foster’s conclusion that restoration was “probably the centrepiece of Neile’s work in the north.” Neile’s associate in the north, Bishop of Carlisle Barnaby Potter, also viewed Neile’s aims in this light, writing approvingly to Neile of his
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“excellent worke, namely to repayre, and uniforme the churches of your Province.”

Though Nottinghamshire churchwardens do not appear to have been as lackluster as those in Bath and Wells, Stieg’s observation of the increased burden placed on churchwardens in the 1630s nevertheless rings true for the archdeaconry. These burdens are rightly seen as part of the larger “Thorough” approach to church and state characteristic of Caroline governance.

Clergymen also potentially faced new or heightened expectations during the 1630s. A previous chapter endeavored to identify those clergy who could reasonably be classified as Laudians. The number of such ministers was likely quite small. It remains to be seen, however, whether the nature and extent of most ministers’ experiences was much out of keeping with what had gone before. As in the case of the faults and failings of the churchwardens, a sheerly numerical comparison of clerical failings year by year would be methodologically problematic, given the nature of the archidiaconal records and the reality of different visitation articles being administered depending on the year. Presentment bills for some years, such as 1611, appear to be absent for most parishes, and in other years, only presentment bills for Easter or Michaelmas terms survive. As indicated above, the years in which diocesan or metropolitical visitations occurred also offer far fewer archidiaconal presentments. For 1636, however, the episcopal visitation records for much of the archdeaconry survive. Another caveat to keep in mind is that in some cases, churchwardens presented infractions associated with clergy in more or less neutral terms. For example, they might present the “want of a hood” for the curate, rather than presenting the curate for not wearing it. This highlights once more the significance of the churchwardens’ roles both in terms of the functioning of ecclesiastical discipline and as
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producers of historical sources. Keeping the above considerations in mind, one can still conduct a meaningful comparative analysis. The various “types” of clerical failings—regarding vestments, the reading of prayers, maintenance of parts of the church, and other duties—have been disaggregated in what follows so that each category can be examined in more depth. Even more than in the case of churchwardens, the evidence does not generally reflect the extent of discontinuities one might expect.

Given the well-known Elizabethan controversies concerning the vestments, issues regarding the surplice and/or hood make for a good starting point. The highest concentration of presentments for occasional or total neglect in wearing the surplice is seen in the years between 1596 and 1603. Until 1635, no year after 1603 saw any more than three such presentments. On the other hand, before 1635 there was also only one explicit presentment against a minister for failing to wear a hood. In the clearest case of discontinuity among clergy-related offenses, this number jumps up to 20 in 1635.70 Over the next several years, however, only a handful of clergymen were presented for not wearing the hood: Peter Coates and Robert Ollerenshawe in 1637, and William Smith and Thomas Holmstead in 1638.71 It is worth noting that, in contrast to 1635, none of these ministers appear to have been puritans. Ollerenshawe, for example, can be seen in 1625 signing his name to a presentment of a woman, purportedly a ‘sismeatique [sic]’ who refused to kneel to receive communion.72 He was also suspected of immoral dealings with a woman of the parish a few years thereafter.73 In any case, the large number of ministers presented for not wearing hoods in 1635, and the even greater number who served parishes that
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claimed not to have one in or after 1635, demonstrates that a certain, less strenuous, standard of conformity had indeed prevailed earlier in the seventeenth century with regard to clerical vestments.74

Another offense category revealing some degree of discontinuity regards the ministerial responsibility to conduct prayers at certain times during the week, particularly on Wednesdays and Fridays, but also on Holy Days and at other times. While four presentments for non-fulfilment of this duty were made in 1602, no other year until 1635 saw more than two. In 1635, however, eight such presentments were drawn up, with a further six in 1637 and five each in 1638 and 1639. Out of these 24, puritan ministers appear to have been at fault in six instances. As it is clear that more known puritans were at work before the 1630s than after, one could reasonably conclude that the hierarchy by 1635 was no longer willing, at least in some cases, to tolerate disregard of this more formalistic, ceremonious aspect of pastoral duties. Alexandra Walsham, for one, has highlighted the tremendous value that Laudians placed on prayer. One Laudian writer, she notes, asserted that prayer was “like a corde wherewith we binde the hands of God.”75 The archdeaconry’s experience to some extent bears out this Laudian preoccupation with prayer.

Less discontinuity can be seen in terms of ministerial culpability for repairs to the church. Somewhat surprisingly, the greatest concentration of citations against ministers for infractions like letting the vicarage house or barn fall into decay, or—in the case of parsons—the chancel suffer decay, came between the years 1596 and 1603, wherein a total of 13 instances were reported. A scan over the remaining years through 1641 reveals a total of only seventeen further
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cases. It must be stated, however, that these data do not provide a full picture of the church repair and restoration process during the early seventeenth century, about which more will be discussed in a subsequent chapter. Nevertheless, it is worth pointing out here that, while ministers were especially targeted for not wearing their hoods or not delivering the weekly prayers during the Laudian period, they seem to have avoided a similar harrying with regard to their churches.

In at least several areas of clerical concern, operations appear to have proceeded much as they always had. Aside from the years 1618 and 1623, no more than two presentments were made against ministers who failed to lead a moral life. In fact, only three such cases can be seen after 1635. One of these involved the curate of Lambley, Thomas Holding, who allegedly engaged in frequent brawls with members of the parish, lived incontinently with a woman and spent much of his time in alehouses. In 1636, the episcopal visitation saw Paul Sherwood, vicar of Radcliffe-on-Trent, presented for suspected adultery as well as drinking and fighting. Likewise, in 1638, Alexander Lowther, curate of Fledborough, was presented for slandering a churchwarden as a “thief” and a “rogue” and for being “a usual alehouse haunter” and frequently quarrelsome. The majority of cases stretching back to the 1590s have a similar ring, usually involving sexual misconduct and/or drunkenness. It does not appear, moreover, that anything unusual lay behind the spurt of five presentments in 1618, although two of the instances involved violence or the threat thereof. While Roger Loades, curate of Cotham, was accused of drawing his dagger against a man in the churchyard, Mark Wyersdale, parson of Costock, was accused of actually striking the clerk’s boy in the church. Regrettably, the churchwardens who recorded
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these events did not attempt to explain why the ministers acted as they did.\textsuperscript{79} In any case, given the alleged Laudian emphasis on reverence in and around the church, one would have expected to see some discernible increase in the presentment of immoral clergymen in the 1630s.

A similar expectation applies to presentments concerning the administration (or lack thereof) of the sacraments. As John Fielding argues in explaining the differences between “Arminianism” and puritanism, the key distinction came down to “differing attitudes towards the Christian community either as an inclusive body based on participation in public worship or as an exclusive grouping of proven true believers.”\textsuperscript{80} Central to the Laudian emphasis on inclusivity and public worship, the sacraments increasingly appeared to Laudian eyes to have been relegated to a secondary role in worship vis-à-vis the sermon. The Laudians wanted to implement “a style of piety more closely oriented around the sacraments and the liturgy” but they also sought a “redefining [of] the status of the clergy in relation to” the same.\textsuperscript{81} Perhaps the most interesting finding, therefore, regarding sacrament related infractions is that so few clergymen were presented for refusing or failing to administer the communion in the Laudian period. Only three such instances were reported in the 1630s. In 1633 puritan William Westerby, curate of Skegby, was cited for “refusing to give George Roberds communion at his own house last Easter,” even though Roberds was taken ill.\textsuperscript{82} In 1636, Paul Sherwood was presented at the episcopal visitation for not “delivering” the communion to those who had assembled for the same, even though wine had been provided.\textsuperscript{83} In 1638, the Laudian William Clough, vicar of Kneesall, was presented for
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“refusing to give the communion to the said Nicholson and Gascoyne at the first time they offered themselves ready, viz. on Palm Sunday, wishing them instead to come the week after and he would consider it.”\textsuperscript{84} Although Sherwood, Westerby and Clough’s exact motives must remain uncertain, the juxtaposition of puritan and Laudian for similar infractions highlights the significant degree of overlap noted by some between the two styles of piety, or as one scholar describes it, a “curious affinity of purpose between Laud and his enemies.”\textsuperscript{85}

Several other categories of infractions related to divine service are also largely absent from presentments of the 1630s. Given the apparent interest of Laudians in resurrecting the (purified) primitive church, along with its Holy Days and other rites and rituals, it is striking that not a single instance of a minister being presented for failing to bid fasts and holy days survives after 1630.\textsuperscript{86} Some historians have also emphasized Laudian efforts to see perambulations properly observed during the Rogation Week. Foster, for example, suggests that this concern was borne out of a particularly “Arminian” interest in the property and tithes of the parish, as well as its bounds: this was intended to prevent parishioners from gadding elsewhere for divine service.\textsuperscript{87} The latest surviving presentment against a minister for preventing or not attending a perambulation in the time period, however, dates to 1625, when the churchwardens of Eastwood presented their parson, Richard Holland, for “not going on the last perambulation.”\textsuperscript{88} Also nearly totally absent from the 1630s records are presentments for failure to perform churching services, to use the sign of the cross during christenings or baptisms or to use the ring while performing marriages. While the puritan William Westerby was presented in 1634 for not signing the cross,
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one must go all the way back to 1622 to find another such presentment. By contrast, at least nine such cases appear prior to 1622. In 1616 William Snape, the curate of Sutton-in-Ashfield, was presented both for not christening with the sign of the cross and not marrying with a ring. Performance of clandestine marriages, however, appears to have been prosecuted with about the same level of fervor throughout the period.

In any case, none of the above findings quite fit with David Cressy’s characterization of the Laudian concern with life-cycle ceremonies, including the conviction that illicit marriages were “disrespectful of the christological calendar, as well as disorderly and disobedient.” Was this simply a case of churchwardens in puritan led parishes being unconcerned with presenting such infractions? In certain parishes, like Annesley where hardly any infractions were presented in the 1630s, this may have been true. In other parishes, like Costock, this seems less likely. Churchwardens had not hesitated to present their minister for “annoying the churchyard with his cattle” in 1633, nor, in 1638, for letting the churchyard fence be out of repair. Likewise, the churchwardens of East Retford had not been shy in presenting John Watt for offenses like “suffering the chancel to be unbeautified” and not wearing the hood, and a few years later presented a woman for neglecting to be churched, demonstrating that Watt had indeed been conducting at least certain ceremonies. In short, while there were negligent or puritan-sympathizing churchwardens in some parishes during certain years, there does not appear to have
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been any widespread conspiracy of silence. Indeed, churchwarden presentments constitute one of the main sources by which many ministers can be identified as puritans.

As in the case of infractions involving birth, marriage and death ceremonies, a large degree of continuity can be seen with regard to the more basic offenses of neglecting divine service by absence or non-residence, failing to preach, or failing to read the canons. The first thing noticeable is the greater number of such presentments in the years around 1602 and 1603 than at any other point during the period. To some extent, this can be connected to the quality of the clergy at this earlier period, as most cases involved ministers either failing to preach or failing to provide for the same. This inference is strengthened by contemporaneous evidence of other ministers being accused of either not reading or not providing a licensed reader of the homilies. The last case of such a presentment came in 1622. While there is reason to believe that greater attention was being paid to activities in parish church chancels, at least two ministers being presented in 1635 and one in 1636 for teaching scholars in the same, such citations were not wholly without precedent. Nevertheless, the latest surviving presentment specifically concerning the chancel dates back to 1612. Neither were presentments for failure to read the canons or constitutions without precedent. In fact, the greatest cluster of such presentments appears in the 1610-1613 period, when Archbishop Matthew was presumably still concerned with sniffing out remaining pockets of separatism. S.B. Jennings posits that the lack of such presentments in the 1635-1640 period might be the result of “a conspiracy of silence” in some parishes, particularly puritan ones. Though this is a possibility, Jennings provides very little
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evidence to this effect. Moreover, his argumentation might even be read as running back to front. In a subsequent section, he notes that nine of the seventeen parishes which took longer than a year to comply with orders to provide rails would play host to dissenting congregations after 1660. The implication is that “Laudian reforms were ominously beginning to create an undercurrent of dissatisfaction at an early stage” that would eventually manifest in dissent. Jennings’ unsubstantiated assumption here is that the supposedly great number of dissatisfied persons recognized that “outright confrontation would be dangerous and unwise before 1640.”98 This may have an element of truth to it but is not demonstrated empirically.

There were, however, some apparently novel presentations beginning in 1635, though in none of these cases were the infractions “new” according to the canons of the Church of England.99 In 1638, the churchwardens of Thrumpton presented their vicar, Thomas Goodwin, for administering communion to those who remained seated.100 Likewise, in 1639, the puritan Lemuel Tuke, vicar of Greasley, was reported, along with his churchwardens who did not present it, to have given communion to a man while he sat.101 In this latter case, the man who ratted on Tuke and the Greasley churchwardens hailed from Arnold. While the Arnold man’s precise motives are uncertain, his actions if nothing else give some indication of the contemporary perception of the renewed emphasis on ministerial propriety in this domain. In other words, the man from Arnold seems to have known he could cause trouble for Tuke by reporting the specific offense that he did—even leaving aside any personal religious motives. Such a conjecture is supported by the presence throughout the time period of presentations
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against parishioners for not kneeling to receive. While often such presentments clarified that the parishioner in question therefore did not receive at all, in other cases, they do appear to have done. A former churchwarden of Bramcote was cited in 1629 for “receiving the communion sitting.”\footnote{AN/PB 302/541.}

In 1630 a man of Lenton was similarly presented for “unreverently receiving the communion sitting.”\footnote{AN/PB 303/790.} This means, presumably, that the ministers in question actually did administer the sacrament and could have (and technically should have) been presented. As addressed briefly in the previous chapter, presentation of parishioners for failing to stand at the reading of the “Belief” occurred throughout the period. Yet, only one presentation of a minister for this offense survives, dating to 1639. In that year, the churchwardens of Sutton in Ashfield presented their curate, Robert Wallis, for that he “does not stand on [hearing] the Gospel nor does he exhort the people to do the same.”\footnote{AN/PB 303/649.} It is thus plausible that a contemporary perception, unique to the 1630s, of the proper decorum that ministers ought to demonstrate was in operation. This should not, however, obscure the fact that the greater part of the evidence still reflects a large degree of continuity through the 1630s where ministers were concerned.

Presumably, certain novel or revived expectations also applied to the conduct of the laity during this period. If one accepts the account of Peter Heylyn, Laudian apologist and chaplain to Charles I, the period of Laud’s rule at Canterbury saw

\[T\]he Prelates generally more intent upon the work committed to them, more earnest to reduce this Church to the ancient Orders, than in former times; the Clergy more obedient to the Commands of their Ordinaries, joyning together to advance the work of Uniformity recommended to them, the Liturgie more
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punctually executed in all the parts and offices of it; the Word more diligently preacht, the Sacraments more reverendly administred, than in some scores of years before; the people more conformable to those Reverend Gestures in the House of God...more cost laid out upon the beautifying and adorning of Parochial Churches.105

While aspects of this picture may well have been true in some places and at some times over the decade, Heylyn did not have scores of visitation and court records by which to examine or substantiate his claims. Such records, no doubt in part due to their inherent bias toward the troublesome and exceptional, have led some to portray the lay experience of Laudianism in almost totally negative terms. In Bath and Wells, Laudianism purportedly consisted of a series of “petty, small-minded corrections” including especially drives against gadding, non-attendance, and non-payment of tithes.106 Jennings argues that Neile’s policies fell “particularly harshly on the Puritan laity” of Nottinghamshire and were “implemented with great zeal.”107 Even J.R. Mawdesley and Christopher Spencer, who use alternative sources like manor court rolls, emphasize opposition and conflict, suggesting that the Laudian policies were nothing short of a “shock” to clergy and laymen alike.108 Nevertheless, Stieg admits that a small sliver of the population in Bath and Wells were willing to at least comply with the Laudian policies, and it has been demonstrated above that some Nottinghamshire laymen were prepared to assist the
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hierarchy in uncovering nonconformity—even if some took the opposite tack and neglected to do the same.

Thus, it is too simplistic merely to appeal to Tyacke’s schematic of conflict at the outset of a discussion of the laity and proceed to rattle off a series of incidents involving lay resistance to or, perhaps, violence against, Laudian ministers or policies.109 One step in a better direction is to pursue the sort of inquiries conducted thus far in relation to churchwardens and members of the clergy. Thus, rather than simply list each surviving Laudian era case of “abuse” against clergymen, it will be preferable to set these instances in conversation with what had transpired before.110 Much of the scholarship centering on the Laudian period highlights the clericalism purportedly inherent in Laudian policies and ideals, and typically strives to illustrate how offensive this was to lay opinion. Even Kevin Sharpe, who argues for a largely peaceful Personal Rule, admits that what has hitherto been interpreted as evidence of opposition to the theological or liturgical elements of Laudianism “may well have represented a sharp anticlericalist reaction to the clerical pride of the 1630s.”111 Tyacke, perhaps unsurprisingly, argues that lay support for “Arminianism” would have been inherently paradoxical, given “Arminianism’s” emphasis on clerical closeness to, and lay distance from, God.112 Even more provocatively, T.M. Parker asserts that the Laudians “substituted for an arbitrary and all powerful God the arbitrary and absolute prelate.”113 While a previous chapter has argued for the paucity of out and out Laudians among the archdeaconry’s parish clergy, it is worth exploring how and to what extent certain
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112 Tyacke, Anti-Calvinists, 221.
aspects of Laudianism were nevertheless experienced and responded to by the Nottinghamshire laity.114 As in the case of the clergymen, though the Laudian period did result in some alterations for the laity and did provoke instances of resistance and dissatisfaction, these changes were not on the scale seen in places like Bath and Wells or Norwich. In many ways, including the perennial episodes of lay apathy or irreligion, religious life played out for the laity much as it had in the preceding decades.

One obvious route into the lay experience concerns episodes involving “abuse” of ministers on the part of certain lay persons. In light of findings presented by Egan and others, one might expect that more than a few parishioners reacted violently toward certain manifestations of Laudianism.115 Yet, the first thing to be noticed about the surviving “abuse” of clergy presentments is their relative infrequency: no more than five or six episodes of abuse appear for any year in the 1600-1640 period. Granted that much anticlerical sentiment went undetected and/or unreported, the proportion of cases in the archdeaconry nevertheless fails to square with the assertions of David Cressy, who holds that “verbal abuse by parishioners was so common that some clerics accepted it as the price of their calling.”116 Nor does one see great variations year by year. There were four and five instances in 1634 and 1635, respectively, but only one in 1637 and two each in 1638 and 1639. The years between 1600 and 1634 reveal a similar distribution. Do any patterns regarding the content of the abuse episodes emerge? One perhaps unsurprising finding is the relatively high rate of abuse episodes in certain parishes; that is, no less than six ministers were subjected to some form of abuse serious enough to present on

114 J.R. Mawdesley and Christopher Spencer, “The Politics of the chancel screen,” 363. Mawdesley and Spencer conceive of Laudianism in terms of an ideology that could be bought or sold by a given minister. It is reasonable to suspect that “buying” could have been more or less selective and partial.
115 Egan, “Laudians, Puritans and the Laity,” 166. Egan notes that at least 9 Laudian ministers are known to have suffered physical violence.
at least two occasions during their tenures. At least three ministers suffered three times or more. Richard Colebrand, minister of Broughton Sulney (also called Upper Broughton), endured “unreverent and unseemly speeches” in 1610, “undecent” speeches in 1621, and further “irreverence” in 1625 when a man allegedly bragged that he was “as honest...and as good a man” as Colebrand.\textsuperscript{117} Another victim of repeated abuse was the minister of Scrooby, John Haige. In 1621, Haige presented Miles Greneoppe for calling him a “saucy vicar,” being of “contemptuous behavior” and daring Haige to “delle your nose in my arse.”\textsuperscript{118} Further impropriety awaited Haige in 1624, although this time several persons were at fault. One man, a fugitive sheep thief, threatened Haige that if Haige reported him “he would make it the worst day worke that ever I made since I knew letter of booke.” Another parishioner, Alice Booth, called Haige a “filthy and scurvy Cockes combe” while yet another man called Haige a “quarreller.”\textsuperscript{119} Thus, in the Archdeaconry of Nottingham at least, some ministers did face more opposition than others, though such opposition was relatively rare and did not disproportionately materialize in the 1630s.

As noted in the previous chapter, conflict tended to concentrate in parishes with a uniquely combustible assemblage of circumstances, as in the case of North Collingham under Vicar George Greene. Greene’s tenure opened in turmoil and continued in the like tempestuous manner into the 1630s. According to his own account, Greene had been granted a sequestration to the living from the then Archdeacon of Nottingham, Dr. Joseph Hall. Puzzlingly, but not without precedent, another clergyman, James Piercy, had also allegedly been granted a sequestration “from York” and published this on a certain morning in March, approximately one

\textsuperscript{117} AN/PB 295/1/101; AN/PB 314/2/34; AN/PB 314/5/53.
\textsuperscript{118} AN/PB 339/2/50.
\textsuperscript{119} AN/PB 339/5/50; AN/PB 339/6/22.
week after Greene had taken up the living. As Greene read prayers that afternoon, Piercy
purportedly interrupted the service and told Greene that he would “either read prayers or
preach,” to which Greene replied by sternly warning Piercy not to disrupt him any further. On
another occasion, Piercy and a man named Samuel Sheppard attempted to apprehend the bread
and wine as a communion service proceeded. When Greene took hold of the wine, Piercy and
Sheppard purportedly “thrust him against the wall and the communion table and took the wine
away from him.” Piercy and Sheppard are also accused of stealing away the Bible and Book of
Common Prayer from the church. By the next year, Greene appears to have done with these
two troublemakers, but two more men appeared who found cause to call Greene a “rogue deboist
preiste and drunken fellow” and “the sonne of a bitch.” In 1635, Greene was accosted with
“vile and approbrious” speeches at the communion table, and in 1639 a man slandered Greene by
claiming that Greene denied to baptize one of his children and bury another.

Greene seems to have shared some Laudian sympathies, and his turbulent career
therefore fulfills many stereotypes of Laudian pastoral experience. Yet it should be emphasized
that puritans were far from immune to such tumult. Also making an appearance above, the
puritan Ephraim Tuke, curate of Saundby, in 1627 reported that one John Nodder “violently
struck me and threatened to knock out my brains” and did so again two weeks later. Apparently,
Nodder was upset with Tuke for having brought charges against him, though Tuke claims he had
forgiven the same by the time of the incidents. In the same year, Tuke presented a man for
calling him a “villaine and Rascaldly knave” and another for disobeying his commands to deliver

120 AN/PB 326/7/9.
121 AN/PB 326/8/42.
122 AN/PB 328/9/7; AN/PB 328/15/7.
123 AN/PB 339/10/42/1.
a letter to the court by instead throwing it into a “dike in Heaton Lane” to which he bade Tuke go and search for it. In 1634, Tuke presented a former churchwarden for delivering false information about the church bells, claiming they had only one good bell, and for calling Tuke a “base lying fellow” in front of members of the congregation. Tuke’s most extensive run-in came in 1635, when he reported that William Nailor had slandered him and threatened that if he had Tuke out of doors he “would so bang my cote as I was neuer bangd in my life.” At this point, allegedly, another man entered the house and took Nailor’s side, saying to Tuke, “what the diuell wilt thou doo thou base rogue thou shitten rascally knaue thou pilld preist.” This was the basis of Tuke’s appeal to the Official, as indicated above.

Although presentments for abuse against Tuke and Greene therefore feature among the episodes between 1635 and 1640, neither these nor other cases of abuse from this period appear to implicate any particular theological, liturgical, or other element explicitly associated with the Laudian era. One potential matter of discontinuity is that of the four instances seen in 1638 and 1639, each was presented by the minister in question, which may be indicative of the supposed clericalism of the time. Yet the sample size is small and clerical presentments for faults committed against their persons were certainly nothing new. Given the purportedly Laudian concern that the perambulation was properly conducted each year, one may also plausibly read some theological significance into the words of a man from Fledborough, who in 1635 scorned the minister as the perambulation proceeded, saying that it was “never invented by Christians.” Yet, a quite similar instance occurred in the parish of Mansfield in 1612, when a

124 Ibid.
125 AN/PB 340/8/40.
126 AN/PB 341/1/41.
127 AN/PB 328/7/13.
woman was presented by the vicar for “deriding and scoffing against me and them that went the perambulation walk with me this year.”

Moreover, it appears that those cases of abuse in which theological or liturgical controversies were most clearly at issue materialized before the 1630s. In 1610, for example, William Rowerth of Tithby claimed that his minister “preached false doctrine and never made good sermon since he came to the town.” The puritan vicar of Worksop, William Carte Jr., in 1618 drew up a lengthy presentment in which he reproduced the statements of William Hodgkin, who allegedly claimed, “[W]hen Mr Carte preached that the church of Rome taught the doctrine of devils [devils] in forbidding meat and marriage I could have smiled at him, for he defendeth the doctrine and practise of the church of England wch forbiddeth meat and marriage, doth not he teach the doctrine of devils then?” Hodgkins went on to accuse Carte of teaching “that only seven [people] in his parish should be saved, and that he would not bid God Speed, nor good morrow and good even to men when he met them or saw them working, lest he should take God's name in vain in speaking to profane persons.”

Perhaps unexpectedly, then, cases of theologically tinged abuse were rarer in the 1630s than they had been in previous decades.

It ought also to be emphasized that lay misconduct took a multitude of forms, many of which need not have involved offenses committed directly against a minister. Nor does the tag of “lay non-conformity” automatically implicate puritanism. As Christopher Hill noted, despite the significant advances made since the latter parts of the sixteenth century, the Diocese of York was still considered by some to be among the “Dark Corners of the Land” as late as the 1630s. Even under Archbishop Neile, that is, “not enough preachers were being licensed even to keep

---
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monthly sermons going in each parish.”  

Evidence of irreligion, apathy or the like stretches across the time period, and does not appear to have been concentrated in any particular year or cluster of years. In 1610, Richard Smith was presented by the churchwardens of Eastwood for not attending Church on Sundays and for “scoffing and deriding those who do come.”  

More seriously, a man of Trowell was presented in 1612 for “verie malitiouslye to the great contempte of the sacramente’ taking the wine remaining on the communion table after the rehearsal of the words of the Institution, and giving part of it to be quaffed in the church by some of the parishioners, and carrying the rest home for his own use.”  

On a lighter note, the churchwardens of Sutton Bonington St. Anne had to present a man in 1621 for “leaping upon the communion table in the chancel and breaking it.”  

Apathy and irreligion persisted into the Laudian era proper, notwithstanding the noted improvements in the training and numbers of the clergy. Gervase Dodson, the vicar of Attenborough, found cause to present a number of parishioners in 1631 and 1632 for irreverent carriage, refusal to participate and for sleeping “continually” during service time. The rector of East Bridgford, John Hull, faced similar indifference in 1632, when he was compelled to present parishioners for “gazing and talking in the churchyard” after service had begun, and others for persistent tardiness. In 1637, a woman of Cossall was presented by the churchwardens for performing her penance in the cloth belonging to the communion table.  

Even in 1640, the
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The minister of Radcliffe on Trent had to present a man “for saying in his hearing that the words of God were not true and neither would he ever believe it.”\textsuperscript{138} The pattern of presentments for theologically colored speeches or actions matches more or less that of those for apathy and irreligion, though a handful of cases do reflect the specific concerns of the time. Those familiar with the history of Nottinghamshire will not be surprised to see instances such as that at Scrooby in 1598, when the famous Separatist William Brewster was presented for “repeating sermons publicly in the church without authority.”\textsuperscript{139} Other Separatists, or Brownists as they were frequently called, were presented in 1608, 1616, 1618, 1619, and 1625, which appears to be the last year in the time period to see such a presentment.\textsuperscript{140} Other parishioners were presented for acts or opinions that, while not Separatist, still reveal strong doses of puritan thought. In 1607, a woman of Babworth was written up for impugning the “rite and ceremonie of the crosse in the sacrament of Baptisme by force and violence.”\textsuperscript{141} Another woman, of Basford, was presented in 1608 for alleging that “there is no true doctrine [in] England.”\textsuperscript{142} Thomas Pacy, of North Collingham, made his objections to the Church’s positions more explicit, publicly maintaining in 1610 “that whosoever comes into the church in the time of divine service and shall kneel down to pray that he may hear with edification offereth the sacrifice of fooles and his prayer is abominable.”\textsuperscript{143} Several years later, in 1618, two other parishioners of North Collingham were presented for refusing to hear the Book of Common Prayer.\textsuperscript{144}

\textsuperscript{138} AN/PB 298/85.
\textsuperscript{139} AN/PB 292/7/46.
\textsuperscript{140} AN/PB 302/266.
\textsuperscript{141} AN/PB 352/4/8.
\textsuperscript{142} AN/PB 352/2/27.
\textsuperscript{143} AN/PB 295/1/13.
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Theologically tinged flare-ups remained infrequent in the Caroline period, but did involve a somewhat broader range of opinions and concerns, including both anti-Laudian and anti-Puritan sentiments. Thus, in 1628 one can see the puritan minister of Holme Pierrepont, Reuben Easthorpe, presenting a weaver for going “in sawcy fashion...into the minister’s seat...on the Sabbath” where he proceeded to “vilify and gainsay the doctrines which [Easthorpe] preached.”145 On the other hand, a man of South Collingham was presented in 1634 for claiming that “the word of God was not taught as it out to be” and that “he thought himself not bound to observe the canons and constitutions of the Church of England because the authors thereof were not thereunto lawfully called.”146 More explicitly anti-Laudian sentiment came in 1635 from Kneesall, where the Laudian William Clough officiated. In this year, a woman, when asked by a neighbor whether there was a sermon at Kneesall or not, allegedly responded, “noe, but a company of shitten prayers.”147 Again at Kneesall, in 1637, a man refused to receive the sacrament at the altar rail and demanded that Mr. Clough “show him either canon or article for it . . . otherwise he would not.”148 At Stanton-on-the-Wolds in 1641, a man allegedly pulled the communion table out of the rails, spilling the communion bread.149 Conversely, a man of Lenton was presented by the churchwardens and vicar in 1637 for “saying that the Papists’ prayers are better than ours that are protestants.” The exact theological positioning of this man is complicated, however, by the further presentment against him for saying that “the scripture lies and he could prove it in divers places.”150

146 AN/PB 328/7/41.
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In any case, the above evidence still permits several takeaways. For one, it is clear that at least some parishioners, including women and those of humble trades, had strong religious opinions, and that these were not always informed by a predilection for puritanism. Secondly, business did not carry on entirely as usual in the Laudian era. That is, at least in some parishes, and possibly in more than the surviving records would indicate, Laudian concerns did stir up strong sentiments. Thirdly, however, it nevertheless remains the case that outbursts of theological conviction, whether puritan, anti-puritan, or otherwise, must be seen as scattered oases amidst a desert of banality.

More common than presentments for religiously colored speech were those for more basic faults, such as receiving communion improperly or not at all; refusing to remove hats in service time; failing to adhere to the canons requiring kneeling, bowing, or standing at different points; or attending parish churches other than one’s own. In each case, the main difficulty lies in interpreting the extent of theological motivation underlying a given infraction, and beyond that, the extent to which this might have involved specifically Laudian concerns. Egan, for example, presumes that those who failed to communicate likely had (puritan) religious motives unless otherwise stated. Likewise, she generally interprets presentments for failing to stand as evidence of puritan sentiment. In most cases, she sensibly leaves the question of the extent of Laudian implications up to the particular instance, though even here she admits the inconclusive nature of her inferences. For example, she posits that the increasing number of parishioners presented for disrupting divine service at Kelvedon Easterford by the later 1630s is connected to

151 Somewhat ironically, given Neile’s reputation, the visitation book for 1636, so far as Nottinghamshire is concerned, does not record any cases of theological “speech” or opinion stating. Moreover, it records only one case of refusal to receive at the altar rails (Attenborough) and only one case (at Worksop) of failing to stand at the Creed and the Gospel and bow at the name of Jesus.
153 Ibid., 149.
the increasingly Laudian convictions of its minister by that time. yet, even in this case it is not entirely clear whether disruptions should not be seen as what Egan refers to as concerns of pre-Laudian conformity. One example of such concerns is the issue of hat wearing in church. Fincham has argued that the admonition against men covering their heads in the church, articulated by the XVIII Canon of 1604, became a particular concern beginning with Archbishop Harsnett in 1629. in that year, the archbishop issued a circular for the diocese in which he lamented the “great irreverence” by which “yong men mis-led by the example of their elders, doe sit covered with their hats on their heads, neither regarding the holinesse of the house of God, nor the greatnesse of the divine Maiestie.” So strongly did the archbishop feel about this issue that he ordered churchwardens to pull off the hats of younger men and children if it came to it. Evidently, the years after 1629 did not see a great spate of presentments for improper head coverings. Only five cases, in fact, appear in the 1630s. The decades prior to this also witnessed few such presentments. The most dramatic instance seems to have played out at Treswell in 1620 when nine men were reported, but even here only one other parish recorded the like infraction in this year. In short, whether most churchwardens were simply not interested in enforcing the rule and/or most parishioners not willing to break it, hat wearing did not become a major issue in the archdeaconry in the 1630s.

A stronger case for discontinuity can be made in the case of the requirement to receive the communion reverently and while kneeling. First, however, it must be noted that, saving the episode at St. Peter’s in 1638, discussed below, this discontinuity is not evident in numerical
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terms. Very few were presented for such offenses at all during the period, with three instances being the most in any year.\textsuperscript{158} The discontinuity appears rather in the specific “irreverence” involved in the infractions occurring after 1635. Four cases of parishioners refusing to receive at the altar rails are known: the Iretons at Attenborough presented at the episcopal visitation of 1636, John Lawson of Kneesall, presented by the churchwardens of the same in 1637 and 1638, and a great number of people (43, including the Mayor) at St. Peter’s, Nottingham, in 1638.\textsuperscript{159} It is not entirely clear whether the relative infrequency of these presentments reflects widespread compliance to the directives to receive at the altar rails, or whether the infraction was simply not of great concern to the majority of churchwardens. Reception at the rails had been directed at least at St. Peter’s Nottingham, but apparently not enforced by the minister until he was compelled to do so in 1637. In any case, St. Peter’s puritan minister and substantial puritan population make it something of an outlier.\textsuperscript{160} It is also true that a decent number of parishes in the archdeaconry did not even have rails installed until quite late in the period. This issue will be further examined in a later chapter concerning rails and communion tables. Another seemingly novel element, however, of presentments concerning the proper receiving of communion appears in the latter 1630s: the failure of some to receive in both kinds. Such a failure was reported as far back as 1598, but not again until 1638 and 1639. In 1598, the churchwardens of Littleborough claimed that Davey Harrison “received the communion on Easter Day unreverently, by receiving the bread and then going forth from the church in contempt” though he did return later and take

\textsuperscript{158} It should be noted that this offense is to be distinguished from the more general offense of not receiving the communion at all, which could have resulted from a variety of motives, including apathy or recusancy. Nevertheless, it is plausible to suspect that some instances of non-reception, especially when great numbers were involved such as at St. Peter’s Nottingham in 1638, sprang from dislike of Laudian policies. In this case, it is known that the minister had been inhibited from giving communion to those who would not receive at the rails in 1637. See Marchant, \textit{Puritans and the Church Courts}, 195.

\textsuperscript{159} R. VI. A. 24, f. 506; AN/PB 328/11/19; AN/PB 328/13/19.

\textsuperscript{160} Marchant, \textit{The Puritans and the Church Courts}, 299.
the wine.\footnote{AN/PB 292/7/13.} In much the same language, the churchwardens of Greasley in 1638 presented a man “for his irreverent behaviour for departing from the communion before receiving the same in both kinds.” It appears the same man of Greasley remained excommunicate for the offense through the following year and had already been presented for the like offense in 1635. In both the 1598 and 1630s cases, the individuals involved may have been “church papists” or the like.\footnote{AN/PB 303/560; AN/PB 303/671. The pre-Reformation church had come to cease offering the chalice to the laity.}

To the novel presentments for failure to receive at the rails can be added the relative spike in presentments, in 1634 and 1635, for failing to kneel, stand, and/or bow at the appropriate times. As noted in Heylyn’s statement quoted above, Laudian concern for the proper “reverent gestures” was implicit in the Laudian understanding of the holiness and sacredness of places of worship. As Peter Lake explains, “the laity’s outward, physical acts of reverence and piety, choreographed by the liturgy and performed at the promptings of the priest, served both to express and inculcate various spiritual qualities or habits of mind.”\footnote{Lake, “The Laudian Style,” 166.} A classic Laudian presentment on this score appears in William Clough’s bill of 1634, wherein he reproved a man “for not kneeling down to say his prayers when he comes into the house of God” and for not bowing at the name of Jesus, standing at the Gospel or joining the minister in reciting the Lord’s Prayer.\footnote{AN/PB 328/7/42.} Although standing at the reading of the Creed and Gospel had been required since at least 1604, the earliest instance of someone being presented for failing to do so came in 1625.\footnote{AN/PB 326/8/17.} Prior to this, only two related cases survive for the period, both occurring in Rolleston in 1613.
and 1616. In both bills, the fault at issue was failure to kneel for prayers.\textsuperscript{166} Between 1626 and 1639, by contrast, at least 11 presentments survive that specifically cite parishioners for failing to stand and/or bow at the appointed times. A large number of these appear in parishes hitherto noted to have had Laudian or Laudian sympathizing ministers in the Caroline period: North Collingham, Attenborough, and Kneesall. In 1634 and 1635, these parishes were joined by Marnham, Normanton-upon-Soar, and Girton in presenting non-standers and non-bowers, none of which parishes had puritan ministers in the 1630s. In the case of Marnham, closer inspection reveals that in both 1634 and 1635, the man presented for failing to stand was also one of the farmers of the rectory who happened in these same years also to be presented for failing to address the decay in Marnham’s chancel.\textsuperscript{167} It is possible, therefore, that the churchwardens calculated that including presentments related to Laudian concerns for bodily reverence might heighten the court’s pressure on a lethargic tithe famer. As for Girton, one can see that the woman at fault had previously been presented for gadding to other parishes, and had thus likely been placed under closer surveillance by the churchwardens.\textsuperscript{168} The churchwardens of Clifton, in 1639, also appear to have joined concern about gadding with concern over the proper observation of reverent gestures, as both infractions are attached to the female offender.\textsuperscript{169}

Therefore, while presentments against gadding were less novel\textsuperscript{170} in the Laudian period than those regarding standing or bowing, it is not surprising that the highest concentration of the former centers on the years between 1629 and 1635. Archbishop Harsnett’s directives in 1629
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officially ended the permissibility of attending other parish churches when one’s own did not provide a sermon.\textsuperscript{171} Thus, the churchwardens of Hucknall Torkard presented a man in 1629 for “leaving his parish church and going to other places contrary to his grace’s command.”\textsuperscript{172} While it is not always clear what motivated the various instances of gadding across the time period, it is notable that no gadding offense was reported in a parish with a known puritan pastor after 1622. Even in this case, at North Collingham, it is possible that the gadders sought alternative services because their puritan minister, George Longden, was not radical enough for their tastes.\textsuperscript{173} In at least one parish, Kneesall, an ongoing lay puritan tradition seems to have been behind the gadding infraction reported in 1634. Kneesall had played host to at least two puritan ministers prior to Clough taking up the living: Robert Hargreaves and Luke Bacon. Moreover, the clergyman who was officiating for a period during 1625 and 1626, Robert Aynsworth—who appears not to have been himself a puritan—was accused by one of the churchwardens in 1625 for conspiring with the other churchwarden to forgo presenting two parishioners who had gone out of the parish.\textsuperscript{174} For the most part, however, the relative rise in reported incidents of gadding appears connected to the sort of general tidying-up efforts outlined by Stieg for Bath and Wells.\textsuperscript{175} It is also true that at least two of the known Laudian sympathizers among the clergy presented gadders in the 1630s, showing that lawful attendance was indeed a Laudian preoccupation, albeit one not wholly unique to the Laudian period. Thus, while the increase in presentments for the commonplace offenses noted above does demonstrate a certain degree of

\textsuperscript{171} See Ch. 2.
\textsuperscript{172} AN/PB 302/524. Likewise, in a presentment bill of 1630 (AN/PB 315/1/6), the churchwardens of West Bridgford presented a handful of parishioners who had been “‘formerly presented at the visitation of ‘my Lordes Graces of York and have promised reformation to his commissioners, for continually absenting themselves from their parish church in time of divine service, and have repaired and gone to other churches.”
\textsuperscript{173} AN/PB 326/3/15. In this presentment, a man is cited for taking Longden to task for “speaking against Anabaptists and Brownists in his sermons.”
\textsuperscript{174} AN/PB 326/9/37.
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change in terms of the lay experience, these alterations were relatively slight and generally involved issues of pre-Laudian concern—even if enforcement of these canonically required obligations did augment in the 1630s. Laudian clergy or ideas were implicated in certain theologically-tinged outbursts, but so were puritan clergy, the majority of such rare episodes occurring prior to the 1630s in any case. Perhaps owing largely to its general lack of Laudian clergyman, the Archdeaconry of Nottingham did not see the scale of lay backlash that has been observed, or assumed, for other locales during the 1630s.

III. Concluding Observations

While the nature of the available records makes any definitive conclusions about the pre-Laudian and Laudian era experiences of ecclesiastical discipline in the archdeaconry difficult to sustain, several important observations can still be offered. First and most basically, this investigation has demonstrated that, saving a few exceptions, at no point during the time period were great numbers of clergymen, churchwardens, or other parishioners caught up in the system of ecclesiastical justice. This cannot in itself be taken as proof positive that Laudianism made little impression on much of the archdeaconry. Further investigation of expenditures and the railing and/or moving of communion tables, issues often portrayed as being central to the advance of Laudianism, will therefore be conducted in the following chapters.\(^{176}\) Secondly, based on the types of infractions considered in this chapter, church restoration efforts rather than specifically theological issues produced the most significant discontinuities, and these discontinuities were predominantly reflected in the experiences of churchwardens. This appears to confirm Stieg’s assertion that the bulk of the responsibilities attendant to Laudian efforts fell

\(^{176}\) It was thought methodologically unsound to incorporate the question of expenditures into the present chapter given that for the most part expenditure information only survives for the latter 1630s (1635-1637, and 1639 specifically).
to these parish officers, for better or worse. Thirdly, those infractions that witnessed the greatest discontinuities with regard to clergymen and lay persons can be classed as essentially, though not exclusively, pre-Laudian concerns: the haphazard or non-wearing of the surplice and/or hood; the negligent or patchy performance of required services; the failure or refusal to stand, bow, or kneel at the required times; and illicit wandering to outside parishes for sermons or other services. Fourthly and lastly, however, though basically isolated in terms of the number of individuals and parishes explicitly implicated, infractions unique to the Laudian period emerged that involved clergy, churchwardens, and lay people alike. In many but not all of these cases can be found ministers sympathetic to Laudianism, but also lay persons who appear to have had at least a basic understanding of the major religious issues du jour. It will be sensible, therefore, to investigate other aspects relevant to the experience of Laudianism before attempting a broader evaluation of the “concreteness” of Laudianism across the archdeaconry.
Chapter Four
The Costs of Laudianism

“That the said Mr. Ravens, to show his zeale for the bringing in of Innovations, did, contrary to his parishioners’ knowledge & consent, sett men to worke to make & sett upp rayles, rayse the ground in the chancell three steps high, paint the Church, [and] bought a hood & surplice, to the overcharginge of the parish.”¹ So reads the eighth charge leveled against Jeremiah Ravens by the Suffolk Committee for Scandalous Ministers in the mid-1640s. Across England, other committees indicted clergymen like Mr. Ravens, clerics who had allegedly preached Arminian theology and/or favored the “new” ceremonies and “superstitions” introduced by the Laudian bishops. While allegations regarding the railing and moving of the communion table were commonplace by this time, the accusation that Ravens caused an “overcharginge” of his parish was less so. In the much-changed religious atmosphere of the Civil War period, charges of innovation or “popery” in religious practice surely carried greater force than those merely complaining of burdensome expenditures. Nevertheless, it is no secret that the restoration and beautification efforts overseen by Laud and Neile came with significant price tags, just as they came with potentially jarring ceremonial and liturgical changes. Understanding how regular parishioners experienced the Laudian era therefore requires further exploration of these two primary ways people might have witnessed discontinuities in their religious lives: alterations within and without their parish churches—especially changes to the communion table—and an increasing lightness of their pocketbooks.

While specific discussion of changes to communion tables has been reserved for the next chapter, the present chapter will pay particular attention to the costs of Laudianism, investigating how these impinged on parishes and parishioners across the archdeaconry. As the last chapter revealed, the striking discontinuities suggested in some historians’ views of the Laudian period cannot be accepted as a foregone conclusion in every locality. Yet, neither can one take the paucity of churchwardens’ presentments for open disapproval of Laudian policies as proof positive of “business as usual,” much less enthusiastic approval. Studies of this sort must be attuned to more subtle ways in which general feeling may be evidenced and discerned. James Galloway’s insight that the “religious affiliations of individual clergy are as accessible to analysis through their actions and relationships as through their ideas” might thus be applied in a slightly modified form to an analysis of the laity. As Jeremiah Ravens’ case reveals, the costs of Laudianism were not always acceptable to those required to pay them. An analysis of expenditures and the ramifications thereof can shed light on important questions concerning the Laudian period. As in the previous chapter, presentment bills from the late sixteenth century through the early 1640s can be used to view the Laudian period in relation to what had gone before. Does one see periods of greater or fewer presentments for non-payment? Can these periods be explained? Did the restoration and beautification efforts of the Laudian era, or any one or several of these, cause a spike in presentments for non-payment? If so, were these concentrated in areas with known puritan ministers or with histories of lay non-conformity? Did parishes known to have spent more between 1635 and 1639 see greater rates of non-payment or other evidence of unrest? Through a novel, data driven approach, this chapter will demonstrate that the costs of Laudianism did not disturb the archdeaconry to the extent implied by the
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prevailing modern assumptions about Laudianism’s impact. Moreover, it will be shown that with a small number of exceptions, greater costs during the Laudian period cannot be decisively correlated to increases in non-payment or other evidence of discontent with Laudian measures.

I. Historiographical Context

The notion that Laudianism carried significant costs is as old as the phenomenon itself. It will be recalled from the last chapter that Peter Heylyn observed in the most favorable light the “cost laid out upon the beautifying & adorning of Parochial Churches,” though naturally he says nothing of the problems this may have engendered.3 Conversely, William Prynne returns again and again to the great expense of Laudian restorative and ceremonial measures in rather more negative terms. Speaking of St. Gregory’s Church, Prynne emphasizes the “great cost” laid upon the parish when the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul’s installed a picture of St. Gregory and removed and railed the communion table “Altarwise against the East-end of the Chancell.”4 Again, Prynne writes, “so devoted was [Laud] to his superstitions, that he would spare no Costs to promote them.”5 Included herein would be the great expenses laid upon parishes to contribute toward St. Paul’s. Yet, neither Prynne nor Heylyn prove centrally preoccupied with the question of Laudian expenses. Prynne certainly appears far more concerned to illustrate Laud’s supposed subversion of true religion and bringing in of Arminianism, Romish idolatry and superstition, as Peter Smart had been in his treatises against John Cosin in the late 1620s. This may help explain why the debates between Tyacke, White and their respective followers do not take the expense of Laudianism as a key area of inquiry.

3 Peter Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus (London, 1671), 251.
4 William Prynne, Canterburies doome, or, The first part of a compleat history of the commitment, charge, tryall, condemnation, execution of william Laud etc. (London, 1646), 87.
5 Ibid., 67.
Other prominent historians, however, have emphasized the need to consider the financial impact of Laudianism from at least the 1960s. Marchant could be included among them, but only in a preliminary sense. For example, he provides the average yearly expenses of parishes in the deaneries of Retford and Newark, and notes that one reason some churchwardens had begun by 1638 to evade certain responsibilities was the “considerable raising of the church rates” they had been pressured to enforce. Similarly, in his article concerning the restoration of Nottinghamshire churches in the 1630s, Marchant fairly confidently concludes that “open opposition was remarkably small,” but does not explicitly discuss anything regarding presentments for non-payment of dues or other costs even as he details the occasionally striking expenses some parishes undertook. By contrast, Hoffman’s study of John Cosin much more explicitly associates suits for non-payment of tithes (in the case of Cosin himself) and for non-payment of dues (in the case of his churchwardens) with the costs of Laudian measures. Also describing the experience of parishes in Durham, Mervyn James posits that “it was the financial aspect of the new furnishings which made [the] most impression.” John Morrill and Anthony Fletcher’s Civil War studies also highlight the question of costs, associating these as well with infringements upon the authority of the landed classes.
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Perhaps the fullest consideration of the place of such costs within the wider socioeconomic framework of the country comes in Christopher Hill’s *Economic Problems of the Church*. What Hill stresses more than most are the technically non-religious economic problems facing the church and the reasons a given individual might look upon the Church and/or its hierarchy with some degree of distaste. Many of the problems are rooted in the peculiar English Reformation experience, whereby large swathes of hitherto ecclesiastical land passed into lay hands at various points over the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. As was briefly indicated in the last chapter, lay possession of advowsons and/or rectories/impropriated tithes could, and often did, lead to problems for the upkeep of churches. Some parishes, like Arnold, saw presentations of their (lay) rector or farmer of the tithes for chancel disrepair nearly every year during the early seventeenth century.\(^{11}\) Faced with such problems, Hill argues, Archbishop Laud sought to recreate the pre-Reformation ideal of the Church, one in which the clergy had the economic independence necessary to implement restoration initiatives and impose uniformity.\(^{12}\) Thus, Hill’s claim that a “principal objection to the Laudian ritual was its expense,” should be understood in broad terms: such expenses could be seen as intrusions into local affairs or as “clericalist” overreach just as much as symbols of possibly unwanted religious change.\(^{13}\)

While many of the more recent local studies concerning Laudianism have sought to see the experiences of and responses to Laudian measures in this broader light, few go into much detail about the specific question of refusal or neglect in paying dues and/or other Church fees. Stieg’s study of Bath and Wells includes a chapter on the church courts that indicates the
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11 See, for example, AN/PB 302/208, AN/PB 302/308/2, and AN/PB 302/350.


13 Ibid., 184.
frequency of presentments for non-payment, but gives little indication as to how this may or may not have applied specifically to the Laudian period.\textsuperscript{14} Her final substantive chapter on the “Impact of Laudianism on the Diocese” says virtually nothing about the issue. By contrast, David Marcombe’s study of East Retford notes that seventeen cases of non-payment transpired between 1631-1640 while only two could be found for 1591-1600.\textsuperscript{15} While Marcombe does not give any details of these episodes, he does note that East Retford was notable for non-payment in the 1630s and that much of it stemmed from pressure to make repairs. He further specifies that one must be attuned to the particular individuals indicted for not paying. For a figure like an alderman not to pay, in other words, likely reflects disapproval of the church and/or minister.\textsuperscript{16} Mary Millicent Egan broaches this question in reference to the average parishioner, suggesting that non-payers “may have been puritan non-conformists” who did not appreciate how the money was to be spent. Yet she quickly adds that non-payers could also just have been people “not prepared to cooperate with the parish authorities.”\textsuperscript{17} Sylvia Watts builds on this latter interpretation in her study of Staffordshire and North Shropshire, arguing that the rationale behind non-payment was “usually based on arguments of legal exemption or procedural faults rather than any objection to the proposed expenditure or the actual principle of levying a loan.”\textsuperscript{18} She likewise conjectures that slow or delayed compliance in certain parishes owed more to financial than doctrinal or theological concerns.

\textsuperscript{14} Margaret Stieg, \textit{Laud’s Laboratory: The Diocese of Bath and Wells in the Early Seventeenth Century} (East Brunswick, N.J.: Bucknell University Press, 1982), 237.
\textsuperscript{15} David Marcombe, \textit{English Small Town Life: Retford, 1520-1642} (Department of Adult Education: University of Nottingham, 1993), 242.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., 247.
\textsuperscript{17} Mary-Millicent Egan, "Laudians, Puritans and the Laity in Essex c. 1630-1642," (PhD diss., University of London, University College London (United Kingdom) 2001), 143.
The succeeding pages implement a methodology rarely employed in studies of Laudianism to test some of the notions just described and deepen the understanding of Nottinghamshire’s experience of Laudianism. Once more, presentment bills ranging from the 1590s into the 1640s will be examined, this time to identify trends and patterns relating to non-payment of dues, fees, and other ecclesiastical expenses. Wherever possible, the context for such presentments will also be analyzed to see if reasons or circumstances for non-payment are forthcoming. This process will entail examining a significant number of particular details; yet such thoroughness is necessary to move beyond generalities about the Laudian era. The primary goal is to examine the extent to which the 1630s did or did not see notable increases in resistance to ecclesiastical payments as the prevailing view of widespread dissatisfaction with Laudianism would suggest. It can only be wished that each person charged with refusing or neglecting payments had been required to provide a statement explaining why, or better yet, that large numbers of the laity had left journals describing their thoughts and experiences regarding Laudianism. Alas, instances of non-payment, similar to the refusals of some to receive at the rails, still serve as useful if ultimately indirect indicators of popular feeling. Thus, the perennial problem of the available sources accentuating conflict remains intact, though in this case the methodological difficulties of interpreting non-payment prove less problematic than those of interpreting compliance. As Alexandra Walsham and others have emphasized, silence and compliance cannot necessarily be equated with consent, to say nothing of approval.\textsuperscript{19} Marchant, for example, freely admits that he finds the argument from “silence” quite convincing in the case of parishes that recorded large expenditures but did not receive specific court orders. Likewise, he suggests that the lack of unusual expenditure “must indicate that a church was up to

standard.” To test these conclusions, the parishes in Nottingham archdeaconry have been ranked by expenditure total for each of the years 1635, 1636, 1637, and 1639 so that investigations of the highest and lowest spending parishes, for example, can be conducted. The relevant information for 1638 unfortunately does not survive; in some cases, however, presentment bills and court records make it possible to determine the scale and type of work ongoing in this year, thereby permitting some sense of the amounts that might have been spent. As noted above, with regard to Marchant’s arguments, a more thorough parsing of the presentment bills reveals a bit more resistance to Laudian costs than the “remarkably small” amount of opposition that he describes. Significant discontinuities were, nevertheless, far from the norm, even in parishes that expended great sums of money toward their church.

II. The Costs of Ecclesiastical Life: Canons, Articles, and Payments

But what might non-payment actually involve? First, it should be noted that myriad sorts of payments were a seemingly constant part of ecclesiastical life in the early seventeenth century. As John Spurr notes, fees were charged for just about everything: visitation articles, collections for the poor rate, burials, ringing of bells at weddings, registration of baptisms, dues on lands held in the parish, duties for the communion silver and for the bread and wine, offerings at Easter, wages for the parish clerk. Such expenses were in addition to the tithes that parishioners owed in kind. According to Hill, the progressive Protestantization of the nation entailed a growing suspicion of these payments, which were seen by some as popish remnants. Many congregations therefore questioned their legality. A scan of the Canons of 1604 reveals the
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21 Ibid, 62.
extent to which such expenses were built into the entire system. Canons 80 through 86 require the maintenance of items like the Book of Common Prayer, a Bible of the largest volume, the Book of Homilies, a decent communion table and pulpit, and a chest for alms. They further demand that churches be “well and sufficiently repaired” and order window glazing, paving of floors, and the proper fencing of churchyards. Churchwardens’ accounts typically list the expenditures undertaken in this upkeep, as well as the income—such as assessments levied on each household—used for the purpose. To properly enforce these directives, the 86th canon requires dean and chapters, archdeacons and others holding the proper authority to survey their churches at least once every three years and report the names of men at fault for the defects.24

Visitation articles make more explicit the requirement of parishioners to contribute toward the costs entailed by the canons. An examination of several sets of articles concerning York Province over the early seventeenth century illustrates the non-innovatory trajectory of the specific articles relating to non-payment. Archbishop Toby Matthew’s 46th article for the 1607 provincial visitation formed the basis for Archbishop Samuel Harsnett’s 1628-29 provincial visitation articles. It asks “Whether any of your parish do refuse to contribute towards the repartitions [sic] of your church or chapell or towards the provision of anie necessarie ornaments therin, or that refuse to paie your curate or parish clerke his wages, or other usuall duties, and who they bee.”25 Harsnett incorporated this with no changes. Archbishop Neile’s 1633 provincial and 1636 diocesan articles appear to have been based on Bishop William Chaderton’s 1607 articles for Lincoln diocese. Chaderton’s 21st article under section six (“Touching Parishioners”) asks “Whether do any refuse to pay to the reparations, ornaments, and other things required in

your church, as they are ceased by a lawfull vestrie, or anie dwelling out of your parish, which
hold land in your parish?”26 Neile words this slightly differently in his own articles, but the
changes in no way impact the article’s scope or intent. Unfortunately, the only surviving articles
for the Archdeaconry of Nottingham from this period date to 1639, preventing an examination of
significant changes over time. This is important because, while visitation articles in general
appear to have been basically conservative in nature, several sets demonstrate the possibility of
timely innovation. Archdeacon of York Henry Wickham’s articles for 1635 are essentially those
used by Neile in 1633, but add thirteen questions at the end. To give an example, one of these
questions extends the inquiry about churchwardens “winking” at faults to men who had served
the post up to six years prior, rather than the usual one.27 Clearly, churchwarden malfeasance was
something the hierarchy was particularly concerned with at this time. On the other hand,
Wickham’s additions do not alter Neile’s (originally Chaderton’s) article concerning non-payers.
This makes it less problematic to compare numbers of non-payment across and within the first
four decades of the seventeenth century.

In what follows, comparative analysis of this sort reveals little disruption in patterns of
ecclesiastical payments. An initial section will examine incidents of churchwarden abuse insofar
as they can be connected with non-payment. Given the prevailing beliefs about Laudianism’s
impact and what is known about higher expenditures during this period, one would expect there
to be a clear rise in the number of such incidents and the circumstances behind these to
increasingly involve specifically Laudian costs and measures. This will be followed by a closer

26 Ibid., 78.
27 See David Cressy, “Conflict, Consensus, and the Willingness to Wink: The Erosion of Community in Charles I’s
examination of those years that witnessed the greatest numbers of non-payment. Conveniently, and intriguingly, three of the top six years fall in the 1620s and the other three in the Laudian period. This allows exploration of possible changes in the scale and scope, as well as the circumstances, of non-payment. After consideration of the other Laudian era years not among the top six, this chapter will conclude by examining non-payment within parishes that had known puritan or Laudian-sympathizing ministers. Presumably, the former would have been particular targets for Neile and Mottershed, while the latter would be expected both to have spent enthusiastically on Laudian measures and to have had assessments and other payments collected in a fairly uncompromising manner. The following sections will demonstrate that, in fact, the Laudian period did not witness disruption in payment patterns to the extent that might be expected; research reveals a relative paucity of evidence for discontinuity in the Laudian era in terms of non-payment or the circumstances thereof, even for most of the parishes that rank atop the lists of yearly expenditure and/or had puritan or Laudian ministers.
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28 See Table 4.1.
Table 4.1 Instances of Non-Payment by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Instances of Non-payment (Chronological by Year)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Instances of Non-payment (Rank Order by Number of Instances)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1596</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1638</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1598</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1612</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1604</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1608</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1609</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1612</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1637</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1613</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1622</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1614</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1616</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1617</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1620</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1618</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1609</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1619</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1613</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1641</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1622</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1608</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1623</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1624</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1626</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1602</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1627</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1627</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1628</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1629</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1607</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1631</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1632</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1633</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1640</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1634</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1635</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1619</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1636</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1637</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1638</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1598</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1639</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1596</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1601</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1642</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1643</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1643</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1617</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Churchwardens and Non-Payment

As churchwardens’ responsibilities for collecting funds, overseeing repairs and purchases, and making up accounts constituted explicit elements of the canons and visitation articles, not collecting fees or assessments could bring financial and legal trouble for these men. Non-payment was therefore an offense they would seem to have been less likely to indulge than others, even as attempts at collection could sometimes result in “abuse” being directed their way. Though payments were hardly the only basis for abuse, one might reasonably expect to see a notable increase in the 1630s of both the number of abuse cases and the proportion of these involving payment collection. On closer inspection, the 1630s did witness slight increases on both counts. Yet, the number of payment-related abuse episodes was still less than ten over 1635-1640, and only a few cases can be linked to specifically Laudian measures.

To begin with the period running from 1596 through 1624, 33 episodes of churchwarden abuse survive. For example, in 1603 a churchwarden of Shelford presented William Smyth for detaining the surplice from the church and saying “turd in the churchwardens teeth” when confronted about it.29 In 1608, the churchwardens of Kelham presented Mark Richardson for using “vile words” when confronted by them for his negligent attendance.30 For the most part, however, specific details are not provided as to the cause of the abuse. The earliest surviving case of churchwarden abuse that can be specifically linked to non-payment comes from the parish of Worksop. In 1602, the churchwardens’ bill claimed that “Edward Nedam offends in denying us his church due and abusing us in words and the cessors likewise.”31 While Nedham’s refusal cannot be satisfactorily accounted for, he does appear again for non-payment the

29 AN/PB 293/2/49.
30 AN/PB 352/2/11.
31 AN/PB 293/2/24.
following year, although this time he avoided charges of abuse. Perhaps, as Egan might suggest, Nedham was simply unwilling for whatever reason to work with the parish authorities. The next such case comes from Nottingham St. Mary’s in 1613, when Ralph Shaw was presented for “giving evil words to the churchwardens” and not paying the assessment. It appears the churchwardens for this year subsequently revisited this bill after Shaw and another non-payer handed over their dues and crossed out those parts of the presentment. This was a fairly common practice and reflects the extent to which presentments could be used to motivate the intransigent. Yet, only two other presentment bills through 1624 evidence payment related churchwarden abuse, making for a total of only four out of the 33 instances.

Between 1625 and 1635, there were 25 recorded instances of abuse of churchwardens, of which only three cases can be linked with non-payment. Fascinatingly, none of these three occurred in 1635, the year in which Neile’s man Edward Mottershed took control of the archidiaconal administration. Two date to 1625, one from Newark and the other from Clarborough. At Newark, a former churchwarden Anthony Hobman was presented “for his scandalous terms in church against the churchwardens, giving them the lie...and other reproachful speeches in time of divine service for demanding his church duties.” Although Hobman’s specific religious leanings are unknown, he would in 1627 and again in 1631 be presented for improper use of the churchyard, indicating if nothing else an utter disregard for Laudian notions of sacred space. At Clarborough in 1625, Katherine Carr allegedly gave “unreverent speeches” when the churchwardens were “demanding the church lays, calling us

32 AN/PB 293/2/68.
33 AN/PB 295/3/72.
34 AN/PB 326/9/34.
35 AN/PB 326/11/35.
‘paulltrie felowes’.”36 Carr seems to have submitted in the end, as no charge of actual non-payment was made, nor was she presented again in the following years. Similarly, at Everton in 1630, Robert Mew was charged for “unreverent speeches in the churchyard to the churchwarden when he demanded his church lay for the good of the town,” and for the like terms toward the constable when he came into the churchyard, presumably to deal with Mew’s disorderly conduct. Yet, Mew was not in fact listed for non-payment in the end, nor was he presented for the remainder of the time period.37

The five cases of churchwarden abuse that survive from 1635 cannot be explicitly connected to “undecent” speeches (or the like) given out as the wardens went about their collections. A glance at the expenditure rankings for 1635 shows that of the five parishes involved only Car Colston, in 15th place, ranked within the top 30 out of 183 for total money reported spent this year.38 At £15, Car Colston’s expenses were nearly double the average for 1635, so frustration over potentially higher payments might be expected.39 The churchwardens for this year claimed in October that William Arnold said “openly in the church ‘it is reported that you are a surlie knave’,” to one of the churchwardens, but no further context is given.40 Arnold had been a churchwarden himself as far back as 1596 and again in 1602, so it is possible he had found fault with the present churchwardens’ conduct or methods, or had simply grown more irritable in his old age. Clayworth came in 35th for expenses in this year, registering £6

36 AN/PB 339/8/4.
37 AN/PB 340/2/4.
38 See Appendix (this will need to be the full list of rankings by year); compare to the top spending parishes for 1635 as listed in Table 4.2.
39 It should be noted that, in the absence of corroborating evidence, yearly expenditure totals and rankings should be used as general indicators rather than certainties; the actual assessment totals, that is the amount extracted from parishioners, might not necessarily correspond directly to the amount expended depending on when exactly the assessment was agreed upon and conducted. Notwithstanding, enough bills exist that complain of inability to purchase some item or perform some repair due to unpaid dues that one can be reasonably confident that higher expenditures required higher assessments.
40 AN/PB 315/10/9.
towards the church, and the abuse toward one of its churchwardens is described in quite general terms: John Jessop allegedly gave “the lie” to warden Roger Clarke one day. As in the case of William Arnold, Jessop appears to have previously served as a churchwarden for his parish, in 1609-1610, 1623-1624, and again in 1629-1630. Thus, Jessop could perhaps have been letting Mr. Clarke know of people’s dim view of Clarke’s churchwardenship. On the other hand, Jessop may simply have been turning more cantankerous as he aged; in 1634 he had been presented for “scolding and brabbling in the church porch.” Motives and circumstances aside, what remains in view for the 1625 to 1635 period is the paucity of abuse presentments that can be plainly connected to payment related issues.

If one examines the five-year period from 1636 to 1641, the number of abuse presentments remains nearly the same at 26, but now twice as many of these instances can be connected to payment concerns. As will be seen, however, only a handful of these eight cases can be decisively linked to Laudian measures. In 1636, widow Margaret Hanson of Austerfield was presented for giving the churchwardens “very ill speeches” when they demanded her lays. Austerfield’s 15s expenditure in 1636 places that parish in 150th place for that year, and Margaret does not appear in any other presentment bills. It is possible therefore that widowhood had brought some financial difficulties. It should also be noted that Austerfield was a chapel that played host to the puritan Thomas Johnson from 1624 to 1635. His teaching may have left some impression on widow Hanson. The two episodes dating to 1637 occurred in Nottingham, St. Nicholas and Clarborough, which rank 72nd and 103rd, respectively, for total expenditure in 1637. John Greaves of the former allegedly called the churchwarden a “dunce asse calfe and
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blockhead” when the assessment was demanded, along with other vile words. Greaves has the dubious honor of being one of the only recidivist churchwarden abusers in cases related to non-payment, his 1623 episode having been noted above. He had also been presented for not paying his assessment in 1632 to the tune of 12d. In the absence of further information about Greaves, it would appear plausible to label him, as Egan might, as one of those parishioners who were simply unwilling to cooperate with the authorities. His recidivism does not exclude the possibility of a peculiar distaste for the expenses of the Laudian era, but it does make it less likely. At Clarborough, the abuse involved William Pocklington calling one of the churchwardens a “rogue divers times, when the churchwarden made demand of the church duties.” Unlike Greaves, however, Pocklington had no history of presentments, nor did he accumulate the like hereafter. Since he apparently agreed to pay in the end, Clarborough did not actually have any non-payers after 1633, despite court orders for repairs to the seats and a new font cover in 1638.

Without individual expenditure amounts for 1638, it is more difficult to make meaningful comparisons related to abuse of churchwardens and non-payment, but overall averages for the 1635-1639 period can be used in addition to information about known repairs or purchases. Harworth hosted one of the three individuals indicted for abuse this year, ranking 95th in terms of its overall average expenditure. In September, the churchwardens alleged that widow Vessey of Austerfield called one of the churchwardens a “scurvye sawcye Jacke” and told them to “gett it as they coulde” when the assessment was demanded of her. As with the aforementioned
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widow Hanson of the same chapelry, widow Vessie may have been influenced by the puritan Thomas Johnson and/or had financial difficulties; nor does she appear again in the records of this period save for in 1625 when she and her soon to be husband were presented for premarital fornication. This does indicate, however, that she was likely still quite young when her husband passed away and probably had several children to provide for—a likelihood that would certainly impact her willingness and/or ability to pay.

Of the remaining two cases of payment-related abuse from 1638, one concerned a parish one might presume to have had more problems with non-payment. In addition to its extensive puritan traditions, East Retford was also market center that had a broader potential impact on the region. Moreover, it ranks 6th in terms of overall average expenditures and did indeed see six presentments for non-payment in 1638 alone. Among those six was one Francis Tye, whose 3s 4d balance was fairly hefty. The churchwardens accused him of “threatening us in respect of us presenting him” in September. Tye had not hitherto been presented and would remain unpresented thenceforth. As Marcombe suggests, this spate of non-payers in the parish probably stems from the ongoing changes to the church fabric. The hierarchy placed particular importance on East Retford, as is reflected in the extensive orders given to its churchwardens by the Chancellor in 1636. These included *inter alia* the classic Laudian measures of railing the communion table at the east end of the chancel, removing additional stalls from the body of the church, and making all remaining stalls “uniforme to the auncient stalls.” The final case of abuse for 1638 occurred once more in Nottingham St. Nicholas. Contrary to Francis Tye of East Retford, John Tillingley was not joined by any others refusing to pay. When demanded to pay,
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Tillingley rejoined that “he would pay none and that he cared not for us and we were ‘base fellowes’.”\textsuperscript{52} Tillingley was like Tye not a repeat offender, making it more difficult to gain a clear sense of his motives. Examining the St. Nicholas presentment bills issued earlier in the decade reveals that the drive for repairs and beautification took place earlier here than in East Retford. In October 1635, the St. Nicholas churchwardens specifically cited certain individuals for “refusing...to pay towards the repair and beautifying of the church.”\textsuperscript{53} Moreover, St. Nicholas was apparently not issued any court directives in the mid to late 1630s, raising even more the likelihood that Tillingley’s infraction was not specifically connected to paying for Laudian restoration or beautification measures.

Somewhat surprisingly, no payment related abuse cases survive from 1639 or 1640. One can see that at least in 1639, the archidiaconal authorities were still attempting to implement Laudian directives. The 36th article of section II “Touching the Ministery, Service & Sacraments” asks if the King’s recent declaration for “quieting & silencing” controversies has been published and the King’s instructions on lecturers “strictly observed.”\textsuperscript{54} More straightforwardly, the 20th article of section IV “Touching Churchwardens and Sworne-men” asks, is all in the “Church, Chappell & Chancell well and sufficiently repaired, the stalls decent and uniform, and also boarded or paved underfoot: the allies and floore even paved, the Communion Table rightly placed, and encompassed with a decent raile, and all the other things provided and done according to the instructions and order lately given by the Court.”\textsuperscript{55} The final two cases for the period date to 1641, by which date the number of presentations had declined
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fairly markedly across the board. In some parishes at least, the tide by this time had turned against the Laudian efforts, as at Bilborough where in October the churchwardens claimed that their minister “bows and cringes to the Alter.” 56 At Balderton in May, Matthew Spawton told one of the churchwardens who was collecting the charitable benevolence for the poor to “‘goe looke in the church’. . . in a scorning manner.” 57 The churchwardens of Mansfield Woodhouse were not as specific in their May bill, presenting Francis Wash simply “for not paying his duties to the church . . . and for abusing the churchwardens.” 58 Neither Wash nor Spawton had been cited before 1641, and neither Balderton nor Mansfield Woodhouse appear to have been engaged in costly work by this date. This adds to the overall impression that dissatisfaction with restorative or beautification efforts did not lie behind most payment related abuse episodes. Of the 84 cases of churchwarden abuse for the 1596-1641 period, only 15 can be clearly connected with payment related offenses. While the Laudian period did see a slight increase in payment related abuse, only a handful of these cases can be decisively linked to Laudian building projects.

IV. Non-Payment: Comparing the Jacobean and Caroline Eras

Clearly, cases of churchwarden abuse cannot alone uncover the complete picture of the impact and significance of expenditures. Between 1596 and 1643, there were 42 years that recorded one or more cases of non-payment. Non-payment has been defined in broad terms for the purposes of the ensuing discussion. It could have involved a simple non-payment of the assessment made for the repair of the church 59, or one of the fees charged for ecclesiastical services like baptism, marriage, and burial. There were also those charged with not paying the
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customary offerings delivered to the ministers of some parishes at Easter, not paying the duties for bread and wine for the communion, or not paying the wages of their parish clerk. In the case of non-payment of offerings, especially in a parish with known puritan links, non-payment likely signified dissatisfaction with a perceived “popish” remnant. Similar sentiments probably also lay behind failure to pay for baptism, marriage, or burial services. In the 1630s, it is probable that in some cases, non-payment arising at the time of Laudian or other restorative work reflected discontent with, for example, the railing of the communion table. Given the presence throughout the early seventeenth century of episodes featuring scorn toward the hierarchy or certain members thereof, non-payment may also have indicated disapproval of outside interference in local affairs. Certainly, however, the interpretation of each “type” and instance of non-payment is not always straightforward. Thus, to the extent that the evidence allows, one must investigate the particular circumstances of each case of non-payment. While evidence of a handful of major non-payment episodes and for some increase in the presentation of prominent men does stand out for the Laudian period, much less is unprecedented than might be presumed. In the large majority of parishes, resistance or non-compliance in the form of non-payment was simply not forthcoming, and even where it was, Laudian measures were not necessarily the root cause.

Out of the 180 parishes for which presentment bills survive in sufficient quantity, 24 had no recorded cases of non-payment of any kind over the 1596-1643 period—a relatively small, but not insignificant, number. Of these 24, Thorpe, Winkburn and Normanton-on-Soar rank within the top five parishes for average expenditure during 1635-1639. As with most of the 24, these parishes did not host known puritan ministers during the Laudian era. Like Thorpe, Winkburn makes for a particularly curious case because its 1635-1639 average expenditure
places it number three on the overall list.\textsuperscript{60} As far as can be determined, Winkburn did not have any puritan ministers even as far back as the middle of Elizabeth I’s reign, and this may have permitted a consistent tradition of conformity. Moreover, Winkburn’s number three ranking may elide the fact that the parish was already spending plenty of money on repairs from at least 1631-1632, when someone discovered a crack in the wall of the steeple and a damaged window.\textsuperscript{61} The £100 and £90 expenditures noted by the churchwardens for 1636 and 1637, respectively, were both accompanied by notes of “nothing to present” which, as noted above, led Marchant to conclude that the parish was likely ahead of the authorities in meeting requirements.

Normanton-upon-Soar stands at 5th place on the average expenditure list, but unlike Winkburn does not appear to have engaged in serious restoration efforts until 1635. Also unlike Winkburn, the churchwardens of Normanton-upon-Soar in 1636 were accused at the diocesan visitation of making an imperfect presentment, and those for 1637 had to be ordered to set up the rail before the communion table.\textsuperscript{62} The revived enforcement of canons requiring standing upon the reading of the Creed and Gospel had also entangled two parishioners in 1635.\textsuperscript{63} Part of the explanation for these differences with Winkburn may lie with the residual effects of puritan Robert Evington’s tenure at Normanton-upon-Soar from 1586 through 1621. Evington’s rap sheet is not particularly lengthy when compared with more notorious puritan offenders, but he had at least initially refused to subscribe to the articles in the 1604 canons, claiming “that he hath no reason to subscribe unles it be required by his majesties letters or otherwise by due course of
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lawe it be required." Nevertheless, Normanton’s 1635 expenditure of £160 was more than twice that of the second highest expense, and the lack of any non-payers in this year or in 1636 when £80 was spent reflects at least a grudging compliance in circumstances that might have prompted the opposite response.

With the exception of Thurgarton, none of the other parishes without cases of non-payment ranks higher than 63rd on the overall average expenditure list, and 13 rank higher than the 100th spot. Two of these, Thrumpton and Papplewick, share the distinction of ranking within the bottom three. One might have expected even more parishes clear of payment related offenses at this end of the list. At Thrumpton, the overall impression is of a poor and at times poorly served parish. In 1614 the churchwardens complained in their May bill that their minister had “gone away” leaving them “unprovided.” In 1625, the churchwardens reported that they did not know “whether they have the books of Homilies, Constitutions, Juell, Harding etc.” The biggest expenses of the Laudian period probably came in 1633, to which year two of the church bells date; nine shillings were spent over 1639 and a good portion of this had likely gone toward the communion rail that was finally installed as of March. The lack of non-payers here can therefore be explained at least in part in light of the overall lack of expenditures, the general poverty of the parish playing a large role in this.

Papplewick had no puritan minister in the 1630s or any time heretofore, but the curate Zephania Saunders does not appear to have run a particularly exacting ecclesiastical regime. Neither Saunders nor his churchwardens for the years 1635-1638 concerned themselves
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sufficiently to present the lack of a rail before the communion table, the neglect of which brought a formal prosecution in early 1639. At the same time, Saunders appears to have been pastorally oriented even if he was not always canonically tidy. In 1637, Saunders and the churchwardens penned a letter (probably addressed to the deputy registrar) on behalf of their parishioner William Byrd who had purportedly stood excommunicate for three years. They requested that Byrd be absolved, for “he is no recusant papist but was poor and did not have the apparel he wished at that time” to perform the absolution. Whether by Saunders’ nonchalant approach and/or the implicit recognition of the parish’s poverty, relatively little was spent on the church in the 1630s. In this sense, the 1630s for Papplewick was largely business as usual: only one year prior to this, 1610, records specific repair measures being undertaken. Thus, aside from late-appearing issues involving the communion rail, Papplewick like Thrumpton seems to have avoided problems associated with the costs of Laudianism thanks to its meager expenditure totals.

Yet, the reality stands that nearly 90% of parishes did in fact witness instances of non-payment over the 1596 to 1643 period. It is also true that the 1630s saw some increase in the number of presentments. If the number of non-payment incidents for the 1596-1629 period is examined, the average (mean) comes to 29 and the median to 26. By contrast, the average and median for the years between 1630 and 1643 stand at 47 and 53, respectively. Clearly, then, the 1630s saw a departure from what had gone before in this arena. This truth may, however, conceal important nuances. If one ranks each of the years supplying data from 1596 to 1643, one discovers the seeming oddity of the years 1624, 1612 and 1626 occupying three slots within the
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top six. In fact, only 1639 (80 cases) and 1638 (83 cases) featured more incidents than the years 1612 and 1626 (67 cases each). As Table 4.1 shows, the year 1624 also saw 61 cases, only one less than the 62 recorded for 1636.\textsuperscript{71} This illustrates that the considerable number of presentments seen in certain years of the 1630s were not entirely without precedent.

To what extent, however, do possible explanations for the high totals in 1612, 1624 and 1626 differ from those that might be determined for 1636, 1638 and 1639? While Archbishop Toby Matthew had proceeded against Separatism fairly intensely in the early years of his tenure (1607-1628), Marchant has demonstrated that practical power in the Archdeaconry of Nottingham rested in the hands of the Deputy Official Michael Purefey for much of the early seventeenth century. Purefey seems to have been a “Puritan of the orthodox type” who had relatives in key puritan leadership roles and/or had graduated from Emmanuel College, Cambridge in the late sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{72} Based on the average presentment bills handed in for 1612, it does not appear that the archidiaconal visitation articles were very different from Matthew’s articles from 1607. Yet, some churchwardens were clearly still attuned to the drive against Separatism and many 1612 bills demonstrate a good deal of specificity. Among other conformity-focused presentments, the churchwardens of Barton in Fabis cited their minister John Edmans “for not wearing a surplice when he christens children...for not reading service according to the book of common prayer, but reading such chapters as pleases and likes him best...[and] for serving at Barton and Thromton [Thrumpton], contrary to the 48th canon.”\textsuperscript{73} Similarly, the churchwardens of East Stoke presented the almost never mentioned neglect of
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their minister in visiting the sick, and the fact of their parish clerk being underage. An outgrowth of Archbishop Matthew’s ongoing drive against Separatism, sustained sensitivity to the specificities of the canons and articles may therefore have played a part in the unusually high number of parishes that saw five or more persons presented for non-payment in 1612.

Further analysis reveals, however, that the most notable episodes of non-payment in this year, occurring at Linby and Mansfield, can be explained as the result of specific costs toward bells or other repairs. Originally, churchwardens listed eleven names “for non-payment of a contribution towards our bells” in the Linby presentment bill, but they subsequently struck two out, presumably because payment was shortly forthcoming. Of the remaining nine, none had been presented in any surviving bill since 1596, nor would they appear in any bills through 1642. In fact, Linby did not see any more presentments for non-payment over 1612-1643, even as they were able to report that their church was in good repair in 1637. This heightens the likelihood that the non-contribution in 1612 owed to a specific dissatisfaction with the expense toward the bells or with the way in which the decision for the expense was brought about.

At Mansfield, non-payment might be correlated to the fact that Mansfield was in the time of Purefey a center of puritan activity and hosted an exercise as Nottingham and Retford did. Nevertheless, Mansfield’s vicar from 1592-1628, Brian Brittan, does not appear to have been a puritan himself, as his successive long-winded presentments between 1609 and 1612 illustrate. In fact, in a letter to the registrar from February of 1609, Brittan chastises him for absolving a
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parishioner whose “obstinacy hath been great, and his behaviour at the reading of the absolution saucy and ridiculous” before Brittan’s churchwardens were able to receive compensation for processing the man’s excommunication.\textsuperscript{79} Two months before, in late March, Brittan and his churchwardens presented thirteen parishioners for “refusing to pay money lawfully cessed for the repair of the belfry and the casting of three of our bells, and other necessary charges.”\textsuperscript{80} Unlike at Linby, several of the 13 refusers were no strangers to ecclesiastical discipline. Most notorious was Nicholas Wilson, who had been the obstinate, “saucy and ridiculous” excommunicant mentioned in the 1609 letter, as well as having been presented in 1608 for non-payment, being excommunicate again in late 1612, and not receiving in 1616.\textsuperscript{81} More bizarrely, Richard Hibbert, who had most recently been guilty of Sabbath breaking in 1610, had also been presented in 1598 for engaging in incontinency with another couple.\textsuperscript{82} Even so, none of the 13 would again be charged with non-payment, suggesting that as at Linby, the specific costs entailed by the repairs and bells were more at issue than any broader ideological concerns, leaving aside simple deviancy.

One can explain the spike in non-payment for 1626 more straightforwardly. The turbulent parish of North Collingham alone featured twenty-five non-payers this year.\textsuperscript{83} North Collingham has already been described in some detail in the last chapter, and it was there noted that 1624 saw the beginning of major disorders in the parish. South Collingham’s church, served in the early seventeenth century by the puritan Brian Barton, stood less than a half mile from North

\textsuperscript{79} AN/PB 352/1/25.
\textsuperscript{80} AN/PB 295/3/97.
\textsuperscript{81} AN/PB 295/6/61.
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Collingham’s own and appears to have attracted gadders from the latter fairly consistently. Marchant blames Barton “for the disturbed condition of the area and the spreading of non-Anglican traditions, calling South Collingham “in effect a Separatist congregation.” Some members of North Collingham became upset at the forced departure of fellow puritan James Piercy, who had only taken the cure a few months prior, and this likely explains the repeated refusals to pay of several persons in October and December 1624. A few of these parishioners also earned a spot on the much longer list of non-payers for 1626. Perhaps unsurprisingly, at least eight of the non-payers from 1626 were or would become repeat offenders. Former churchwarden (c. 1614) William Frothingham, for example, had been presented in 1624 for refusing to take communion unless he could have it sitting, and in 1625 for non-attendance, hat wearing and refusing to kneel during prayers. A persistent lay puritan tradition, fed by South Collingham, combined with the undiplomatic manner of vicar George Greene, therefore seems to have played a significant role in fomenting non-payment.

Only two other parishes in 1626 had five or more non-payers presented: Warsop and Nottingham St. Nicholas, each with five. A closer look at the cases in Warsop reveals that three of the five non-payers came from the township of Sookholme; they had failed to hand in “the accustomed duties they must pay towards the use of the parish church of Warsope.” The other two non-payers owed the substantial sum of 9s 4d each. Of these five men, only one had committed a previous offense (a fornication case in 1622) and none would be presented again after 1626. In fact, the man indicted for fornication would serve as a churchwarden in 1625,
and one of the men who owed 9s 4d would serve that role from 1629-1630. At Nottingham, St. Nicholas the churchwardens likewise neglected to explain the circumstances of non-payment, though one man declined to pay his lay on two separate occasions this year.\textsuperscript{89} As at Warsop, so at St. Nicholas only one other non-payer had a previous offense: Alice Wolf had been presented in 1625 for suspected fornication.\textsuperscript{90} The overall impression from St. Nicholas and Warsop for 1626, then, stands in some contrast to that of North Collingham. While in the latter, much of the refusal appears to have stemmed from puritan influences and/or dissatisfaction with the then present ecclesiastical regime, at Warsop and St. Nicholas non-payment seems to have been based in more ephemeral, non-ideological causes.

The notable cases of non-payment in 1624 might be understood in largely the same terms. As noted, 12 of the 61 episodes transpired in North Collingham amidst the conflict and disorder there in this year. One can, however, see other sizable presentments at East Retford (nine) and Nottingham St. Peter’s (10). With two exceptions, the non-payers at East Retford had not appeared, nor would appear again, as ecclesiastical offenders. The impression is one of landowners having simply fallen behind: three of the presentees owed two lays and one had accumulated a debt of three lays. It is also true that the parish may still have been performing work on the stalls and the pulpit in early 1624, as in 1623 the vicar had been accused of pulling down stalls and the pulpit, and in 1622 the quire and several windows had needed repairing.\textsuperscript{91} The offenders at Nottingham St. Peter’s were with one exception accused of not paying their assessments nor their church duties. As at East Retford, most of the 1624 offenders had not been
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nor would be presented for other offenses. 92 Given East Retford’s puritan traditions and Marchant’s description of St. Peter’s as a “Puritan stronghold” from at least the 1610s through the Laudian period, it is more than likely that these one-time offenders were not motivated by puritan ideological opposition but by more banal factors that are difficult to specify.93

The data for the remaining three years (1636, 1639, 1638) permit one to compare and contrast the circumstances behind notable cases of non-payment, but also to test assumptions about high costs being a key factor behind disapprobation of Laudianism. Thus, while paying particular attention to the most notable cases of non-payment, the following analysis will also investigate several of the highest spending parishes for each year. It will be seen that some of the highest spending parishes did indeed see some discontinuities in the form of non-payment moving into the Laudian period, and that more former churchwardens and gentleman were presented than in earlier decades. Nevertheless, the bulk of evidence suggests that for the majority of parishes, non-payment did not become more of a problem than before, if it became one at all. Nor, in large part, do the circumstances for the majority of cases appear to be without precedent.

According to the court book of the diocesan visitation, the parishes of Gringley, Clifton and Holme Pierrepont saw the most notable cases of non-payment in 1636.94 While the circumstances surrounding these episodes reflect a large degree of continuity with those of the previous decade, those transpiring in Gringley manifest some novelties. Continuity can be seen firstly in the roughly parallel “spread” of non-payment across the archdeaconry, with 22 parishes seeing cases in 1636 compared to 18 in 1624 and 19 in 1626. Although Clifton did not witness
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the sort of numbers seen in North Collingham, the men at fault for non-payment in the former were, like many in the latter, also recidivists. In fact, the seven cases noted in the 1636 court book involved only one man other than two well-known repeat offenders.\footnote{Vis. 1636 CB f. 488.} The situation at Holme Pierrepont was more akin to that in Nottingham St. Nicholas and Warsop in 1626. That is, the majority of the six non-payers were first-time offenders, while two were no strangers to ecclesiastical justice.\footnote{Vis. 1636 CB f. 494.} By contrast, while several of the non-payers at Gringley were first-time offenders in 1636, they would be presented again at least once before 1640. Though not unheard of, the presence of two former churchwardens among the non-payers, as well as several gentlemen, also stands out at Gringley. The amounts owed by some of these men, including non-gentlemen, is also striking. The farmer of the tithes owed several assessments, totaling to more than £7, and another man owed assessments worth more than £5.\footnote{Vis. 1636 CB f. 438.} Compare these figures to Holme Pierrepont, where the greatest amount owed was only 4s. This sizable difference can be explained in part by the substantial court orders laid upon Gringley and the relatively high yearly expenditures that resulted therefrom. Speaking more broadly, Gringley appears to have entered a new epoch as of 1630: while non-payers had been presented in four different years through 1629, they would be presented every year thereafter until 1640, saving 1635.\footnote{Much of the unruliness at Gringley in the 1630s seems to have revolved around negligence and/or mismanagement on the part of the farmer of the tithes, John James.} It is possible, therefore, that the royal directions calling for the improvement of churches issued in 1629 caused Gringley churchwardens to take a firmer approach in collecting fees and dues.\footnote{Watts, “The Impact of Laudianism on the Parish,” 24.}

Among the three parishes just discussed, Clifton placed highest in overall expenditure for 1636 at 5th place, with Gringley in 11th and Holme Pierrepont in 63rd. Thus, while some...
correlation between expenditure and non-payment can be seen, high expenditures did not necessarily lead to non-payment. An examination of the top-spending parishes in 1636 bears this out, but at the same time reveals other ways that hefty expenditures concretized Laudianism—that is, made it physically real and present—in a given parish.¹⁰⁰ Newark’s place among these probably comes with little surprise, given its importance among the county’s major towns, and its status as a center of ecclesiastical administration. All of these factors, especially together with the resistance to Ship Money exactions from 1635 appear to have substantially augmented the concreteness of Laudianism in Newark.¹⁰¹ In fact, Mottershed himself had inspected the church in 1635, describing the stalls as “uncomely and undecent and no uniformitie therein obseved, some of them beinge made double stalls, and some higher and some lower” than others. Mottershed in the same report authorized and directed the mayor, churchwardens and an unnamed third party to attend to the necessary repairs and “certifie” the same “att our next generall Chapter to be holden there for the said Deanerye of Newarke.”¹⁰² The court excommunicated the non-compliant churchwardens in November of the same year, and the “Church and seats” were still under repair at Michaelmas term for 1636.¹⁰³

¹⁰⁰ See Table 4.2.
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Table 4.2 Top Spending Parishes by Year (Amounts in Pence\textsuperscript{104})

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1635</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>1636</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>1637</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>1639</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normanton-on-Soar</td>
<td>38400</td>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>24000</td>
<td>Thorpe</td>
<td>43200</td>
<td>Keyworth</td>
<td>9600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fledborough</td>
<td>14400</td>
<td>Thorpe</td>
<td>24000</td>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>33600</td>
<td>Sibthorpe</td>
<td>7200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winkburn</td>
<td>12000</td>
<td>Winkburn</td>
<td>24000</td>
<td>East Retford</td>
<td>24000</td>
<td>Strelley</td>
<td>7200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laxton</td>
<td>9600</td>
<td>Nottingham, St. Nicholas</td>
<td>8400</td>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>24000</td>
<td>Radford</td>
<td>6720</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gringley</td>
<td>7200</td>
<td>Clifton</td>
<td>7200</td>
<td>Teversal</td>
<td>24000</td>
<td>Sutton Bonington, St. Michael</td>
<td>6720</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumtree</td>
<td>7200</td>
<td>North Wheatley</td>
<td>7200</td>
<td>Winkburn</td>
<td>21600</td>
<td>Broughton Sulney</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlton-in-Lindrick</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>Plumtree</td>
<td>7200</td>
<td>East Markham</td>
<td>14400</td>
<td>South Collingham</td>
<td>5640</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Leverton</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>Sutton-cum-Lound</td>
<td>7200</td>
<td>South Collingham</td>
<td>14400</td>
<td>Cotham</td>
<td>4800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkesley</td>
<td>4800</td>
<td>West Markham</td>
<td>7200</td>
<td>Worksop</td>
<td>12000</td>
<td>East Bridgford</td>
<td>4800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayton</td>
<td>4800</td>
<td>Weston</td>
<td>7200</td>
<td>Balderton</td>
<td>9600</td>
<td>East Retford</td>
<td>4800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While Newark had seen its fair share of non-payers in the first decades of the seventeenth century, presentments became more consistent especially after 1634, though they did not see any notable increase in terms of the numbers of persons cited. 1627 had witnessed two instances of non-payment, 1629, four, and 1632, two. After the three cases of 1635, there were two at the diocesan visitation of 1636, five in 1637, one in 1638 and four in 1639.\textsuperscript{105} Only two of the individuals so accused had been or would subsequently be presented for other offenses. Cited for non-payment in 1635, Richard Coppendale had been presented twice for non-attendance along with his wife in 1632.\textsuperscript{106} The other repeat offender was Joshua Cross, presented in 1629 and then again at the diocesan visitation of 1636 for non-payment of assessments.\textsuperscript{107} Richard Dickins,

\textsuperscript{104} These figures were determined by converting amounts originally given in terms of pounds, shillings, and pence. Note that £1=240d. No rounding was used.
\textsuperscript{105} Vis. 1636 CB f. 474v.
\textsuperscript{106} AN/PB 328/5/15.
\textsuperscript{107} AN/PB 296/2/41.
cited for non-payment in 1637, stands out for his previous service as churchwarden in 1632-1633, and James Pilkington, guilty of the like in 1635, appears to have been a clergyman of some sort. Dickins having served so recently as churchwarden and Pilkington’s clerical status raise the likelihood that their non-payment stemmed from deeper concerns. On the other hand, one must also note that Pilkington’s dues for 1635 totaled to 5s, more than the 4s 8d owed by gentleman Phillip Ballsard at the same visitation. Why Pilkington owed such a hefty sum is not exactly clear, as the presentment bill does not indicate any outstanding dues, thus it is possible that Pilkington’s non-payment resulted simply from the sense that he was mis-assessed. Similarly, in 1637 Dickins’ dues amounted to the high sum of 8s 6d. An examination of the comparable episodes of non-payment in 1618, 1619 and 1624 suggests that those of the 1630s did not constitute a significant departure from the previous two decades. As in the 1620s, most of the offenders were only cited once. Given Newark’s size, yearly expenditures, and importance to the hierarchy, the parish presents fewer instances of non-payment or other potential indicators of popular resistance than might have been expected, evidencing less discontinuity than Gringley, for example. A post-Reformation ecclesiastical tradition relatively free of puritanism may constitute part of the explanation, as Dr. Moseley (from 1629) appears to have been the first puritan to hold the vicarage.

The rural parish of Thorpe stands in some contrast to the larger and frankly more important town of Newark, though like Newark appears not to have had much history of puritanism. In 1613, the churchwardens admitted to not having the works of Jewell, explaining that “our town is poor so that we are not able to buy it.” Similarly, the churchwardens for 1625

108 AN/PB 328/9/29.
109 Each of these years witnessed four instances of non-payment.
presented that they could not complete the necessary repairs to the roof because they were “but three or four poor men.”\textsuperscript{111} Thorpe, however, not only matched Newark’s 1636 expenditure but would go on to spend more than the latter by the end of the decade. Most of this money presumably went toward work on the seats ongoing throughout 1636, as well as repairs to the steeple in late 1636 and early 1637.\textsuperscript{112} Given all the money put toward these projects, it comes as something of a surprise to see just how little was presented throughout the Laudian era. Aside from that against Mr. Scarlett for not reading Wednesday and Friday prayers out of Lent, presumably the most serious presentments were a case of non-communication in early 1634 and the lack of a parish clerk in 1638.\textsuperscript{113} Yet, also in 1638, a report to the archdeacon’s court recorded the want of a font cover and paving in the bell tower; there was also need of a poor man’s box, a lock and keys for the chest, a book of homilies, a book of canons, a register book and a book for the names of “strange” preachers.\textsuperscript{114} The juxtaposition of this report with the massive sums expended in 1636 and 1637 poses a clear interpretive quandary, especially in light of the churchwardens’ bill from May 1637. Therein, the churchwardens assert that “there is a new pulpit and a new rail for the communion table and all the church ornaments are fitting and decent.”\textsuperscript{115} It might even be interpreted as evidence of a higher degree of zeal for the specifically Laudian measures than those comprising basic conformity to the canons. However one explains these oddities, it remains true that no cases of non-payment survive from Thorpe during the Laudian era or hitherto. The churchwardens’ preoccupation with the major efforts of 1636-1637 and/or simple negligence on their part therefore constitutes the likeliest explanation for the 1638

\textsuperscript{111} AN/PB 326/8/18.  
\textsuperscript{112} AN/PB 328/11/34.  
\textsuperscript{113} AN/PB 328/15/39; AN/PB 328/7/37; AN/PB 328/13/4.  
\textsuperscript{115} AN/PB 328/11/34; in October (AN/PB 328/12/6) £180 is recorded for the 1637 expenditure.
report. In short, Thorpe saw fewer issues with non-payment and other signs of disruption than did Gringley despite spending more than three times as much.\textsuperscript{116}

Another top spender in 1636, Nottingham St. Nicholas, also experienced less quietude in the Laudian period than Thorpe.\textsuperscript{117} This owes in part to lay puritanism fed by the nearby puritan stronghold of St. Peter’s. Three persons had been presented for gadding in 1629, two in 1630, and in 1631 the churchwardens had presented a man for reading divine service without license.\textsuperscript{118} As for non-payment offenses, St. Nicholas witnessed a fairly continuous stream throughout the early seventeenth century but with slight increases in the Laudian period. In 1635, the churchwardens explicitly linked the non-payment of nine parishioners to funds raised “towards the repair and beautifying of the church.”\textsuperscript{119} As shown above, St. Nicholas also witnessed two episodes of payment-related churchwarden abuse in 1637 and 1638. Yet, St. Nicholas had already seen the presentment of eight people for non-payment of dues for the repair of the church in 1632. Moreover, for both 1632 and 1635, all but two so charged had not been presented before nor would be again. This indicates that the advent of Mottershed and firmer Laudian measures did not lead to totally unprecedented changes.\textsuperscript{120} Thus, while St. Nicholas clearly experienced some disruptions as a result of Laudian measures, these were not to the degree that might be expected given Nottingham’s size and puritan traditions This probably relates also to St. Nicholas’s lack of major repair projects during the 1630s.

\textsuperscript{116} AN/PB 303/401 records £100 spent at Thorpe in 1636.
\textsuperscript{117} Nottingham St. Nicholas and Clifton were the remaining two of the top five spending parishes for 1636, spending £35 and £30, respectively.
\textsuperscript{118} AN/PB 320/513; AN/PB 303/61.
\textsuperscript{119} AN/PB 303/327 (October 1635). Nine non-payers were presented in all this year at Nottingham St. Nicholas.
\textsuperscript{120} AN/PB 303/765/2.
1638 saw roughly 20 more cases of non-payment across the archdeaconry than did 1636, and is second only to 1639 in terms of the breadth of non-payment, touching thirty-three parishes to the latter’s thirty-seven. Registering 20 non-payers, Nottingham St. Mary’s witnessed the most notable episode of non-payment this year, evidencing as well some of the novelties seen at Gringley.121 Although expenditures are missing for 1638, St. Mary’s impressive count should not be too surprising, given that 1638 tops the list for the total number of non-payers by year for Nottinghamshire. Moreover, St. Mary’s had seen nine cases of non-payment in 1635 and 10 in 1637, while fairly extensive adjustments had been ordered in the latter year as well.122 On the other hand, small numbers presented by a wide swathe of parishes constitute the bulk of cases, making St. Mary’s exceptional.123 Marchant records a £10 expense for St. Mary’s in 1637, but the churchwardens’ bill itself notes “60 pounds bestowed this year on our church.”124 It is possible that a higher amount could have been presented for 1638, but this seems unlikely given that St. Mary’s churchwardens had already certified completion of several projects by February of that year.

While St. Mary’s had non-Puritan rectors during the 1620s and 1630s, it had been the main center of puritanism in Elizabethan times, and pockets of lay puritanism persisted thereafter.125 Encouraging this was St. Mary’s maintenance of a preacher in the 1630s named Thomas Cranage, a puritan who was personally cited to court by Mottershed in 1635. Apparently

121 AN/PB 303/588.
122 AN/PB 303/466; AN/PB 303/509.
123 In 1637, twenty-three parishes presented non-payers, while thirty-three did so in 1638.
124 AN/PB 303/509; Marchant, “The Restoration of Nottinghamshire Churches,” 81. Compare these amounts to the £35 reported for St. Nicholas in 1636 and £40 from St. Peter’s in the same year.
125 Marchant, The Puritans and the Church Courts, 186. Some were presented, for example, for gadding to St. Peter’s. In 1637, the vicar, Laudian sympathizer Edmund Lacocke, was the target of “base, vile and reproachful words” per AN/PB 303/466.
Mottershed’s tactics worked; Cranage does not appear in the disciplinary records again.\textsuperscript{126} Prior nonconformity does not, however, stand out for St. Mary’s non-payers from 1635-1638. In each year’s bills, one can see a fairly diverse spread of amounts owed. In 1635, unpaid dues ranged from 6d all the way up to 20s. In 1637, a widow owed 8d, while a Mr. Blythe owed 10s. Similarly, in 1638 a Mr. Allen owed 12d while James Alderman owed 20s.\textsuperscript{127} Notwithstanding, by 1638 the proportion of recidivist and/or socially prominent non-payers became noticeably larger. Only one of the 1635 non-payers appears again in the records, and for adultery at that. Among those for 1638, five had failed to pay in 1637. Of these five, Mr. Blythe owed the greatest sums, being 10s each year. Also among the 1638 non-payers were three gentlemen, including Robert Hurt who had served as churchwarden in 1633-1634. Another former churchwarden from 1630-1631 had also failed to pay. A glance at the 1618 bills recording the second highest number of non-payers for St. Mary’s reveals the notable rise in dues for gentlemen: in this year, gentleman William Hooper had only been assessed 2s, compared with the 10s and 15s William Stanhope would be assessed in 1635 and 1638, respectively.\textsuperscript{128} As at Gringley, then, non-payment on the part of gentlemen and former churchwardens probably indicates a more specific dissatisfaction with the higher assessments but also, perhaps, the way these funds were being used. The presentment of only one non-payer in 1639, by which time the major changes to the church had been completed and only £2 15s spent, supports this interpretation.\textsuperscript{129}

\textsuperscript{126} Ibid., 194.
\textsuperscript{127} AN/PB 303/588.
\textsuperscript{128} AN/PB 303/700; AN/PB 295/7/10.
\textsuperscript{129} AN/PB 303/614; AN/PB 303/660.
East Retford saw the second most cases (six) in 1638, though a notable increase in amounts owed does not seem to have been the root cause. As noted above, one of the six non-payers would also be charged with threatening the churchwardens. Two others were widows, raising the likelihood that sheer inability to pay was behind their infractions. It is not entirely clear whether the “Parnell” noted in the 1638 bill (owing 20d) is the same alderman Robert Parnell listed as a non-payer for 1639, but the presence of the school master Thomas Stacye for non-payment in 1638 suggests that at least some notable men had begun to take exception to the Laudian measures and costs; in 1639 Parnell was joined by George Halfhide, who had served as churchwarden from 1637-1638, and both owed more than 6s. This demonstrates that even while the Laudian measures ordered for East Retford caused less disruption than expected, there were at least a few men that early Stuart historians peg as likely opponents of Laudianism that do indeed appear to have become discontented.\(^{130}\)

In 1639, however, the majority of parishes across the archdeaconry experienced less turmoil and expended less toward repairs. The overall average expense for 1639 comes out to just under £5, down from 1637’s £11 9s 4d average. Glancing at the list of 1639’s top spending parishes, one sees a host of names new to the podium: Keyworth, Sibthorpe, Strelley, Radford, and Sutton Bonington, St. Michael. Unlike Thorpe, East Retford or Newark, these parishes maxed out at £40, a substantial sum, but far from the likes of Thorpe’s £180 total in 1637.\(^{131}\) Nor do the parishes other than Sutton Bonington evidence much of a puritan past. Nevertheless, the fact that each spent more in 1639 than 1635, 1636 or 1637 suggests some slackness in carrying out directives. At Strelley, the churchwardens from 1631-1637 had presented virtually nothing,

---

\(^{130}\) Marcombe, *East Retford*, 247. Also see the earlier section on abuse of churchwardens for more discussion of the Court orders for East Retford, listed in Marchant, “Restoration of Nottinghamshire Churches,” 70.

\(^{131}\) AN/PB 315/17/22.
while court records from 1638 reveal a host of items needing repair: the roof, walls, glass, floor, lead, timber, lime, stone and the seats as well. At Sibthorpe and Radford, repairs had also been slow in coming, the seats and floors only finished as of August 1639 at Sibthorpe and the roof still under repair at Radford in April 1639. Keyworth and Sutton Bonington St. Michael’s large expenditures for 1639 prove harder to explain, given the lack of court orders or issues noted by churchwardens. In terms of non-payment, however, the fact remains that very few cases survive for any of the five parishes; at most, churchwardens presented one person for the offense in 1639. That few other indications of lay resentment survive suggests that Laudianism arrived late and enjoyed but a brief tenure in most of these parishes.

The site of the greatest incidence of non-payment in 1639, Kelham shared Sibthorpe’s experience of notable expenses in the late 1630s. While Sibthorpe, Strelley and Radford reported their largest expenses in 1639, Kelham churchwardens had reported theirs in 1635, being £30, and their second largest in 1636, being £20. Yet, the wardens had only cited two different men for non-payment prior to 1639, when £14 was spent. Two basic reasons for the spate of nine incidents in 1639 can be given. Firstly, the churchwardens had failed to address the problems with the middle bell and churchyard fence presented in September 1638. The court excommunicated them for this neglect in January 1639. As the first six cases of non-payment appear in a bill from the next month, it seems likely that the churchwardens had been spurred into action and had begun attempting to collect funds to complete the repairs.

---

133 Ibid., 84; AN/PB 303/603.
134 Keyworth’s churchwardens had certified for the seats and floors in February 1638, but no orders were given thereafter. See Marchant, “The Restoration of Nottinghamshire Churches,” 75.
135 See Table 4.3.
136 AN/PB 328/10/19; AN/PB 303/418.
churchwardens’ bill from April 1639 provides a second rationale, a notable increase in the rates owed by parishioners. Gentleman John Pond owed 10s in February, but in April owed 30s. Henry North had apparently paid up in February, but in April 24s was demanded of him. 138 The changes in the rate owed by another non-payer, William Whitton, also illustrates the increase. Whitton’s unpaid dues in 1633 had totaled 2s 1d. In 1637 he owed 4s 8d; by February 1639 his rate had almost doubled, being 9s. 139 This suggests that Kelham had an experience of Laudianism akin to that of East Retford, Gringley or Nottingham St. Mary’s. That is, successive waves of high rates eventually drove some, especially prominent, men into non-payment. John Pond and Henry North’s dues in April 1639 individually amounted to more than the total expenditures of some parishes for the same year. Stanton on the Wolds, for example, recorded only £1 toward repairs. 140

Table 4.3 Notable Cases of Non-Payment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year*</th>
<th>Total Instances (Yearly)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Local Instances (Yearly)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1607</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Kirton</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nottingham, St. Peter’s</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1608</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>West Retford</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1609</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Warsop</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1612</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Linby</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sutton in Ashfield</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Warsop</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bawtry</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1616</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Annesley</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1618</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Nottingham, St. Mary’s</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Warsop</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1619</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Lenton</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1624</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>North Collingham</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nottingham, St. Peter’s</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>East Retford</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>East Retford</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1626</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>North Collingham</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

138 AN/PB 328/15/20.  
139 AN/PB 328/6/59; AN/PB 303/397.  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1627</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Nottingham, St. Nicholas</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1628</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Barnby in the Willows</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Gringley</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1631</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>East Retford</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carlton in Lindrick</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1632</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Nottingham, St. Nicholas</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1635</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>North Collingham</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nottingham, St. Mary’s</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nottingham, St. Nicholas</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sutton on Trent</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1636</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Gringley</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clifton</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Holme Pierrepont</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1637</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nottingham, St. Mary’s</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1638</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Nottingham, St. Mary’s</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>East Retford</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1639</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Kelham</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this examination of years with the greatest number of non-payment cases, one can draw several important observations. Firstly, it should be reiterated that only three of these six years derive from the Laudian era and that sizable episodes of non-payment related to specific church repairs or purchases were forthcoming at earlier points in the seventeenth century. In none of the major episodes from 1636, 1638, or 1639 can one explicitly link non-payment to refusal to pay for specific items or repairs. Moreover, although not precluding other ramifications, it has been shown that even if some correlation can be established between high expenditures and problems with non-payment, this was not always the case. Secondly, however, while the number of notable episodes did decrease in 1638 and 1639, non-payment cases do appear to have become more widespread and to have involved greater individual costs as well as greater numbers of gentlemen and former churchwardens. While this indicates greater disaffection than Marchant allowed for in his studies, the evidence still reflects less antipathy than the prevailing assumptions would lead one to expect.

With two notable exceptions, the evidence regarding expenditures and non-payment in 1635 and 1637 aligns with the basic patterns just described. Ranked by the number of non-
payers, these years come in ninth and eleventh place, with 59 and 51 cases, respectively.

Gringley excepted, none of the top five spending parishes for 1635 saw more than a handful of presentments for non-payment of any sort. As noted above, some saw no cases of non-payment whatsoever, including far and away the highest spending parish for this year, Normanton-upon-Soar, as well as the third-place parish, Winkburn. While the second place parish, Fledborough, did not have the highest quality ministers in the Laudian period, the churchwardens between 1635-1641 were not particularly slack in making presentments; in 1635 and 1637-1639, they presented over twenty cases of recusancy each year.\(^{141}\) Given their similarly thorough descriptions of needed repairs and/missing items, it is unlikely that non-payment would have gone unpresented.\(^{142}\) As for the top spenders in 1637, it is true that some of these such as Newark and East Retford did see issues with non-payment in the Laudian Era, though nothing unprecedented. It is also true, however, that two of the top five spenders—including the top spender Thorpe—did not see any presentations for non-payment during the 1630s.

The two main exceptions occurred at North Collingham in 1635, and Mansfield in 1637. North Collingham’s case will be analyzed in the next section concerning Puritan and Laudian pastored parishes. Mansfield had neither sort of pastor in the 1630s. Reporting £100 toward the church in 1637, the churchwardens there presented nineteen parishioners for not paying their assessments.\(^{143}\) Such a number was not totally unprecedented in Mansfield, given the aforementioned presentation of twelve persons for not paying toward belfry and bell repairs in 1612. Mansfield’s puritan past makes it somewhat surprising that the most consistent

\(^{141}\) AN/PB 328/12/27. See AN/PB 328/1/16 and AN/PB 328/14/29 for descriptions of Fledborough’s vicar and curate hosting drinkers or “haunting” alehouses themselves.

\(^{142}\) AN/PB 328/14/29.

\(^{143}\) AN/PB 303/507.
presentments from the 1620s through the Laudian period involved recusancy. May 1625 saw nine persons presented, April 1626, 13, and 1631, nine more.\textsuperscript{144} Added to this were 13 persons in 1634, 15 in 1635, 10 in 1637, and 15 in 1639.\textsuperscript{145} One might therefore reasonably expect that many of the non-payers cited in 1637 were also recusants. In fact, not a single person among the nineteen had been or would be presented for recusancy. One might then look to lay puritanism as the explanation, but the evidence cannot support this interpretation either. The few recidivist offenders among the eighteen were guilty of fornication, adultery and/or standing excommunicate for adultery, none of which bespeaks puritan behavior. Unfortunately, expenses do not survive for 1635 or 1636, and the court records do not specify any orders or repairs. It is known, however, that the Chancellor was in Mansfield in September 1637, and the fairly extensive orders he issued for Mansfield’s nearby chapelry of Mansfield Woodhouse suggest that he also gave directions to the mother church.\textsuperscript{146} Moreover, evidence from Quarter Session records for 1635-1636 reveals ongoing disagreements about how the assessment process was to be conducted. In October 1635 the justices ordered that the assessment ought to be based on actual wealth, rather than land. Yet, in an entry for January 1636 the justices noted that this decision was under review because it had led to inequality of assessment.\textsuperscript{147} The spate of incidents in 1637 might thus have been the result of higher assessments compounded with dissatisfaction over the assessment process itself. Though the exception rather than the rule, Mansfield’s experience in 1637, as with Nottingham St. Mary’s in 1638 and North Collingham’s
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in 1635, demonstrates that the costs and measures of Laudianism did provoke antipathy in certain places and given certain circumstances.

The presence of puritan preacher Thomas Cranage in St. Mary’s in the 1630s, as well as the observably hefty doses of Laudianism experienced in large puritan pastored parishes like East Retford and Newark raises the question of the broader experience of puritan pastored churches across the archdeaconry. If one includes these larger parishes in the calculations, the average expenditure per year (1635-1639) for parishes with puritan ministers totals to £10 14s 7d, which is slightly more than the average for all parishes of £9 7s 7d. Taking Newark and East Retford’s totals out of the equation, however, lowers the average for parishes with puritan ministers to £6 8s, though the median remains similar to the overall figure, at £5 11s 8d. This indicates that most parishes with puritan incumbents did not feel the extent of Laudianism one might have expected—if the hierarchy had indeed been particularly targeting such parishes.

While several such as Sutton-cum-Lound, Greasley, Tithby and Hayton experienced one year of notable expenditures, there were no resulting cases of mass non-payment. At Sutton-cum-Lound, where among the greatest of these sums was spent, only three cases of non-payment appear after 1632, all coming in 1639. At least one of the churchwardens for this year was sympathetic to the Laudian ideals, as they presented the communion table as insufficient and the vicar for problems with the seats in the chancel, despite the fact that the communion rail had been certified in December 1637 and the uniformity of the seats in April 1638. While nothing is known beyond the names of two of the non-payers, the third was a gentleman by the name of
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150 AN/PB 341/8/47; Marchant, “The Restoration of Nottinghamshire Churches,” 86. These churchwardens would see to the installation of a new table by August, though the case regarding the chancel seating was dismissed.
Thomas Stowe, who had been presented twice in 1638 and again in 1639 for the non-uniformity of his seat in the church as well as negligent attendance. Even if it is granted that Stowe refused to attend or pay for ideological reasons, his resistance is the exception that demonstrates the rule of general compliance of puritan-led parishes with the costs of Laudianism.  

With the notable and unsurprising exception of North Collingham, parishes with ministers identified as Laudian or Canons-Laudian in this study also generally complied with these costs. In Kneesall where William Clough presided, successive churchwardens did not present a single case of non-payment between 1604 and 1640, with only one appearing in 1641. Aside from a few individuals, including Mrs. Ireton, who failed to pay their tithes in 1631, no one in Gervase Dodson’s parish of Attenborough was presented after 1631 for non-payment of any sort. Barton in Fabis and Langar did not have rectors sympathetic to Laudianism until later in the 1630s, so it is perhaps less surprising that they also saw very few cases of non-payment. Part of the explanation for general compliance may lie in the surprisingly small expenditures reported by the above parishes. While Kneesall ranks 30th in terms of overall expenditure, the next highest ranks in only 86th place. All besides Kneesall had lower average expenditures than the modified average expenditure of puritan led parishes.

The spate of twelve non-payers at North Collingham in 1635 cannot, however, be explained as the reaction to great expenditures; only £3 10s was reported for this year.  

151 Although South Collingham did not have a puritan minister in the 1630s, the general lack of non-payment in the Laudian era is still telling, given the extensive expenditures noted for 1637 and 1639 and the fact that Marchant considered this parish essentially a “separatist” congregation. See AN/PB 328/12/36 (£60) and AN/PB 328/16/12 (£23 10s).
152 AN/PB 299/58.
153 AN/PB 303/123.
154 That is, modified to exclude Newark and East Retford’s totals from the overall average.
155 AN/PB 328/9/8.
closer examination, one sees that all twelve specifically failed to hand in their Easter offerings, and it is not a coincidence that these offerings were intended for the particular use of the minister. Vicar George Greene drew up this bill and, in fact, the churchwardens themselves were included among those not paying the offerings. While none of the twelve saving the notorious Walter Lloyd had been or would be presented for blatantly puritan offenses, other evidence still suggests that continuing puritan sympathies influenced the non-payment of offerings in 1635. For one thing, almost all of the twelve men, along with their wives, appear to have left off attending prayers on “Wednesdays, Fridays and holy evenings according to the 15th canon and the Book of Common prayer” at some point before the next visitation. All of this illustrates the fireworks that could result from the right combination of Laudian churchmanship and strong puritan leanings. Yet it remains the case that a great majority of parishes were free of such a combination and that compliance with the costs of the Laudian era was normative even in puritan and Laudian pastored parishes.

V. Conclusion

The evidence regarding the costs of Laudianism presented in this chapter has demonstrated that opposition was neither “remarkably small” nor remarkably large. If Laudian measures “destroyed the Church of England” in Bath and Wells, lay resistance neither led to nor reflected anything of the sort in the Archdeaconry of Nottingham. As John Morrill and Anthony Fletcher might have suspected, there is some reason to believe that Laudian costs did adversely and disproportionately impact those called upon to bear the greatest part of the increased assessments, especially given the other costs laid upon such men in the 1630s.
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Moreover, events in parishes like North Collingham and Nottingham St. Mary’s demonstrate that the persisting influence of puritanism could, given the right circumstances, result in notable episodes of lay defiance. While it is probable that some of the persons involved did refuse payment owing to dissatisfaction with specific Laudian costs, there is very little evidence that proves this beyond reasonable doubt. By contrast, a sizable amount of evidence demonstrates that the increased expenses of the Laudian period did not lead to great changes or unprecedented infractions, even in parishes that bore the heaviest costs. The evidence for 1635, when the Laudian changes would presumably have been the most unsettling, is particularly striking. Of the five biggest spenders in this year, only two reported non-payment cases of any kind in the 1630s, and these come to a grand total of only four. While not quite as serene, the archdeaconry’s experience appears to resemble that described by Sylvia Watts for East Staffordshire and North Shropshire: lots of compliance, even if slow compliance, and less evidence than suspected of disapproval of specifically Laudian costs. Thus, this and the previous chapter have revealed the limited impact of Laudianism respecting its observable effects on lay persons and the normal rounds of ecclesiastical discipline. Even in those parishes with low yearly expenditures and few lay behavior issues in the Laudian period, however, Laudianism could become “concrete” in less observable, but no less important ways. The historiography has above all focused in this regard on changes involving the communion table, though other Laudian measures implicating the materiality of religious experience have also received much attention. It is therefore to a more specific investigation of these material concerns that the work now turns.
Chapter Five
The Material Impact of Laudianism

In the spring of 1639, while Edward Mottershed’s church restoration and reform program continued apace in the archdeaconry of Nottingham, the churchwardens of Barnstone Chapel were excommunicated for failing to rail their communion table, properly maintain the chapel yard, or provide a decent cloth and cushion for the pulpit.¹ Just months before, the sole churchwarden of Bradmore chapel had been excommunicated for publicly refusing to rebuild the wall on the south side of the chapel yard or provide a rail. Though absolved, the churchwarden would again refuse to comply and was excommunicated in April. Continued recalcitrance saw yet another citation from the court issued in October 1640.² For historians of Laudianism, these episodes fit neatly into the prevailing view of the 1630s in the Church of England. Ministers, churchwardens, and even common parishioners purportedly opposed and, in some cases, openly resisted the reforming efforts of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and their secular and clerical allies. While new, or newly enforced, expectations regarding proper behavior in ecclesiastical services and the potentially high price tags associated with Laudian measures explain some of this opposition, many scholars would agree with James Galloway that to a great extent, Laudian efforts “to rehabilitate churches...were the most damaging of their endeavors.”³

Even Nicholas Tyacke, who long emphasized the disruptiveness of Arminian theology, came to see that the attack on Calvinism was secondary to the “sacramental reorientation of English

---
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religious life” implicit in the Laudians’ reforming campaign. As Suzanna Ivanic argues, in the early modern period, “religion was not just about the internal…but also consisted of ‘external’ practices, rituals and objects, and it is the connection between the two that is important.” Among other measures, changes to the communion table allegedly provoked the most controversy. This was so because of the potentially “striking” changes in religious experience that could result, such as compulsory reception at the rails. The present chapter seeks to explore the impact of material changes wrought by Laudianism in the less studied northern province to further test prevailing assumptions about this period—many of which are grounded in studies of southerly jurisdictions. While the central focus will be on analyzing the dynamics of the railing process, this chapter will also examine other issues connected to Laudian notions of sacred space, striving to determine how concern for churchyards, chancels, ornaments and furnishings changed (if at all) over the early seventeenth century in the Archdeaconry of Nottingham.

As the episodes noted at the outset of this chapter demonstrate, opposition to Laudian efforts certainly did arise, but it is not exactly clear how such instances should be interpreted. In fact, the two historians who have provided the most substantive treatment of Laudianism in the archdeaconry arrive at rather different conclusions despite looking at essentially the same body of evidence. S.B. Jennings argues that opposition to the material changes was both widespread and indicative of “an undercurrent of dissatisfaction” with Laudianism that would manifest as
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nonconformity and dissent in the decades to come. While Ronald Marchant does admit the use of both persuasion and compulsion on the part of the authorities in carrying out Laudian aims, he ultimately emphasizes that there was “little open resistance” and “much voluntary cooperation.”

This chapter seeks to build upon the findings of Marchant and Jennings in two primary ways: through an in-depth examination of the railing process, and a systematic investigation as to how attention to churchyards, chancels, and church items may have changed over time. Both previous works describe the scope and scale of orders regarding chancels, pews, and flooring in the 1630s, but pay less attention to setting this in the wider early seventeenth century context. The existence now of several important local studies also allows the present chapter to compare findings for Nottinghamshire to those for other localities. In brief, closer study of the railing process and these other issues regarding sacred spaces recommends a more nuanced understanding of how Laudianism became concretized in different ways and to differing degrees across the archdeaconry and, more broadly, across different dioceses. Certain facets of the Laudian program were undoubtedly novel and widely felt in this northerly region, but this should not elide the similarly widespread evidence of conformity and continuity.

I. Laudianism and the Sacredness of the Material

If Galloway’s assertion regarding the divisiveness of Laudianism’s material impact is even partly true, it is worth examining Laudian aims and ideals in some depth. Firstly, it should be noted that William Laud did not himself originate these ideals. The key works laying out the Laudian world view date to the late Elizabethan and early Jacobean period, stemming from the

---

pens and policies of men like Lancelot Andrewes, John Overall and Gabriel Goodman. Andrewes, the most influential among them, looked back in turn to churchmen who, while Protestant, had distanced themselves from the seeming radicalism of the Edwardian Reformation. Thus, the Laudian polemicists writing in the 1620s and 1630s inherited a certain understanding of the Reformation in England, one that manifested in their writings as an “apologetic of true Catholicity.” Laud likewise thought in these terms, claiming that “the Romanists have been apt to say, the houses of God could not be suffered to lie so nastily, as in some places [in England] they have done, were the true worship of God observed in them.” In short, the Laudian vision was one of restoring the beliefs and practices of the primitive church, shorn of medieval Catholic abuses and contemporary Protestant (that is, puritan) excesses. Perhaps the most critical facet of this vision was the belief that God’s presence suffused “the whole structure [of the church] and all the physical impedimenta used in his worship with an aura of holiness.” In particular, God’s presence was held to be “most intense in the areas given over to the administration of the sacraments, the font and the altar.”

Understanding the Laudian worldview helps explain the peculiar attention Laudian churchmen paid to restoring and/or restructuring churches, and to communion table settings in particular. Not only was the “visible church...invested with a positive holiness by dint of its continuation of the Church of the Apostles,” but the altar itself deserved special reverence “in regard to the presence of our saviour, whose chair of state it is upon earth.” If Christ truly

---
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dwelléd most fully within the altar, then no pews should be built, or allowed to remain, above it. As the Laudian polemicist Richard Sibthorpe argued, it “is not fit that any sit above God almighty.” More notoriously, Laudian altar policies also entailed the removal of communion tables to the east end of the chancel and their being railed in an altarwise (north and south) orientation. This was precisely the policy that the vicar of Newark, Dr. Moseley, took issue with in 1638, in which year he was presented for removing the communion table from its altarwise position and setting it east and west. Laudians also justified their altar policy in more practical terms. According to Laud, “If it stand not thus, and be not railed in, it wilbe subject to many prohanations [sic] and abuses; churchwardens will keepe their accompts at the Lords Table, parishioners will sitt found it and talke of their parish business . . . Schoolemasters will teach their boyes to write upon this Table.” Acutely critical of Laud for many reasons, even Margaret Stieg sees “considerable justification” in Laud’s arguments on this point.

As the special site of the communion table, which many Laudian churchmen came to treat as an altar, the chancel also deserved special attention. The Christian life was understood as a progression from font to altar, with each approach toward the latter constituting elevated degrees of holiness. Therefore in the Laudian period many chancels were “repaved . . . with high quality stone in order to provide a dignified approach to the altar.” In keeping with this elevated view of the font, chancel and altar, Archbishop Neile ordered “whatever pews or stalls had been erected [in the chancel] . . . to be removed, and new ones placed chancel-wise” or east-
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west, in order that all parishioners' views of the altar would be unobstructed.¹⁸ A broader vision of sacred spaces as “places of order and uniformity” led to the similar removal of non-uniform seating throughout the church, especially pews larger than the rest—often built by the gentry—that might obstruct the view of the altar.¹⁹

Neile and other Laudian bishops also sought a more stringent enforcement of the Canons of 1604 regarding church furnishings and ornaments, one of the chief goals of which was to remedy the widespread lack of “suitable font covers, cloths for the Holy Table, pewter flagons . . . pulpit cloths and cushions, service books, chests . . . boxes for alms for the poor” and sentences of scripture upon church walls.²⁰ Outside the church building itself, the churchyard was also invested with great significance. The Laudian Bishops of Peterborough, Francis Dee (1634-1638) and John Towers (1639-1649) composed visitation articles which explicitly forbade “profanation of the churchyard . . . by any secular activity whatsoever.”²¹ While Bishop of Durham, Neile had similarly inquired about “any fighting, chiding, brawling or quarreling, any plays, lords of misrule, summer-lords, morris-dancers, peddlers, bowlers, bearwards, butchers, feasts, schools, temporal courts or leets, lay juries, musters of other prophane usage” in the church or churchyard.²² It should be noted that Neile drew his language here almost verbatim from the 88th canon of 1604.
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As suzerain of the province and diocese in which the Archdeaconry of Nottingham was situated, Neile’s vision and policies, briefly sketched above, loom large in the story of the 1630s. Two key historiographical questions arise in light of this. First is the broader issue of whether or not “Laudianism” (or English Arminianism, or Arminianism) is a useful term to describe particular persons or periods in the first half of the seventeenth century. Against the majority view, scholars like Peter White, Kevin Sharpe and Christopher Haigh see modern insistence on an innovating “Arminianism” as chiefly resulting from the influence of William Prynne’s polemical writings. It is thanks to Prynne, White argues, “that established churchmen, conservative to the core, can be metamorphosed into revolutionaries.”\(^{23}\) Such authors also tend to conceive of the 1630s as a decade of “business as usual.”\(^ {24}\) The more specific question of Neile’s goals and connections with Laudianism has also resulted in divergent views. Marchant insists that there was nothing essentially new about Neile’s measures, claiming that “[H]is one policy was to return wherever possible to what had anciently been the pattern of the church interior.” Marchant also stresses Neile’s “innate conservatism and repudiation of change.”\(^ {25}\) One may perhaps understand Charles’s 1629 directions to repair churches in this light—as a call to fulfill the required canons and injunctions. By contrast, Tyacke and Fincham characterize Neile’s 1632-1634 metropolitical visitation as the “first systematic enforcement of the new ideals for church interiors.”\(^ {26}\) They also emphasize Neile’s past involvement in overseeing alterations to cathedrals

\(^{23}\) White, *The Via Media in the Early Stuart Church*, 212.


at Durham and Winchester, as well as his connections to clerics who independently repositioned their communion tables in the 1620s.\textsuperscript{27}

What seems clear is that Neile had in fact begun requiring, at York and Hull in October, railed-in altars before the (in)famous St. Gregory’s case had been decided by Charles and the Privy Council in November 1633. The dispute at St. Gregory’s in London had begun when one churchwarden and several parishioners repositioned the communion table altarwise at the east end, claiming the same had been ordered by the Dean and Chapter. When other parishioners objected, the case came before Charles and the Privy Council, who ruled that ordinaries were indeed permitted to choose the position of communion tables within their jurisdiction.\textsuperscript{28} This decision is typically seen as the turning point after which railed altars became a national policy. Kenneth Fincham is therefore correct in highlighting Julian Davies’ fallacious assertion that Neile merely adopted Laud’s orders given in 1634.\textsuperscript{29} The question then arises: why did Neile run ahead of Laud and Charles in pressing for these changes (outside of the cathedral church itself) when he had not done so while Bishop of Winchester? Fincham hypothesizes that Neile was more at home in the north and “may have felt more confident in initiating the policy in the conservative north, where his godly critics were a beleaguered minority.”\textsuperscript{30} One must keep in mind that even though Neile purportedly ordered railed altars for the entire province after his metropolitical visitation 1632-1634, enforcement across York diocese was staggered and uneven, in large part owing to administrative factors.\textsuperscript{31} Historians generally agree, and the visitation and court records demonstrate, that especially with regard to railing, the Archdeaconry
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of Nottingham was among the last regions to witness the full weight of Neile’s program. As the following sections will demonstrate, even within this relatively small jurisdiction, Laudianism materialized in different ways and to different degrees.

II. Sacred Spaces: Laudianism in Practice

At first glance, 1630s court orders aimed at realizing Neile’s program for the archdeaconry appear not only widespread, but in some cases quite involved. Especially true for some of the larger towns, like East Retford, it could also prove true for smaller parishes like Warsop. The Chancellor’s deputy in October 1637 ordered, inter alia, that “seats at the ends of the Communion table” be taken away, that a seat facing the belfry be remade to face the opposite direction, that seats added in the south side of the Church be removed from their then current position “and placed uniforme to the rest that the alley may be straight as formerly hath beene,” and that “decent railes . . . be made before the Communion table, and a decent Cover for the Fonte.” In all, Warsop’s orders contained ten different items to be completed. On the other hand, a good number of parishes apparently received no court orders at all; if one adds in those that only received orders for the rail, that number rises to nearly half of the archdeaconry. A clearer view of how Laudianism concretized requires attention not only to this reality—which may not be as illustrative of fitness as Marchant claimed—but also to the extent to which parishes’ 1630s experiences constituted departures from past norms. The ensuing analysis will be structured by the Laudian apprehension of sacred space, starting with those spaces out of doors and moving inward toward the sanctum sanctorum, what Heylyn called “more sacred than any material thing besides to the church belonging.”

32 Marchant, “Restoration of Nottinghamshire Churches,” 89.
always constitute notable departures from past norms or have demonstrably extensive material impacts.

As with other aspects of the Laudian vision, the main impetus behind greater attention to churchyards was to drive forward “the recovery of the church and churchyard as holy spaces.” There had been a modest revival of iconoclasm earlier in the seventeenth century, some of the targets of which were occasionally churchyard crosses and the like. Whereas churchmen like Lancelot Andrewes and Richard Bancroft saw such installations as conducive to greater reverence, many puritans saw them as dangerous idols. Archbishop Neile largely inherited the views of the former, as noted above, and it was there seen just how thorough an inquiry Neile expected into how the churchyard was being used. Other Laudians also insisted that “land consecrated to God’s service should be clearly separated from the daily transactions of commerce, agriculture, and entertainment,” and the issue allegedly became “much more prominent in the 1630s.” Scholars like David Underdown once suggested that, in light of Laudian support for the reissuing of the Book of Sports in 1633, Laudian churchmen encouraged and perhaps even participated in traditional games with their parishioners. The Laudian support for “communal sociability” stood in contrast to the supposed “fragmented sociability and political dissent” that characterized puritan religious life. While Neile was surely not aiming to foster the latter, neither does he appear to have been a great encourager of games and festivities. His articles for York Province in 1633 retain his 1624 article concerning churchyards virtually
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unchanged. Given that such activities need not have involved the churchyard, it is worth pointing out that presentments for improper game playing remained few and far between across the first three decades of the seventeenth century. If Neile had encouraged traditional festivities in some less observable way, in other words, this did not result in notable crackdowns in puritan pastored parishes or elsewhere.

Even if Neile had been tolerant of traditional pastimes, it is clear that he would tolerate no misuse whatsoever of the churchyard, whether from games or otherwise. “Churchyard violations” as they are generally categorized were not somehow more acceptable at earlier periods, however. Archbishop Toby Matthew’s articles for York Province in 1607, while less specific regarding churchyards, still required them to be “well walled or fenced, and decently kept” and demanded the names of those responsible for any defaults. In fact, the greatest concentration of presentments concerning “churchyard violations”, which offenses did not involve disrepair and could range from brawling to enclosure of churchyard land, appears in the 1620s while Matthew still held the archbishopric. Presentations for 1624 in particular ran the gamut of churchyard violations. One man of St. Peter’s Nottingham found himself accused of leaving “excrements” about the yard, two men of Hickling drew “a blood”, and two men of Trowell allegedly dug holes in the churchyard to set up a “quitain” for a game of skill.

Though more consistent by the 1620s, presentments for churchyard violations never appear widespread, reaching at most six in any given year. Nor does there appear to have been much change over time as to the nature of these offenses. Back in 1601, the vicar of Girton
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earned presentment for felling an ash tree in the churchyard, just as a man of Hawton would
during the diocesan visitation in 1636. Presentments for allowing swine into the churchyard,
which in some cases led to the grisly digging up of graves, appear throughout the early to mid-
seventeenth century, as do presentments for the conducting of secular work. One man of St.
Nicholas Nottingham even killed and dressed a beast in the churchyard in 1620. At Clayworth
in 1638, a man purportedly constructed “a cartway over our churchyard” and led a cart of hay
across it in due course. Emblematic of this continuity is the parish of Sutton Bonington. In the
early seventeenth century, the parson John Savage was presented on at least three separate
occasions (1601-1603) for keeping a garden and dunghill in the churchyard, presumably for his
own use. Decades later in the 1630s, his successor Thomas Savage would be presented on
several occasions for nearly identical offenses: for making the churchyard a “garden place and a
place for a barne.” Presumably, Thomas had just been keeping up the family garden. In any
case, as a previous chapter revealed, he was to get away with it in the end.

When one turns to presentments relating to actual churchyard disrepair, typically
involving failure to properly maintain the churchyard walls, the latter years of the 1630s do in
fact indicate some degree of discontinuity. 1638 and 1639 witnessed fifteen and twenty separate
presentments, respectively, relating to this shortcoming. This constitutes, firstly, a departure from
the numbers seen earlier in the decade, during which no more than eleven such presentments had
been made. The figures for 1638 and 1639 also represent an increase from those earlier in the
seventeenth century, though the 1620s saw several years with at least ten; 1625 alone saw
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thirteen, and 1622, twelve. Thus, while the latter years of the Laudian period did see a rise, that rise was not as unprecedented as other accounts have suggested.46

How might that rise be explained? The archidiaconal visitation articles for 1639, identical to Neile’s for York Province in 1633 and 1636, specifically ask about “any fighting, chiding, brawling or quarelling, and Playes, Lords of misrule, summer Lords, morris dancers, peddlers, bowlers, bearewards, butchers, feasts, schools, temporal courts, or Leets, Lay Juries, musters, or other prophane usage,” and require the yard to be “well fenced with walls, railes, or pales and cleanly kept.”47 Although other archidiaconal visitation articles from the 1630s are not extant, one can reasonably assume that, at least from 1635 on, these articles would not have differed substantially one year to the next. It is more likely that the increase seen in 1638 and 1639 owed to the survey of the archdeaconry’s churches initiated by Mottershed in 1638. Full records of this survey apparently do not survive; for some parishes, however, presentment bills and/or penances drawn up in 1638 appear to record its findings. At West Retford, a penance describes the churchwardens omitting to present

that the church aisle and font are unevenly paved, the minister's seat is not decent and the pulpit not sufficient, Mr Spivall's seat is not uniform, the windows are not sufficiently glazed, the east side of the churchyard is not fenced, the poor box without a lock or key, no pulpit cloth or cushion, no pewter flaggon or bible of the last translation, there is no book of homilies or book for the names of strange
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preachers, the carpet for the Communion Table is made of old buckram, there is no Register book in the church, the north porch is in decay.\footnote{AN/PN/360/350.}

Possibly, the fencing problem arose only after the 1636 diocesan visitation, as its findings for West Retford say nothing of this fault even as they cite the churchwardens for allowing swine to dig about in the churchyard.\footnote{Vis. 1636 CB, f. 444.} There is reason to believe, however, that fencing problems were implicit in the 1636 return, as many examples can be found connecting failure to keep up the fence/wall with swine invading the churchyard.\footnote{AN/PB 303/775.} Thus, for West Retford, ending up among the dozen other parishes with churchyard disrepair issues may have been simply a matter of slackness rather than some attempt to conceal faults. A similar situation can be reconstructed for Sturton le Steeple, whose churchwardens for 1638 had also performed penance for not presenting the decay in the wall and for allowing a “muckhill” and clothes washing in the churchyard\footnote{AN/PN/360/349.} Several years before, in 1634, the vicar Edward Barnes had presented several men in quite acerbic terms for playing football in and drawing a plough “after the manner of beasts” through the churchyard.\footnote{AN/PB 340/6/1.} He was likely behind the consequences of the churchwardens several years later.

In parishes like Kelham, Clarborough and Hayton, the delayed presentation of churchyard fencing issues appears to have come down to priorities. A puritan pastored parish in the 1630s, Hayton did not witness a presentation for lacking a rail until October 1637. Moreover, churchwardens did not present defective floorboards and non-uniform
pews until April 1638.\textsuperscript{53} Thus, it is not so surprising that problems with the churchyard fence, bier for corpse carrying, font cover and the step up to the chancel were not presented until the following September. At Kelham, where churchwardens also held responsibility for fixing the churchyard fence, not even a court order was sufficient to compel compliance. Given that other orders regarding the seating and font cover \textit{were} eventually completed, it seems that churchyard fencing was not a particularly high priority for men who were also dealing with bell issues and non-payment of dues.\textsuperscript{54} Likewise at Clarborough, fence repairs appear to have taken a backseat to non-uniform seats and decay in the leads and font cover, also reported in September 1638.\textsuperscript{55} This is even reflected by the court orders for 1638 which covered the seating and font cover issues, but not the fencing problem.\textsuperscript{56}

Fencing problems in Averham, Orston, and Marnham, also arising in 1638, seem to have owed more to the difficulties of diffused responsibility. That is, in these and other parishes, each householder was generally responsible for maintaining “their part” of the churchyard wall or fence. It is easy to imagine why this might lead to slackness and/or disputes when the need for repairs arose. Indeed, at Orston the churchwardens claimed in April not to know who was at fault for the disrepair of the fence. Perhaps with a degree of resignation, their September bill claimed the needed repairs “belong[ed] to the whole town.”\textsuperscript{57} At Marnham, the churchwardens named five parishioners by name for the default, but this only points up the difficulty of ensuring that all parishioners fulfill their

\textsuperscript{53} AN/PB 341/5/26.  
\textsuperscript{54} Marchant, “The Restoration of Nottinghamshire Churches,” 75.  
\textsuperscript{55} AN/PB 341/7/10.  
\textsuperscript{56} Marchant, “The Restoration of Nottinghamshire Churches,” 68.  
\textsuperscript{57} AN/PB 315/14/30; AN/PB 315/15/31.
responsibilities.\textsuperscript{58} Somewhere in between, Averham’s fencing problem purportedly lay at the feet of one of its constituent townships: Staythorpe.\textsuperscript{59}

Thus, one can see the variety of ways in which churchyard fencing problems could go unresolved and therefore wind up in presentment bills. From this, it might even be reasonable to conclude that the uptick in such presentments in 1638 and 1639 was simply a matter of chance—that, for example, it just so happened that certain churchwardens and others neglected their responsibilities in these years. This has some truth to it, but it is wrong in at least one particular. As noted above, the archidiaconal visitation articles for 1639 required that the churchyard be “well fenced with walls, railes, or pales,” which seems to have been Neile’s expectation in all his territories since the 1620s. Some 1633 metropolitical visitation returns indicate that hedges seem to still have been permitted in some parishes. At Ampleforth in Yorkshire, a man was cited for “letting his hedge lye downe between the prebend yard and the church yard” while another man was cited for “settinge up a tree in the church yarde and spoylinge the hedge.”\textsuperscript{60} Tacit acceptance of hedging appears to have prevailed in Nottinghamshire as well before 1635. The case of Rempstone proves particularly revealing, as decay in the fence had been presented by the rector in 1628, 1630, and twice in 1631, none of which presentations specified that the wall was made up of hedging.\textsuperscript{61} When the next relevant presentments appeared in 1639, both mentioned that the churchyard was “hedged” but only the latter bill, from November, specified that the yard was “hedged, not paled or

\textsuperscript{58} AN/PB 328/14/20.
\textsuperscript{59} AN/PB 328/14/43.
\textsuperscript{60} Vis. 1633 CB, f. 363v.
\textsuperscript{61} AN/PB 314/7/63; AN/PB 315/3/35.
railed or made of stone walls, according to the article." Similarly, at Saundby the original churchwarden presentment for April 1639 had claimed nothing was amiss; below in another hand, however, it was noted that the “fence is made of a dead hedge.” Presumably the churchwardens had grown accustomed to the latter being tolerated even for a portion of the 1630s.

While not comprehensively illustrative, evidence from the remaining seventeen parishes witnessing churchyard repair issues in 1639 does provide some support to the conclusion that more rigorous expectations, or enforcement thereof, were a reality of the latter 1630s. In part, some of the increase in churchyard issues may be explained by the apparent focus of churchwardens and ministers on more pressing, often more expensive, issues. As seen for the parishes discussed in connection with 1638, the court seems to have placed more significance on the latter as well. Kilvington provides the clearest case of Laudian expectations colliding with persistent equivocation on the part of successive churchwardens. From 1630 through 1636, churchwardens had presented little other than a few cases of fornication, failing to receive and non-payment. Even the diocesan visitation in 1636 had returned a “nil” result. While the lack of a hood was presented in 1638, a vast array of shortcomings, likely delineated as a result of the 1638 survey, appeared only through an anonymous presentment the following year. In addition to lacking a flagon, other faults included wanting

[A] handsome desk or cushion to lay the common prayer book on when the minister officiates at the Lord's table and a hassock for him to kneel on; the chest

62 AN/PB 315/17/34.
63 AN/PB 341/8/43.
64 Vis. 1636 CB, f. 471v.
in which to lay the church book and the surplice is very indecent and not fit for that use; there wants a common prayer book; the reading seat and pulpit stand so close and inconveniently together that there is not room to lay the books upon the desk of the reading seat whilst service is being read; the pavement in the aisles of the church is uneven; the rubbish which has for a long time been thrown down at the slating of the church has raised the earth so high that it reaches up to the windows, which is very indecent; some windows, instead of glass, are stopped up with lime and hair; the bells are very much out of order in their hanging; the churchyard fence on the north side is very ruinous and is to be newly made.65

Unsurprisingly, the churchwarden bill drawn up for the same visitation had claimed “omnia bene.”66

In other parishes, the weight of other requirements also appears to have landed heavily upon churchwardens. Everton, South Leverton and Clarborough had serious enough shortcomings to warrant court orders in 1638. At Clarborough, though fencing issues had also been presented in 1638, the court orders given that year only covered font and seating faults, indicating that these were of more concern to the authorities. As the latter were only certified in August 1639, it appears that as of April that year, the churchwardens had simply been too busy to deal with the persisting fence problem.67 Likewise at Everton and South Leverton, fencing issues were not included in 1638 court orders. This proves somewhat perplexing for Everton, given that the orders concerned missing church ornaments as well as non-uniform seats: one might expect churchyard

65 AN/PB 328/16/20.
67 Ibid., 68; AN/PB 341/8/10.
issues to be at least as important as the former.\textsuperscript{68} Thus, it may be that the fence disrepair had in fact only come about as of 1639—a temporary, small problem that, in any case, was solved before the following visitation.\textsuperscript{69} As for South Leverton, Clarborough’s experience serves as a better model. For one, problems with the fence had been presented back in the diocesan visitation of 1636.\textsuperscript{70} Secondly, two separate presentments in April and then August 1639 were needed to spur the responsible parties into action.\textsuperscript{71} Likely adding to the delay were ongoing problems with non-uniform seats and the lack of paving in the north aisle, orders for which had been sent out in 1638. Moreover, the paving needed in the chancel was not certified until August 1639.\textsuperscript{72}

In several parishes, however, churchyard disrepair appears to have emerged in 1639 as it might have done in any other year. At Grove, the apparent specificity of the particulars presented in 1637, an absent Book of Homilies, and 1638, the lack of a sufficient pulpit cloth, suggests that the fencing problems presented in 1639 had indeed only arisen in that year.\textsuperscript{73} Similarly, at St. Peter’s Nottingham, the minister and churchwardens had in 1638 complied with orders to move and rail in the communion table; more than that, they had even gone along with the requirement to have parishioners receive at the rail, a demand that, as seen in chapter three, resulted in the most notable episode of dissent in the archdeaconry during the period.\textsuperscript{74} In light of this, it is unlikely

\textsuperscript{68} Marchant, “The Restoration of Nottinghamshire Churches,” 72.  
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\textsuperscript{72} Marchant, “The Restoration of Nottinghamshire Churches,” 84.  
\textsuperscript{73} AN/PB 341/7/23; AN/PB 341/8/25. Churchwardens’ words cannot, of course, be taken as absolute fact. Nevertheless, the bill claims that the parish has “all belonging to the church” saving the Book of Homilies, and also states that the latter had been “purloined.” The fact that only one churchwarden made the presentment may also be significant. Sometimes, one churchwarden was willing to present certain fault(s) that the other(s) was not. This raises the likelihood that churchyard issues would have been presented had this been needed.  
\textsuperscript{74} AN/PB 303/583.
that a problem with the churchyard fencing would have gone unpresented across multiple visitations.\textsuperscript{75} A fencing issue had developed at Greasley probably due to vicar Lemuel Tuke’s alleged refusal to perform his duties for several months early in 1639.\textsuperscript{76} That is, the general patterns of church life and upkeep had probably been temporarily allowed to decline. Given the hostile tone of the churchwardens’ bill from January explaining these circumstances, it is also possible that Tuke’s August bill describing the fencing problem was intended as revenge; it was not the first, nor would it be the last, acrimonious dispute between Tuke and his churchwardens. Taking the 1638-1639 data as a whole, then, one sees that even as increased presentations for churchyard disrepair constitute a modest departure from previous years and a heightened level of enforcement, the evidence proves neither overwhelming nor unidirectional. Especially juxtaposed with the lack of increase in presentments of other churchyard violations, it is clear that in the large majority of parishes Laudianism did not manifest in terms of greatly enhanced concern for churchyards as sacred spaces, notwithstanding Laudian ideals.

Moving into the church building itself, the Laudian emphasis upon sacramental grace imparted through baptism makes the font a necessary site for analysis. In 1561, Queen Elizabeth had responded to over eager Protestants by issuing a set of royal orders that prohibited the removal of steps up to the altar as well as the moving and/or altering of the traditional font. Some puritans, particularly Marian exiles, thought that baptisms ought to be accompanied by sermons and thus sought to reposition fonts—often in the form of basins—adjacent to the pulpit. Presumably advocates of these changes also

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{75} AN/PB 303/609.}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{76} AN/PB 303/576: Tuke claimed that he had received “nothing” for his services for half a year.}
sought to eliminate “all links with Catholic ceremomialism.” Moving into the
seventeenth-century, Marchant determined that Neile favored Elizabeth’s orders but more
specifically intended to revive enforcement of the 1604 canons. Concerning fonts, these
stipulated that (i) every church and chapel that conducted baptisms should have “a decent
font with a cover for the keeping clear thereof”, (ii) that the font should “stand as near to
the principal entrance as conveniently may be”, (iii) and that the “font bowl shall only be
used for the water at the administration of Holy Baptism and for no other purpose
whatsoever.” Obviously, the idea that Neile was simply “reviving” these requirements
suggests that they had been enforced at least at some points prior to the 1630s. If one
were just to consult the 1635-1640 chancery act books, however, even this period did not
see that much attention toward fonts: only nine parishes received related court orders.
Moreover, only a few other parishes saw font related presentations in the 1630s: Sturton
le Steeple and Egmanton in 1635, and Marnham and Winthorpe in 1638. In all thirteen
cases, the issues related specifically to font covers. For some parishes like Sturton le
Steeple, Clarborough, Fledborough, Girton, Hayton and Marnham, a font cover appears
to have been completely absent. In others, like Nottingham St. Mary’s, the cover was
considered substandard; Mottershed’s deputies considered the then present cover to have
been more suitable for a “beefe Tub” and unlike for other parishes, also ordered the
whole font to be railed about. While a small number, even these thirteen cases signify a
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77 Fincham and Tyacke, Altars Restored, 40.
78 Cf. Tyacke, Anti-Calvinists, 176. Tyacke explains the heightened emphasis on fonts and altars as being largely the
result of ascendant Arminian theology, that is, “sacramental grace replacing the grace of predestination.”
departure from the preceding decades, during which almost no presentment bills can be found specifying font related problems. It is also the case that of the thirteen parishes, none saw any mention of fonts or font covers until 1635, further indicating that special attention to fonts was indeed unique to the Laudian period.

Moving eastward from the font, one’s attention turns to flooring and seating arrangements. As Marchant notes, even in the 1630s many churches still lacked paving, some simply maintaining dirt floors, while others had floors strewn with rushes. The Canons of 1604 had “provided that all aisles should be paved and the seats either paved or boarded beneath,” so Neile’s expectations in this regard should not be considered a novelty. Even so, as Jennings notes, some sixty-two parishes would be ordered to pave or make even their floors during the 1635-1640 period. By comparison, only nine parishes describe flooring issues, such as want of paving, before 1635. Five of these reports date between 1598 and 1614, one to 1627, and two to the early 1630s. Similarly, some sixty parishes would receive orders to repair and make uniform their church pews, with private pew holders being among the chief targets as well as seats or pews in the chancel that did not sit “chancelwise” facing north and south. In keeping with Neile’s basically conservative outlook, “constant emphasis was laid on a return to the old ordering of churches” so that in the 1630s, new pews were to be made to be like the older ones. Only eight parishes appear to have reported seating issues prior to 1635, these presentments dating between 1604 and 1627. In some cases, as at Girton and Coddington, lack of paving beneath the seats or stalls was at issue. In other cases, as at Plumtree,
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Bunny, and Shelton, the seats themselves were in decay or even “broken.” Thus, even as proper flooring and seating arrangements should not in theory have constituted “new” requirements, the numbers demonstrate that for many parishes Laudianism materialized within their churches specifically along these lines. As John Reeks suggests, it is possible that in at least some parishes, local elites had grown accustomed to using the churchwardens “to administer their own models of spatial organisation” and therefore experienced these changes as challenges to “their authority and status within the community.”

The importance of the chancel to the Laudian vision of ceremonial and spatial order drew attention to the seating and flooring issues that occurred in that space. Yet chancel problems could take many different forms, as a vast array of early seventeenth century presentments and Laudian era court orders demonstrate. Of the twenty-eight parishes that received court orders pertaining to chancels, half of these had issues beyond seating and flooring faults. More broadly, nearly one-third of parishes in the archdeaconry presented some type of chancel issue by 1640, the great majority of these falling before the 1630s. Often churchwardens were frustratingly vague, simply claiming that their chancel was “in need of repair” or was “in decay.” In other cases, churchwardens specifically noted issues with the chancel windows, as at Bawtry in 1596, or the chancel roof, as at Kilvington in 1603. What becomes clear, in any case, is that attention to chancel faults was not a novelty of the Laudian period. Indeed, many parishes had already developed extensive rap sheets in this regard by the 1620s. Walesby saw
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chancel faults presented in 1596, 1610, 1612, 1618, 1620, 1621-1624, and 1635-1636. Boughton chapel similarly saw presentations in 1602, 1607-1610, 1612-1613, 1618, 1620, 1635, and 1637. As a chapel, Boughton might be expected to have suffered in this way, and in fact many other chapels (Perlethorpe, Syerston, Bramcote, Carburton) also had consistent chancel problems. In part, this frequently owed simply to fewer resources, but could also result from the neglect of the proprietor and/or farmers of the tithe.

Marchant points out the major difficulty for the authorities in keeping up chancels: the reality of lay rectors and tithe farmers who may or may not have resided within the archdeaconry. This often led to situations in which churchwardens were not sure who to present for the faults, as at Carburton in 1610 and again even in 1630. Conversely, churchwardens may have known quite well who was at fault, and have had to resort to presenting this individual every few months at the archidiaconal visitations. Edwalton’s churchwardens presented the Countess of Devonshire nearly every year between 1631 and 1641, by which time the chancel had “fallen down.” Mrs. Ireton, responsible for Bramcote chapelry, seems to have grown so weary of being presented for chancel defaults that she petitioned the Archbishop of York for an inhibition, which the churchwardens dutifully acknowledged in their 1631 bills.

While there is therefore probably some truth to Jennings’ contention that official efforts to remedy chancel problems “reduce[d] considerably enthusiasm for episcopacy”
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during the Laudian period, Jennings would have to admit that pressure toward this end had been applied for at least the two preceding decades. 96 This is in keeping with the findings of historians like James Galloway and Ronald Hutton, who have identified a late Elizabethan and Jacobean movement of church repair and restoration. St. Clement Danes, London, paid £1000 toward their chancel in 1608, while three years before St. Mary Vintry laid out nearly £500 on “general repairs” to the church; more impressively, St. Anne Blackfriars spent £1500 enlarging their church in 1625. 97 Galloway admits that in many cases parishes made such expenditures out of necessity; however perhaps in part what Hutton terms a “nostalgia” for merry England, at its height in the first three decades of the seventeenth century, encouraged restoration work as well. Hutton characterizes these decades as witnessing “a profound growth in religious ceremony and adornment” that had little to do with national ecclesiastical policies. 98

Within the Archdeaconry of Nottingham, some parishes do appear to have engaged in this sort of pre-Laudian restorative work—work involving more than just chancel upkeep. At Winkburn, churchwardens oversaw extensive work on the steeple, walls, roof and one of the bells for several years beginning in 1631. 99 At Gringley, churchwardens reported in 1612 that work had temporarily halted “by reason of want of stones for covering the top of the walls.” 100 Acting out of necessity, owing to a “great
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wind” that had damaged their church in 1628, churchwardens at Epperstone spent the next several years carrying out repairs. Apparently these repairs brought the church to such a state that after 1633, only the lack of a rail needed presentation through the Laudian period.\(^1\) Owthorpe witnessed a similar series of events, “a great tempest” having blown down parts of the church in 1628, but the ensuing repairs being sufficient to keep the church in shipshape over the next decade.\(^2\) At Sutton-on-Trent, the chancel was restored and a five light window installed in 1632.\(^3\) Not even the language of “beautification” was unique to the Laudian period. In 1618, the churchwardens of Wellow proudly claimed that “we have beautified our church, and have set up our King’s arms, and have bought the communion book.”\(^4\) While others could be given, these examples suffice to demonstrate that the archdeaconry was not immune to the broader trend of restoration efforts spreading during the early seventeenth century. Though some parishes certainly do seem to have endured Laudian flooring, seating, and chancel measures as a sort of “bolt from the blue”, many others either experienced them as an extension of previous repair efforts or did not feel them at all. Nevertheless, it is clear that the specific requirements to make pews, stalls, and other seating fixtures “uniform”, to remove those fixtures even with or above the communion table, and to make “chancelwise” stalls in chancels did constitute Laudian era novelties for some parishes,

\(^1\) AN/PB 303/800; AN/PB 303/673.
\(^2\) AN/PB 314/8/9; AN/PB 315/12/27: in May 1637 the churchwardens were able to report that “the church is in good repair.”
whatever their basis in canons, injunctions, or older practices. Hardly any evidence of similar changes can be found among presentment bills of the previous decades.

Church supply requirements also saw definite augmentations in the 1630s, though these were less unprecedented than the aforementioned seating and flooring measures. Bishops and archdeacons had long insisted that the proper supplies be obtained and maintained. In 1571, Archbishop Grindal had drawn up a detailed set of directives for churchwardens, a major requirement of which was to supply a

Book of Common Prayer, a Psalter, a Bible, copies of the Canons and the Book of Homilies, a table of the 10 Commandments, a pulpit, a communion table with a linen cloth and carpet, a chalice and paten, a large surplice with sleeves, a chest with three locks, an alms dish, and box for the parish register, a terrier and a copy of the Paraphrases of Erasmus and of the works of Bishop Jewel.¹⁰⁵

The hierarchy’s principal concern was that the proper observances be maintained, and for this, the necessary items were essential. In a number of Nottinghamshire parishes in the early seventeenth-century, to give one example, ministers complained that their communion cups were unfit for use in the sacrament; the Vicar of East Stoke called his parish’s cup a “sillie pice of siluer . . . neither fit nor seemly for that religious and godly use that it is for in a great congregacion.”¹⁰⁶ To avoid such situations, the demand for proper church supplies had also been made clear in episcopal and archidiaconal visitation

articles and the canons of 1604. Archbishop Matthew’s 25th article for 1607, for instance, inquires along much the same lines as Grindal’s directives had several decades before.107

Records concerning supplies for the first decades of the seventeenth century reveal a general emphasis on preaching and the Word. The majority of related bills in the 1598-1602 period, for example, centered on lacking proper Bibles, one or both tomes of the Book of Homilies, or the Paraphrases of Erasmus.108 A similar emphasis on the Word and preaching emerges from the 1612-1616 data. Several parishes presented problems with their pulpits, the lack or insufficiency of Bibles, the lack of a Book of Homilies, and/or the absence of the works of Jewell and Harding.109 Other, seemingly unrelated, concerns were also forthcoming before Neile’s arrival, such as the directive to supply a table for the prohibited degrees of marriage; at least fifteen parishes presented its lack in 1610. A similar drive in 1630, presumably launched by Archbishop Harsnett, resulted in no less than eighty-one parishes presenting the same.110

In any case, 1635 still signifies a turning point in terms of church supply expectations, especially if one includes the revived requirements to possess hoods.111 The need of a box or chest to collect money for the poor and decent coverings for the communion table also stand out. Presentations for these were not unheard of earlier in the century, but priorities had clearly shifted. Thus, a notably wider array of items appear to have become mandatory by the latter 1630s, likely owing to the 1638 survey, but also to
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the visitation articles themselves.¹¹² Churchwardens still presented for insufficient Bibles and absent Books of Homilies, but now also noted much more regularly than before insufficient communion ware, missing sets of Canons, absent or indecent communion table cloths, missing font covers, and doors and covers for pulpits. At Barnstone in 1638, churchwardens wanted a cushion and cloth for the pulpit, a poor man’s chest, a carpet for the communion table, a stoup made of pewter or better metal, the table of prohibited degrees of marriage, a Book of Homilies, and a set of Canons.¹¹³ Three parishes reported in 1639 that several of the required items had been stolen away. Similar thefts certainly appear in earlier decades, and the sheer number of items missing at Treswell and Orston, for example, suggests that churchwardens were indeed telling the truth.¹¹⁴ Even so, one cannot quite shake the suspicion that some churchwardens, under the pressure of the survey, may have resorted to a little fibbing.

More consequential, and certainly more unprecedented, than these changes were those that involved the moving and/or railing of communion tables. While some historians have pictured Laudian altar policies as in line with older, preexisting ecclesiastical trends, others insist that the “the altar was a vital battleground,” and the changes made concerning it a source of widespread dissatisfaction.¹¹⁵ As indicated previously, this seems to have been especially true of Bath and Wells.¹¹⁶ That these measures provoked at least some discontentment in the Archdeaconry of Nottingham is demonstrated by an anti-Laudian petition drawn up in 1641 that explicitly condemned the

¹¹² Archidiaconal Visitation Articles, Nottingham 1639, S3.3.42 (A3v).
¹¹³ AN/PB 315/15/4.
¹¹⁶ Tyacke, Anti-Calvinists, 204.
“preferring [of] the communion table to the east end of the Chancel, thurning [sic] it to
the posture and name of an Altar, advancing it with new steps to it, [and] rayling it with
single or double Rayle.” 117 Between 1635 and 1640, the Chancellor’s court had indeed
issued orders requiring these changes to a number of parishes. The churchwardens of
Mansfield Woodhouse received orders in September 1637 “to cause the communion table
to be placed at the high end of the Chancell long wayes, and to cause the same to be
decently railed about.” 118 Likewise, the following month the Chancellor’s deputy ordered
the churchwardens of Worksop “to cause the Communion table to be set close up in the
Chancells high end and to be raled before.” 119 While many parishes would receive rail-
related orders as a result of the admittedly thinly-based policy, the great number of
parishes that either did not receive these or that complied relatively quickly should not be
ignored. It should also be recognized that the archidiaconal administration does not seem
to have become especially dedicated to enforcing the railing requirements until 1637—
the majority of parishes only saw rail-related presentments or orders in 1637 or thereafter.
This was, at least to some extent, the result of Neile’s diocesan visitation in 1636, which
temporarily suspended the archidiaconal jurisdiction but also provided an additional
impetus for enforcement once it was restored. Nevertheless, faults related to the
communion table do not feature as prominently as expected in the records, even for
Neile’s 1636 visitation.

As indicated above, the conventional wisdom regarding Laudian “altar policy”
casts it as part of a larger, ill-fated set of policies that saw “many mainstream

119 Ibid., 90.
parishioners...driven into anger, frustration, and distrust.”

David Cressy speaks for many in calling the altar policy “the most controversial of innovations” introduced in this period. Not all agree with this view, however. Looking back from the Restoration period, admittedly through rose colored lenses, Peter Heylyn claimed that there had been “[N]o clamour touching the transposing of the Holy Table.” More recently, Christopher Haigh famously declared that the “most striking [thing] about the church court and visitation records of the 1630s is how little they differed from what had gone before.” He posits two possible explanations for this. One view, held by Cressy, Tyacke, Jennings and others, perceives widespread anger and resentment bubbling throughout the 1630s, suppressed until 1640 due to fear of the courts and High Commission in particular. Haigh prefers an alternative view that sees widespread acceptance and compliance, that reality only being altered by the Scottish wars later in the decade. Such a view permits him to cast the Laudian altar measures as building upon “a fashion for church decoration and improvement that had been growing since the 1590s.” Peter White likewise sees Laudian altar policy as emerging out of a much longer lived “Prayer Book Worship” dating to Elizabethan times. Far from radically innovative, these policies allegedly derived from the 1559 Injunctions and the Canons of 1604, both of which “envisaged the east end of the chancel as the normal position for the communion table at times other than during a communion.”
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The actual text of the 1559 Injunctions proves less clear than White might have one believe. Firstly, the authors seem to have been quite deliberate in using the term table as opposed to altar. Recognizing that Catholic style altars still stood in some parishes, the articles explicitly forbade their disorderly removal, stipulating that this must only be carried out “by the oversight of the curate of the church and the churchwardens.” The tone and context suggest that an altarwise orientation for the tables replacing such altars would not be acceptable. Still, ambiguity enters with the next directive, which commands tables to be “set in the place where the altar stood . . . and so to stand, saving when the communion is to be distributed; at which time the same shall be so placed in good sort within the chancel.” Clearly it is not specified exactly how the table is to be set in the former altar area. This was precisely the question at stake during the Grantham table dispute in 1627, often considered the opening salvo of the altar controversy. Bishop John Williams, Laud’s fiercest critic, argued that “the Elizabethan Injunctions correctly interpreted meant that parish communion tables should be aligned east and west,” while Neile and Laud stood by the vicar who had taken the independent initiative to reposition the communion table altarwise.

Neile would also appeal to the 1559 Injunctions to explain the changes he had made at Winchester Cathedral in 1628-1629. In a speech written for a hostile House of Commons, which had accused Neile and Laud of bringing popery into the Church, Neile claimed that the Elizabethan injunctions required that the altar be in the east end. Though this speech was never actually delivered, it points up the uncertainty of some of the
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Injunctions’ requirements.\textsuperscript{127} That the Injunctions envision the table moving during
communions, however, appears beyond doubt. As the text states, “after the communion
done, from time to time the same holy table [is] to be placed where it stood before.”\textsuperscript{128}
The 82nd canon of 1604, though similarly unclear as to the table’s proper resting position
and orientation, also envisions the table being moved, directing that during the
communion “the same shall be placed in so good sort within the Church or Chancel, as
thereby the Minister may be more conveniently heard of the Communicants in his Prayer
and Administration, and the Communicants also more conveniently and in more number
may communicate with the said minister.”\textsuperscript{129} Thus, the demand that the table be set in a
fixed position behind altar rails cannot be straightforwardly drawn from the 1559
Injunctions or 1604 canons. Contemporary accounts corroborate this view. One
conformist London rector, for example, openly “defended rails and kneeling to receive
the sacrament” while attacking east-ended altars. Moreover, in response to radicals
pulling up Laudian altar rails in a London parish in 1641, the House of Lords issued
orders for new rails to be put up “in the same Manner as they were for the Space of Fifty
Years last past, but not as they were for Four of Five Years last past.”\textsuperscript{130}

Notwithstanding the shaky foundations of his policies, Neile pressed ahead with
railed and altarwise communion tables over 1633-1634 even as Laud hesitated. Hull and
churches within the City of York had received orders even before the St. Gregory’s Privy

\textsuperscript{127} See Calvin Lane, The Laudians and the Elizabethan Church: History, Conformity and Religious Identity in Post-
Reformation England (London: Pickering & Chatto Ltd, 2013), 79. Lane sees Neile and others as having to work
hard to “read” Elizabethan documents in ways favorable to their views.
\textsuperscript{128} Henry Gee and W.H. Hardy, eds., “The Injunctions of 1559,” 1559 Injunctions, 2001,
https://history.hanover.edu/texts/engref/er78.html.
\textsuperscript{130} Judith Maltby, Prayer Book and People in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England (Cambridge: Cambridge
Council decision was issued in November of 1633. Churchwardens’ accounts reveal that other parishes in York Diocese soon received similar instructions. Churchwardens at Burnsley, in the West Riding, laid out 8s. for the “Rellinge” of the table in 1634.\textsuperscript{131} Wragby St. Michael’s churchwardens likewise installed a rail in 1634, along with a new font cover, to the tune of £2 17s. 1d.\textsuperscript{132} Several accounts from North Riding parishes, however, do not list railing expenditures until 1635. At Masham, churchwardens spent 5s. for “Rayles” while at Kirkby Malzeard, 30s. went toward a “banister about the communion table.”\textsuperscript{133} Although a variety of reasons could be behind the year-long gap, it is clear that Neile’s officials paid special attention to areas perceived as puritan strongholds like the West Riding. Marchant notes how the Chancellor immediately acted upon the St. Gregory’s decision to enforce changes in the puritan parishes of Wakefield and Halifax, both major towns in the West Riding.\textsuperscript{134}

Relatively far from York and with a tradition of semi-autonomy, the Archdeaconry of Nottingham was not likely to have been among Neile’s most important or accessible targets. Nevertheless, Neile had clearly been working hard to place his own men in the various constituent jurisdictions of the diocese. John Cosin held the Archdeaconry of the East Riding and the similarly zealous Henry Wickham had been installed as the Archdeacon of York. In 1635, two key changes occurred with respect to the Archdeaconry of Nottingham. First, Edward Mottershed was placed as the Archdeacon’s Official, effectively becoming the chief administrator of the territory.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{131} Burnsley Churchwardens Accounts, WDP 121 Box 8, unpaginated.
\item \textsuperscript{132} Wragby St. Michael’s Churchwardens’ Accounts, WDP 99/70, unpaginated.
\item \textsuperscript{133} Masham Churchwardens’ Accounts, PR/MAS 3/1/1, f. 309; Kirkby Malzeard Churchwardens’ Accounts, PR/KMZ 2/1, unpaginated.
\item \textsuperscript{134} Marchant, \textit{The Puritans and the Church Courts}, 114.
\end{itemize}
Second, Archbishop Laud’s half-brother Dr. William Robinson replaced the ineffectual Richard Bayley as the new Archdeacon.\textsuperscript{135} Although the archidiaconal visitation articles from 1635-1638 do not survive, these personnel changes very likely explain the apparent changes and additions to the preceding years’ visitation inquiries. As noted in the last chapter, it appears that with one exception the archdeacons from 1635 were committed to Neile’s vision and generally followed the same basic articles seen in Wickham’s set for 1635. As it relates to the present topic, this inference would help explain why presentments for unrailed tables begin to appear only with the Easter Visitation of 1635.

More specifically, one of Wickham’s dozen or so 1635 additions to Neile’s 1633 diocesan articles asks, “Whether is . . . the communion-table rightly placed, and encompassed within a decent raile.”\textsuperscript{136} It is not exactly clear what Wickham meant by “rightly placed.” Neile was content even through his 1636 diocesan articles to maintain Bishop Chaderton’s original question, which simply asks if the table be “conveniently placed, [and] covered with silke, or other decent stuffe.”\textsuperscript{137} Fincham and Tyacke note a similar ambiguity in discussing Neile’s involvement with the St. Gregory’s case in 1633. As the Privy Council debates continued, Neile allegedly spoke in favor of a “peripatetic practice which, he claimed, he observed in his diocese.” Obviously, however, such a position is difficult to square with his various 1633 rail orders.\textsuperscript{138} Moreover, at least for Laudian polemicists like John Pocklington, a main goal of railing in the communion table was to keep the “most holy altar” safe from the type of profanations that bringing it out of

\textsuperscript{136} Fincham, ed., \textit{Visitation Articles and Injunctions}, 91.
\textsuperscript{137} Neile’s articles, at Durham and York, appear to have been drawn with some modifications from Bishop Chaderton’s 1607 Articles for Lincoln Diocese.
\textsuperscript{138} Fincham and Tyacke, \textit{Altars Restored}, 195.
the east end might entail. As the following pages demonstrate, there is ample evidence that railed in, altarwise tables were indeed expected in the archdeaconry from 1635, whatever Neile’s earlier views.

As in the case of other localities, however, these expectations did not result in a tidy, uniform process. Historians have noted widely diverging “success” and “failure” rates for table alterations across the country, as well as within dioceses themselves. Whereas White insists that “the vast majority of English parishes railed their communion tables off at the east end without significant resistance,” Fielding notes a 70% success rate in the puritan part of Peterborough, and Stieg mocks the less than 30% success rate observed by Heylyn in Bath and Wells. These figures emphasize the need to remain attuned to the nuances and inconsistencies of Laudian era table changes in the archdeaconry. Perhaps, for example, some parishes already had rails and were thereby able to remain basically unperturbed through the period, as Peter Abraham has suggested. Or could certain parts of the county, or parishes with certain traits, have received more attention from the authorities?

Given that the archidiaconal visitation articles for 1635 expected the communion table to be railed, the first oddity to be examined is that, out of the more than 180 parishes, only 24 saw presentments for lacking a rail this year. Jennings rightly notes that by 1640, more than 97 parishes would be presented for the same, so it cannot be that all
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beyond the 24 had anticipated the directive.\footnote{Jennings, “‘The Gathering of the Elect’,” 106.} One might hypothesize, firstly, that the authorities targeted the larger urban centers first, as they had done at Hull, Wakefield, Halifax and York. Such an approach would have made some sense. To many such towns, particularly Nottingham, East Retford, and Mansfield, belonged some of the most vigorous puritan traditions in the county, and Newark in the 1630s was served by an openly puritan minister. Other regions like Somerset display evidence that smaller parishes were delaying action until, in this case, the major controversy at Beckington was decided.\footnote{Tyacke, \textit{Anti-Calvinists}, 204.} It is also true that the general Laudian vision was one of a top-down dissemination of arrangements for worship: “daughter” parish churches were to take the lead from their “mother” cathedral churches.\footnote{Fincham and Tyacke, \textit{Altars Restored}, 196. This was also Heylyn and Prynne’s understanding of Laud’s method, noted in William Prynne, \textit{Canterburies Doom, or, The first part of a compleat history of the commitment, charge, tryall, condemnation, execution of william Laud etc.} (London, 1646), 87; and Heylyn, \textit{Cyprianus Anglicus}, 170.} To an extent, this initial hypothesis fits the data: Newark, East Retford, and Nottingham St. Peter’s all reported lacking the necessary rail in 1635. Given the proximity of ecclesiastical governing structures, this should not be too surprising: Mottershed appears to have personally inspected Newark’s church this year.\footnote{Marchant, “The Restoration of Nottinghamshire Churches,” 79.}

Aside from the size and importance of Newark, East Retford, and Nottingham St. Peter’s, it is difficult to discern patterns among the remaining 21 parishes. Even if the years of railing presentments and orders are mapped, no clear trends stand out. Most of the parishes surrounding Nottingham, for example, did not record presentments or orders until 1637. Likewise, Ordsall lies just south of Retford but did not confront the absence of a rail until 1638. Perhaps one telling fact is that only one of the 21 parishes employed a
puritan minister in 1635: Bawtry. Bawtry’s history of puritanism is well-known, and a
glance at their bills for the late 1620s and early 1630s reveals a consistent emphasis on
traditional puritan concerns. Card players, drinkers and sabbath breakers appear
repeatedly in these years, and in 1634 a man was cited for playing stool ball between
prayers and encouraging others to do likewise.146 Luckily for Neile and Mottershed, the
churchwardens serving as of Easter 1635 were more attuned to the authorities’ interests.
Decayed leads, unpaved stalls and window disrepair were all reported along with the
absent rail. Nor did they attempt to conceal the faults of their puritan curate, who had
managed to avoid presentment since at least 1625.147 This underscores how important
compliant churchwardens were to the realization of Neile’s vision, and, conversely, the
extent to which some churchwardens could and did limit the manifestation of Laudianism
in their parishes.148

Closer examination of other parishes that noted absent rails in 1635 also
highlights the role of churchwardens in bringing the fault to light. At Girton, one of the
churchwardens, Samuel Bearte, who had presented the missing rail as well as three
excommunicate persons and decayed chancel seating, had held the post several times
before 1635. The fact that he was in 1629 the target of abuse without having presented
any particular fault suggests that he may have had an unfriendly temperament.149 More
revealing is the October 1634 bill drawn up by the vicar, Bearte and his fellow
churchwarden Christopher Carver, wherein a woman was presented specifically for not

146 AN/PB 340/9/2.
147 AN/PB 341/1/3.
148 See Chapter 3 for more on churchwardens.
149 AN/PB 326/11/59.
standing up at the reading of the creed.\textsuperscript{150} Such a charge, rare even in the 1630s, indicates that Bearte was probably at least somewhat sympathetic with the aims of the authorities.

In other parishes, 1635 bills note that the presentations had been drawn up by only one churchwarden, presumably the more meticulous among them. This was the case at Adbolton where John Wright also presented a missing poor box, the chancel for being unpaved in default of the parson and two individuals for gadding to other services.\textsuperscript{151} While increasing by the mid 1630s, presentations regarding the poor box were still relatively rare, especially before the 1638 survey, and those against gadding again suggest some sympathy with the hierarchy’s vision. Likewise at Kirkby in Ashfield, apparently only Anthony Farnworth was willing to present problems with one of the bells and the lack of a hood, alongside the absent rail.\textsuperscript{152}

Nevertheless, the truth remains that for many parishes it is simply not clear why churchwardens chose to present the absent rail in 1635 while so many others apparently did not. William Footitt and John Worsley had served the post at North Clifton during four previous terms and between them had presented only one non payer and one case of adultery.\textsuperscript{153} At Keyworth, churchwardens did not present a single offense over the 1632-1634 period. Likewise at Headon, Laurence Addie and George Rayner had served five terms before their 1634-1635 tenure, including the years 1631-1634 during which time no specific presentments were made.\textsuperscript{154} In other parishes, like Thorney, the individual churchwardens had been involved in the making of only one previous bill, usually from
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October 1634. Most of these contain few clues, if indeed any offenses were noted at all.\textsuperscript{155}

Even more perplexing is the data for 1636. While it is true that the metropolitical visitation carried out over 1632-1634\textsuperscript{156} appears not to have targeted communion table issues, Neile’s diocesan visitation in 1636 certainly did. Why, then, did less than ten parishes see presentment for absent rails when clearly many more were in default? Given that three of the six parishes snuffed out by the diocesan visitation—Greasley, Bunny, and Annesley—were pastored by puritans, it may be that the authorities were primarily focused on perceived problem sites. Greasley had churchwardens bold enough to have alleged in 1635 that their vicar was in complete conformity and that “nothing is amiss” with the church or church ornaments.\textsuperscript{157} The diocesan visitation found that the table had not been railed, that unlicensed preachers had been permitted, and that the vicar did not read all the required prayers.\textsuperscript{158} At Bunny and Annesley, churchwardens appear to have been content simply to omit the fault. In any case, in all three parishes, the principal precondition for presentation seems to have been the parishes’ puritan reputations.

As for the other three parishes identified in the diocesan visitation, Marnham, Radford and Bole, it is harder to say. Unfortunately, presentment bills do not survive for Bole, so one cannot see what the churchwardens may or may not have noted in their 1635 bills. At Radford the churchwardens between 1634 and 1635 seem to have been preoccupied with the mostly mundane offenses of recusancy, failure to receive the

\textsuperscript{155} AN/PB 328/8/37.
\textsuperscript{156} Recall that the records for this as regards Nottinghamshire are largely non-extant.
\textsuperscript{157} AN/PB 303/338.
\textsuperscript{158} Vis. 1636 CB, f. 510.
sacrament, sexual immorality, and non-payment. Marnham’s case is more puzzling. On several occasions from at least 1625 onward, churchwardens had presented defects in the chancel, blaming either the proprietor Sir William Cope, or the farmers of the rectory. Thus, when the churchwardens presented the latter in both 1634 and 1635, this was no Laudian era novelty. What was new in these years, however, was the additional presentation of one of the tithe farmers for not standing at the reading of the Creed or the Gospel. Given the relative infrequency of such presentments even in the 1630s, it is surprising that the same churchwardens would not also present the obvious absence of a rail. At the same time, it is possible that the defects in the chancel were such that these churchwardens knew a rail could not be properly installed until the chancel had been brought to an adequate state. For those parishes that presented the absent rail at the archidiaconal visitation or for which only the court orders from 1636 survive—Colwick, Kingston, and Trowell—churchwardens for 1634-1634 appear to have been of a similar mindset to those of Radford. At Kingston, for example, nothing was presented in 1634 and only one case of suspected incontinence in 1635.

The shortcomings of the 1636 diocesan visitation become even clearer when one turns to 1637. Of the more than 90 parishes that would see rail related presentments and/or orders between 1635 and 1640, 41 appeared in 1637. Particularly striking among these is Normanton-upon-Soar, the parish which spent more than twice as much as any other in 1635. In this year, churchwardens noted problems with the steeple and churchyard walls, the former presumably eating up most of the £160 expenditure.

159 AN/PB 303/323; AN/PB 303/275.  
160 AN/PB 326/8/44.  
161 AN/PB 328/8/24; AN/PB 328/9/27.  
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October had also seen the citation of two men for not standing at the reading of the Creed or Gospel, again raising the question of why an absent rail was not also mentioned.\textsuperscript{163} Then in 1636, the diocesan visitation found one case of suspected bastardy, but also cited the churchwardens for making an “imperfect” presentment.\textsuperscript{164} The men most likely in question were John Garner and William Pleadwell, two men who had served together between 1630-1631 as well. If nothing else, they were willing to present a man twice for standing excommunicate, so it is not immediately obvious that they would be likely to cover up faults.\textsuperscript{165} In fact, their being presented for the latter makes it even harder to understand why the absent rail was not noted at that time nor at the next archidiaconal visitation in May 1637.\textsuperscript{166}

Given that some mechanism seems to have been in place for detecting churchwarden malfeasance, one might suspect that the lack of presentations of absent rails largely stemmed from such slackness or misconduct. In fact, only three other parishes—Fledborough, Worksop, and Whatton—have diocesan visitation entries that record churchwarden misconduct beyond the mere failure to display the parish register; and only at Whatton was the wardens’ bill specifically said to be imperfect.\textsuperscript{167} At Fledborough, authorities accused the churchwardens of the more technical faults of failing to make their accompts and collect fines, while at Worksop the wardens had improperly “explained” their presentments.\textsuperscript{168} At the same time, if a total of ten of the thirty-four parishes for which entries could be found saw presentations for
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churchwardens not exhibiting the register, why would those churchwardens not also have been cited for the presumably more important failure to provide the required rail?

Further questions arise in the case of the fourteen parishes that did not see rail related presentments or orders until 1638-1639. Like Normanton-upon-Soar, Fledborough would expend great sums of money over the 1630s. The church was listed as in repair as of 1633, and in October 1635 the churchwardens laid out £60, though on what exactly is hard to identify.\textsuperscript{169} As in previous years, the primary emphasis in the 1637 through April 1638 bills was on recusants, and apparently not on the great number of defects that would only be reported the following September: insufficient paving in the north side; indecent and non-uniform seats; lack of slating for the steeple; problems with the chancel walls, windows, and desks; a decayed “revestrie” house; an insufficient parsonage house and communion table; and the lack of canons, a pulpit cushion and cloth, a flagon, a hood, and a rail.\textsuperscript{170} As noted in a previous chapter, this state of affairs may have developed because day to day religious affairs belonged to a succession of apparently incompetent curates. It is also true that the church may simply have entered the Caroline period in such a poor state that even the work of the early 1630s could only go so far.\textsuperscript{171}

For the most part, however, there is really no obvious explanation for why rail related presentments did not appear for some parishes until 1638-1639. At Teversal, for example, the rail was only noted as “in repairing” as of September 1638, even though in April the churchwardens had listed defects in the steeple, stalls, and seats.\textsuperscript{172} With regard
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to those remaining parishes with puritan pastors, however, it does appear that ministers had been able to secure compliance from successive churchwardens in not presenting the absent rail—at least for a time. At Stanton on the Wolds, Francis Flinders had served as churchwarden since 1636, but only presented the absent rail in 1638. The fact that he was not joined by the other churchwarden in the latter bill, and that he noted the minister’s puritan faults, suggests he had finally decided to align with, or perhaps give in to, the hierarchy’s demands. At Treswell and Tithby, absent rails were not presented until after the departure of their respective puritan ministers. Other parishes likely avoided detection until 1638-1639 due to their relative obscurity, as well as the inherent limitations of early modern governance. Its reliance on unpaid local officials was only among the more significant of these.

Thus far, however, the analysis has considered only one side of the 1630s railing phenomenon. Roughly half of the parishes in the archdeaconry have left behind no evidence of presentments or orders regarding absent rails. Given that some 97 parishes did receive these, it would seem improbable that most that did not had simply avoided or ignored the requirement for several years on end. As indicated above, however, it is likely that at least some churchwardens were able to avoid presenting the deficit altogether. Having access to more complete parochial records for London area parishes, Galloway was able to show, for example, that while only 101 of 652 parishes received railing orders in 1637, only roughly half of those 652 parishes had actually complied by this date. In other words, the number of parishes receiving orders does not necessarily provide an accurate account of those that did not or had not. In both London and
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Nottinghamshire, this reality highlights the ways in which churchwardens, like ministers, shaped the extent of Laudianism’s materialization in their localities.\footnote{Galloway, “English Arminianism,” 226.}

Examining material sources—especially with regard to altar rails—might therefore provide a better indication of Laudianism’s physical impact, given the greater body of physical evidence available from the Caroline period.\footnote{Fincham and Tyacke, \textit{Altars Restored}, 241.} Unfortunately, while this certainly applies to things like communion vessels, it is well known that by the late 1640s, “there were few visible signs of the changes introduced in the 1630s.” Rails were removed, “beautified” walls were whitewashed or had new sentences of scripture applied, images on altars were stripped.\footnote{Ibid., 274-275.} The Southwell Church history project has, however, identified some surviving Laudian items. Most of the surviving items from this period are bells, and as numerous churchwardens’ accounts demonstrate, concern for, and/or purchases of, bells cannot be considered a novelty of the 1630s.\footnote{Worksop Churchwardens’ Accounts, PR/22 765, unpaginated. See expenses for the 1620s.} Even so, researchers have identified, for example, Rolleston, Teversall, and Lambley’s rails as dating to the Laudian period.\footnote{“Rolleston Holy Trinity.” Rolleston - Features and Fittings. Accessed July 28, 2020. http://southwellchurches.nottingham.ac.uk/rolleston/hfitting.php; “Lambley Holy Trinity.” Lambley - Features and Fittings. Accessed July 28, 2020. http://southwellchurches.nottingham.ac.uk/lambley/hfitting.php} Of the three, only Rolleston did not witness any rail related presentments or orders. Several parishes with a similar lack have left behind what seem to be records of the 1638 survey, a survey which involved often painstaking scrutiny. Winthorpe’s survey, for example, noted all sorts of problems, from a belfry “full of rubbish” to a window “doubled up with stone and mortar.” Yet, seemingly accidentally, it recognizes the presence of the rail in claiming that the chancel floor between the east wall
and rail was unpaved. At Bothamsall, fewer faults were forthcoming, the door and cover for the pulpit being the only items still needed. Kilvington’s survey reads more like Winthorpe’s, with many specific faults noted by the churchwardens. This acute attention to detail makes it quite unlikely that an absent rail would have gone unremarked. Thus, there is some basis for thinking that even parishes that showed notable faults in the late 1630s had still earlier complied with the railing requirement or already had a rail in place.

As for those parishes without extant survey records, the internal evidence provided by other presentments and court records likely offers the best path forward. Setting aside the Laudian lenses through which one is often compelled to look at such data, a new perspective is offered by examining the relative ubiquity of “Omnia Bene” presentments in the 1630s. Clearly, of course, such remarks could conceal notable and/or numerous defaults, but it is worth appreciating the extent to which a different story of the 1630s could hypothetically be told. In 1633, the year Neile’s campaign began in the north, 92 parishes handed in at least one “nothing to present” bill, and 42 handed in two. In 1634, these figures increased to 111 and 50, respectively. Though these numbers did decrease over the next few years, largely owing to rail and hood related presentments, in 1637-1638 when Mottershed’s efforts were at their peak, churchwardens returned nearly 200 “nothing to present” bills. These figures highlight the extent to which relative peace.
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rather than conflict and contention characterized many parishes even during the supposed high tide of Laudian enforcement.

Notwithstanding its puritan past, Eakring stands as a parish that ostensibly enjoyed such a peaceful 1630s. Its new parson as of 1630 was George Lawson, a churchman who was allegedly in sympathy with Laudian beautification; he is said to have personally donated an Elizabethan silver chalice and paten to the church. Moreover, it is clear that upon assuming the living Lawson quickly set to work overseeing repairs to the parsonage, quire, and chancel. Hickling is one of many other parishes that also enjoyed an ostensibly calm decade. For the most part, presentations here concerned fornication and negligent attendance. One probable explanation for the relative quietude is that many issues with the church had been addressed in the previous decade. In 1621, churchwardens reported that a beam in the south aisle had fallen down and that the whole church wanted “whiting and painting.” By 1626 these and other shortcomings had been resolved and the churchwardens had also “provided for the parish” a well bound Book of Homilies of the “best” edition. Unencumbered by more involved projects, Hickling’s churchwardens may have been more likely and able to install a rail in the mid-1630s. Given the absence of evidence to the contrary, it seems likely that Eakring and Hickling either had rails or complied promptly once the requirement became known.
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Thus, even if one assumes that some among the great number of parishes with no extant rail presentments or orders had simply been able to remain noncompliant, there is still good reason to think, with Marchant, that a majority had in fact complied. This does not, however, fully address the question of the hierarchy’s “success” rate in the archdeaconry. While White and Fincham and Tyacke both conclude that the vast majority of parishes in England and Wales had a railed altar by 1640, this state of affairs apparently took varying levels of time and effort to effectuate in different parts of the country. 186 Sylvia Watts notes that a mere eight out of some 170 Shropshire and Staffordshire parishes were presented for not installing rails in 1635. 187 By contrast, London area parishes apparently needed until 1638 to demonstrate an acceptable degree of conformity with the railing requirement. 188 Considering only those parishes for which certification dates survive, the Archdeaconry of Nottingham’s “success” rate falls somewhere in the middle. Laxton stands out as the parish that complied most rapidly in 1635, the first presentation in April followed by certification five months later in September. Conversely, Headon and Adbolton’s absent rails, presented in May, were not certified until January 1638 and October 1639, respectively. 189 Yet even with the latter two data points factored in, the average time from court order to certification was just under a year.

Those parishes that saw presentation in 1636 appear to have complied somewhat faster with court orders, the average time from order to certification being just above five

189 Marchant, “The Restoration of Nottinghamshire Churches,” 64.
months. At Radford and Bole, this pace was partly encouraged by excommunications. As indicated above, the majority of parishes presented and/or received orders only in 1637. The court found it necessary to issue orders to sixteen (exactly half) of these, while the other half apparently took steps in a timelier manner. In contrast with 1635 and 1636, the majority of parishes that did not require orders in 1637 took notably less time to set up their rails, a little over five months on average. Some parishes took as few as two months. On the other hand, parishes that did require orders in 1637 averaged more than a year between the date of first presentation and that of certification. Somewhat surprisingly, of the six puritan pastored parishes, only half fell within the latter group, though two of these—Beeston and Thrumpton—did see their churchwardens excommunicated. Of the other three, Sutton-cum-Lound and Hayton erected rails much more quickly, within two and three months, respectively. Roughly the same pattern can be seen for 1638-1639. Ratcliffe-on-Soar and West Leake did not require orders and each took the four months between April and August 1638 to certify. The two puritan pastored parishes, Tithby and Treswell, described their rails as “being done” or “ready” but still received orders in the months following. This may explain the mere one month each took to certify. Only Stanford-on-Soar took longer than seven months after the first presentation to officially comply.

The interpretive difficulties such complex data present are plain to see and have resulted in varying points of emphasis. Some have highlighted the fact that seventeen parishes took more than a year to certify, that four of these took more than two years, and
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four others took more than four years.\textsuperscript{192} In addition to the fact that these seventeen parishes constitute a relatively small subsection, this approach neglects essentially an entire half of the archdeaconry by not considering the parishes that did not see presentments or orders. It also elides the fact that some of the time to certification data may be distorted owing to, for example, the ability of a parish to send men to the court to perform the task. It appears that at least some parishes simply chose to await the next archidiaconal visitation to do so, which could have been several months away. At the same time, one must pay attention to the speed with which certain parishes met the requirements, and to the number of parishes that did not actually require court orders. What remains unclear is how new or recovered evidence may impact an overall evaluation. For more than half of the parishes that received presentments and/or orders in 1635, for example, no further information survives as to when or if obedience was forthcoming. Still, it seems clear that as the years progressed from 1635 to 1639, parishes were under increasing pressure to hasten their compliance with the railing requirement, whatever other factors may have been influencing the rapidity of completion.

Determining the authorities’ success in terms of the translation and turning of the communion table itself is a more complex task. Given that the rails were supposed to “rail in” the communion table within the east end of the chancel by extending north and south between the chancel walls, the eastward shift and altarwise turn may have simply been an unstated assumption of the rail requirement. If Galloway is right, such a situation would have differed from the policies enacted in the southern province, where changes to

\textsuperscript{192} Jennings, “‘The Gathering of the Elect,’” 106.
the table itself were explicitly enforced from 1637.\textsuperscript{193} Although the sample size is small at only nine parishes, it is still the case that only two of these—Newark and St. Peter’s, Nottingham—can be shown to have had rails in place \textit{before} churchwardens received orders regarding the table. On closer inspection, in both parishes the puritan vicars had been in the habit of removing the table from the chancel during communions. This helps explain the episode of mass refusal to receive that took place at St. Peter’s in 1638, as by this time the vicar had been pressured into compelling reception at the rails.\textsuperscript{194} In most cases, the rail and table changes were ordered at the same time. For example, the churchwardens of Bunny were in 1636 ordered to “cause the communion table to be set at the east end of the chancell and to be decently railed in.”\textsuperscript{195} Similarly, in 1637 the churchwardens of Mansfield Woodhouse were “to cause the communion table to be placed at the high end of the Chancell long wayes, and to cause the same to be decently railed about.”\textsuperscript{196} At Keyworth, however, the absent rail had been presented in April 1635, while the table was said to stand “a yard and an halfe from the wall” at the diocesan visitation the next year.\textsuperscript{197} The confusion is resolved when one sees that the rail was only certified as of April 1637.\textsuperscript{198}

It might also be noted that no archidiaconal presentment bill has been found to contain any reference to the position or orientation of the communion table, though some do mention broken or insufficient tables. If the archidiaconal articles for 1635-1638 were essentially the same as those for 1639, as appears to have been the case, then

\textsuperscript{194} Marchant, \textit{The Puritans and the Church Courts}, 67-68. 
\textsuperscript{195} Vis. 1636 CB, f. 485v. 
\textsuperscript{196} Marchant, “The Restoration of Nottinghamshire Churches,” 77. 
\textsuperscript{197} AN/PB 315/9/22. 
\textsuperscript{198} Marchant, “The Restoration of Nottinghamshire Churches,” 75.
churchwardens were only asked if the communion table was “rightly placed.” Writing this question in 1635, the author of these articles presumably had Neile’s 1634 provincial order for railed in altarwise tables in mind. Even so, to the undiscriminating churchwarden, “rightly placed” was likely open to some degree of interpretation, especially when the rail had yet to be installed. At the same time, it is unlikely that the parishes cited only for absent rails at the 1636 diocesan visitation also had misplaced tables that simply went unremarked. Given that the only two known cases of orders to turn tables being given after rails were in place were in parishes that had been moving the table out of the chancel for communion, it seems reasonable to expect that a majority of parishes had in fact moved their tables to acceptable positions. Whether this always involved an altarwise rotation or could simply have entailed moving the table closer to the east end is harder to determine.

III. Conclusion

Despite ambiguities in the evidence, what is clear is that the findings described above necessitate the careful reconsideration, but not mere dismissal, of the conventional wisdom expressed by Jennings and other historians. By employing a more meticulous approach of investigating the particular circumstances of Nottinghamshire parishes as well as taking a wider chronological view, this chapter has demonstrated that in at least some aspects, Laudian measures were neither unprecedented nor especially onerous or widely felt. Churchyard violations, fence decay, and general repairs to chancels had been presented and addressed quite consistently before the 1630s, and the numbers available for that decade simply do not reflect extraordinary changes from what had gone before.

199 Archidiaconal Visitation Articles, Nottingham 1639, S3.3.42 (C2v).
Moreover, while particular requirements regarding font covers and other supplies do appear to have been unique to the Laudian period, a majority of parishes apparently remained untroubled by these demands. At the same time, this chapter has also revealed that other Laudian policies were clearly both novel and widely felt—though still not impacting even a simple majority of parishes. This was notably true in the case of orders to provide paving and/or boarding, to make seating fixtures uniform, and to make seats in the chancel sit in a “chancelwise” manner. Notwithstanding the views of White and others, the requirement to move the communion table behind rails spanning the east end of the chancel must also be considered a novelty of the Laudian period, and one that had little basis in the canons and injunctions of the Church of England. While prompt compliance was not everywhere forthcoming, it is a mistake to focus too heavily on those parishes that took longer than most. By evaluating all of the available evidence, specifically the large number of parishes that either complied relatively quickly or did not even require presentments or orders, this study has shown that resistance and excommunications were not the norm. During the 1630s, life, including ecclesiastical life, was certainly not as it had always been in every parish, and Laudianism undoubtedly became quite concrete in some of them—particularly the larger towns like Newark and Nottingham. Yet Haigh and White are still right to urge the historian to remove the lenses of conventional wisdom and appreciate the extent to which another story of the 1630s may be told—one characterized more by the mundane and commonplace than some might like.
Conclusion

Eschewing anecdotal approaches, this work has sought to conduct systematic and data-driven analyses of the available evidence of Laudianism’s local impact. Rather than single out instances of supposedly Laudian clerics lording it over their parishioners, or facing resistance from them, the initial chapters aimed to account for as many of the ministers active in the archdeaconry in the 1630s as the evidence would allow. It was revealed that, unlike in Essex, the number of demonstrably Laudian clergymen was noticeably small, that even prominent Laudians holding livings in the region did not strenuously impose Laudian measures, and that the general make-up of the wider body of clergy made Laudianism’s thoroughgoing enforcement unlikely. Had they lived to study the 1630s in detail, the two archbishops would likely have regretted the persistent presence of passive churchwardens and long-serving ministers like Leonard Foster at Screveton (1602-1650) who seems to have taken few pains to enforce the Laudian ideals, or William Sharpe at Wysall (1603-1654), who was similarly hands-off during the 1630s.¹ Laud and Neile would probably also have wished that more of the archdeaconry’s graduates had come from Laudian educational establishments like St. John’s, Oxford, or at least have graduated a bit later than many had. Neile in particular would almost certainly have been angered to see how much more patronage had been available to Laud and his allies in the south than had been allotted him in Nottinghamshire.

Neile might also have been upset with the results of this study’s similarly data-driven analysis of ecclesiastical discipline. Had a subordinate been eager to please the archbishop, he might have taken the approach of many works—especially works of synthesis attempting to

¹ Per AN/PB 315/11/37, Screveton maxed out its 1630s expenses with a meager £4. Per AN/PB 315/11/52, Wysall maxed out at the only slightly higher amount of £10.
weave discussion of “Arminianism” into their longer narrative—and simply selected out some presumably illustrative anecdotes, such as when, in 1635, Elizabeth Holmes of Kneesall was cited for slandering the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England as “a company of shitten prayers.” This would theoretically demonstrate the dedication of the minister and churchwardens to the policies of the Church as well as the effectiveness of the Church’s disciplinary mechanisms, all of which Neile would doubtless have applauded. Yet, the present work has shown that such episodes were far from representative of the broader experiences of ecclesiastical discipline in the archdeaconry. Systematic analysis of the decades preceding the 1630s reveals that there had been periods of heightened enforcement of certain requirements or policies prior to the advent of Laud, Neile and Mottershed, and that the extent of discontinuities in the 1630s should not be overstated. Though many churchwardens unquestionably faced stricter oversight in the 1630s than previously with regard to maintaining ecclesiastical structures, Neile would be alarmed to learn that the highest rate of presentments against ministers for failing to maintain the buildings for which they were responsible came, not in the 1630s, but between 1596 and 1603. Neile might also be troubled by the fact that the 1630s saw no uptick in the rate of presentations against clerical misbehavior or immorality.

From this work’s methodical investigation of the financial and material consequences of Laudianism, Neile would find more to be pleased with. A good number of parishes did indeed engage in restorative work, including the installation of altar rails, the repaving of floors, and the rebuilding of chancels. In some cases, such measures could carry hefty price tags. At Newark,
over £200 was spent between 1636 and 1637. The parish of Thorpe spent nearly £300 over the same time period in constructing a new steeple, new seating arrangements, and a new pulpit and rail. Unfortunately for Neile, these spending patterns cannot be taken as representative of the archdeaconry at large. More typical were parishes like Winthorpe, Whatton, and Wollaton, whose expenditures when combined fall far short of Newark or Thorpe. Neile would, however, be pleased to hear that even in parishes that laid out seemingly vast sums on restorative work, resistance to payments did not become a notable problem, if it became one at all. Churchwardens at Thorpe, to give a notable example, did not record any non-payment infractions during the 1630s. This was also the case for other high-spending parishes like Winkburn and Normanton-on-Soar, parishes that rank along with Thorpe in the top five parishes for average expenditure over the 1635 to 1639 period.

Still, in addition to resenting the widespread lack of serious expenditures, Neile would surely also have begrudged the apathetic or conniving churchwardens who had circumvented or circumscribed the impact of Laudianism in their parishes, as well as the apparent inefficiencies of the ecclesiastical administration. Even Neile’s own visitation in 1636 failed in many cases to detect absent altar rails or other faults, a good number of which seem to have gone unresolved. Though in a number of instances parishes may have already had met the requirements, the large number of “Omnia Bene” presentments submitted to the archidiaconal authorities in the 1630s would still give Neile pause. In 1638, for example, at the height of Mottershed’s power, 75 parishes returned at least one “Omnia Bene” bill. Some parishes seem to have had an especially peaceful 1630s, as in the case of Ratcliffe-upon-Soar, which submitted 11 “Omnia Bene” bills

3 AN/PB 303/412; AN/PB 328/12/17.
4 AN/PB 303/401; AN/PB 328/12/6.
between 1633 and 1639. At Car Colston, nothing at all was presented in 1637, 1638, or 1639. In short, while Neile would find much to be proud of, he would also recognize the limited reach of his policies, and the extent to which local factors and individuals circumscribed his goals.

Thus, each chapter of this study has highlighted the variety of ways in which the Archdeaconry of Nottingham did not experience a full scale Laudian “blitzkrieg” during the 1630s as certain other localities seem to have. In so doing, the work has called into question the widely-held views of Nicholas Tyacke and others, necessitating reconsideration of the popular notion that Laudian policies “destroyed the Church of England.” Having benefitted greatly from the existing research, it is hoped this study has contributed particularly to the comparative understanding of Laudianism’s realization in different parts of the country. Clearly, the Archdeaconry of Nottingham differed from London, Middlesex, Somersetshire, and Essex in many important ways. For one, it lacked strong ties to the often more traditional colleges of Oxford, and especially unlike Essex and London, appears to have attracted far fewer Laudian clergymen to its benefices. Consider the contrast with Essex, where Laudian clergymen actually held a greater number of livings than puritans prior to the Civil War. Unlike in London and Middlesex, a majority of the archdeaconry’s clergy did not move too far from home to take up their livings, many being from Nottinghamshire or one of the adjoining counties. As in the case of Bath and Wells, this seems to have made for less adversarial ties between parishioners and
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6 See, for example, AN/PB 315/14/10.
7 “Blitzkrieg” is the term Kenneth Fincham uses to describe the experience of Laudianism in Norwich. See Kenneth Fincham, “Clerical Conformity from Whitgift to Laud,” in The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642, ed. Kenneth Fincham (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993), 152.
8 Margaret Stieg, Laud’s Laboratory: The Diocese of Bath and Wells in the Early Seventeenth Century (East Brunswick, N.J.: Bucknell University Press, 1982), 314.
9 It bears repeating that Ronald Marchant’s work has been indispensable for the present study.
10 Mary-Millicent Egan, "Laudians, Puritans and the Laity in Essex c. 1630-1642" Ph.D. Diss., (University of London, University College London, 2001), 212. Of course, puritans predominated overall given the large number of unbeneficed puritan preachers.
clergy. Also in contrast to London and Middlesex, the hierarchy appears to have had much less
hold over the individual livings in the archdeaconry, having held advowson rights to a small
number and having been able to actually present to an even smaller number. As indicated
throughout this study, these and other key differences resulted in often widely contrasting
experiences of Laudianism.

In making these points, the project also demonstrates the extent to which analysis of
localities outside of the southern ecclesiastical province should be a top priority in the effort to
build up a fuller and more nuanced understanding of Laudianism’s impact across the country as a
whole. Although more research needs to be done as regards the connections between residual
Catholicism and traditionalism and Laudianism, it does seem clear that the somewhat limited
extent of puritanism—lay and clerical—in Nottinghamshire helped smooth over or even curtail
Laudianism’s reach when compared to the more heavily puritan laden counties of Essex and
London. Indeed, it is telling that nearly all of the few major episodes of Laudian related conflict
in 1630s Nottinghamshire involved parishes like St. Peter’s Nottingham, Kneesall, or North
Collingham—parishes with notable puritan populations and/or puritan pasts.11 This aligns with
Egan’s finding that puritan non-conformists were the main instigators of strife both in Essex
parishes with Laudian ministers and even those with moderate puritan ministers.12 Further
studies of northern regions with even less extensive puritan roots, and perhaps larger Catholic or
recusant populations, will be needed to increase the understanding of Laudianism’s impact in a
diverse array of contexts. The increasing digitization of relevant early modern records will
hopefully facilitate this research.

11 See especially presentment bills for North Collingham such as AN/PB 328/9/43. These parishes are an important
reminder that puritanism and even Separatism had strong roots in certain places within the archdeaconry.
In addition to encouraging future studies, it is hoped that this work has contributed toward improvements in the methods used to investigate the local materialization of Laudianism. At the most basic level, this work has demonstrated the benefits of utilizing local and micro history approaches to probe aspects of grand historical narratives. It has also pointed up the importance of setting the 1630s in the context of the early Stuart era as a whole. That is, rather than simply look at the 1630s in isolation and point out major instances of conflict, this study has thoroughly examined the preceding decades in order to evaluate continuities and discontinuities more accurately between the 1610s-1620s and the 1630s. Such an approach allows the historian to identify both the truly novel phenomena introduced by Laudianism and the extent of changes—if changes can be seen at all—in spheres like ecclesiastical discipline. Additionally, this project has pointed up the benefits of relying primarily on primary sources dating to the 1630s or before. Though certain sources from the 1640s or later do have their uses, especially as concerns areas with limited surviving records, records from the 1630s and earlier pose fewer interpretive problems. This has been shown to be especially important, for example, when determining what “sort” of clergy were active in the Archdeaconry of Nottingham by the 1630s. It also prevents simplistic assumptions such as supposing that a minister ejected in the 1640s or 1650s introduced Laudian measures in his parish with some enthusiasm. These methodological approaches are being rearticulated here, not to be precisely imitated, but to inspire careful thinking about methodological choices in future studies on the topic.

While not as central to the aims of this work as its methodologies, the connections between Laudianism and Civil War allegiances in Nottinghamshire have clearly been touched upon in some of its findings, suggesting potential avenues for future research. It seems fairly certain that in some parishes where Laudianism was felt most acutely, particularly in heavily
puritan areas, the financial and material changes it brought did play some role in galvanizing the population toward support of the Parliamentarians. The most obvious example of this would be in Nottingham itself. Nevertheless, the reality of Nottingham’s divided loyalties—it had been, after all, the place where Charles I first raised his standard—as well as the example of Nottingham’s similarly important royalist neighbor, Newark, should prevent any simplistic correlations between intense experiences of Laudianism and support for Parliament. What will be particularly intriguing to discover is the extent to which the muting or evading of Laudian measures seen in many localities had any notable connection with a given parish’s future loyalties. The findings of this study suggest that, for many of those areas that ultimately did go in for Parliament, Laudianism would not likely have been the key deciding factor, or even a main deciding factor.

More than exploring ramifications for the Civil War, however, this study has aimed to examine the lived experience of religious change in early Stuart England—to discover the ways in which Laudianism’s impact was mediated at the local level as a result of specific individuals and other factors. At the broadest level, it has been demonstrated that Laudianism materialized in different parishes at different times, in different ways, for different reasons, and with different outcomes. Some areas did indeed experience sizable “doses” of Laudianism, certain aspects of which were actively opposed. Some communities bore hefty costs and engaged in intensive restorative work with little to no evidence of opposition. Other congregations, meanwhile, seem to have gone about their religious lives as they had done for much of the early seventeenth-century, Laudianism making only the slightest appearance in their evidentiary records. As in the case of Judith Maltby’s Prayer Book Protestants, that such parishes do not stand out among a

crowd partially filled with conflict-ridden (often puritan) neighbors does not make them any less significant or important to study.\textsuperscript{14} Indeed, understanding that Laudianism was far from a one-size-fits-all experience—that for many, continuity and consensus were just as tangible as conflict and disruption—will be critical for future studies on the topic. It is only by being open to, and interested in discovering, the diversity of experiences of Laudianism that future studies can fully overturn Mawdesley and Spencer’s all too recent lament that historians “still lack a real understanding of Laudianism at the parochial level.”\textsuperscript{15} It is hoped that this work has been a significant step in that direction.

\begin{flushleft}
\footnotesize
\end{flushleft}
Appendix A

Caroline Clergy of Nottingham: Classifications

*N.B. It should be noted that in some cases, dates have been particularly difficult to determine. In such cases, question marks have been used to indicate uncertainty. In other cases, little to no information about a given parish’s clergymen could be obtained. Furthermore, classification choices reflect the author’s interpretation of the available evidence, and therefore cannot be considered set in stone.

**The presence of “seq.” indicates that the given clergyman was sequestered from the living.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>CLERGYMAN</th>
<th>CLASSIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adbolton</td>
<td>Joshua Syston, Rector (1628-1637?)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annesley</td>
<td>William Hewitt, Curate (1630-1638)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Bowes, Curate (1639-1642)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold</td>
<td>Thomas Naylor, Vicar (1623-1631)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Coates, Vicar (1631-1642)</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attenborough</td>
<td>Gervase Dodson, Vicar (1625-1642)</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austerfield (in Blyth)</td>
<td>Thomas Johnson, Curate (1624-1635)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averham</td>
<td>Thomas Speight, Curate (1624-1637)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oliver Griffin, Rector (1637-1650)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babworth</td>
<td>Thomas Bishop, Rector (1617-1633?)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theodore Danney, Rector (? – d. 1642)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balderton (annexed to Farndon)</td>
<td>William Chantler, Curate (1629-1635)</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Lovett, Curate (1636-1638?)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnby in the Willows</td>
<td>Leonard Wade, Vicar (1630-1635)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Matkin, Curate (1632-35), Vicar (1635-?)</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnstone (in Langar)</td>
<td>Anthony Somerby, Curate (1635-?)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton in Fabis</td>
<td>Ralph Hansbie, Rector (1616-1635)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Neile, Rector (1635-1637)</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barnaby Barlow, Rector (1637-1641)</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bawtry (in Blyth)</td>
<td>Thomas Johnson, Curate (1624-1639)</td>
<td>See Austerfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beeston</td>
<td>Walter Kindersley, Vicar (1604-1645)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Rector/Minister/Curate (Dates)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bapton</td>
<td>Edward Knutton, Curate (1636-1646)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Besthorpe (in South Scarle)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bevercotes (in West Markham)</td>
<td>Thomas Holmstead, Curate (?) (1637-1643)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilborough</td>
<td>Thomas Lowe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owen Meredith, &quot;Minister&quot; (1634)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ralph Watson, Rector (1636-1641)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilsthorpe</td>
<td>Gilbert Benet, Rector (1625-1663)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>Matthew Wren, Rector (1624-1635)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Robinson, Rector (1635-d.1642)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edward Wethered, Curate (1634-1641)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blyth</td>
<td>Samuel Simpson, Vicar (1622-d.1633)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henry Priest, Vicar (1634-1662)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bothamsall</td>
<td>Henry Bacon, Curate (1628-1643)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boughton (in Kneesall)</td>
<td>(See Kneesall)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradmore (Annexed to Bunny)</td>
<td>(See Kneesall)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bramcote (in Attenborough)</td>
<td>Francis Townsend, Curate (1628-1630?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulcote (in Burton Joyce)</td>
<td>(See Burton Joyce)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulwell</td>
<td>Robert Aynsworth, Rector (1622-?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunny</td>
<td>Richard Towle, Vicar (1595-1637)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samuel Lightfoot, Vicar (1637-1650?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton Joyce</td>
<td>John Gifford, Vicar (1627-1663)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Colston</td>
<td>Edmund Winter, Vicar (1631-1658?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carburton (in Edwinstowe)</td>
<td>(See Edwinstowe)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlton in Lindrick</td>
<td>Thomas Benson, Rector (1616-1638?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarborough</td>
<td>Robert Hurst, Vicar (1631-1645)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayworth</td>
<td>Robert Topham, Rector (1630-?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Horbery, Curate (1635?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton</td>
<td>Henry Wylde, Rector (1623-1633 resigned)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Thirly, Rector (1633-1646 seq.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coddington (in East Stoke)</td>
<td>William Turnpenny, Curate (1638?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colston Bassett</td>
<td>Roger Jackson, Vicar (1597-1633?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colwick</td>
<td>Robert Theobalds, Rector (1628-d.1643)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cossall (in Wollaton?)</td>
<td>(See Wollaton)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Rector/Curate</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Costock</td>
<td>Mark Wiersdale, Rector (1595- d.1639)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gabriel Wiersdale, Curate (1630s?); R. from 1639</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotgrave</td>
<td>Robert Kinder, Rector (1617-1645)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotham</td>
<td>William Chantler, Curate (1630-1638?)</td>
<td>See Balderton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottam (in South Leverton)</td>
<td>(See South Chantler)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cromwell</td>
<td>Richard Hubbald, Rector (1623-1631)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Williamson, Rector (1632-1635)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henry Truman, Rector (1635-1650 seq.)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Hague, Curate (1637-1638?)</td>
<td>CL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eakring</td>
<td>George Lawson, Rector (1630-1670)</td>
<td>CL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bridgford</td>
<td>John Hull, Rector (1629-1658)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Leake</td>
<td>John Presbury, Curate (1627-1638?)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Markham</td>
<td>George Ormerod, Vicar (1618-1655)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Retford</td>
<td>John Watt, Vicar (1618- d.1640)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Stoke</td>
<td>Richard Gymney, Vicar (1578-1634)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Rhodes, Vicar (1635-1641)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastwood</td>
<td>Richard Holland, Rector (1618-1642)</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwalton (See Ruddington)</td>
<td>Thomas Storer, Vicar (1587- d.1638)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Francis Carrington, Vicar (1638-1654)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwinstowe</td>
<td>George Rigges, Vicar (1625-1648)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egmonton</td>
<td>Thomas Wright, Vicar (1617- d. 1637)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leonard Fifield, Vicar (1637-1650?)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkesley</td>
<td>Henry Bacon, Vicar (1628-1643)</td>
<td>See Bothamsall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elston</td>
<td>John Robinson, Rector (1612-1637)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Darker, Rector (1637-?)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elston Chapel (in East Stoke)</td>
<td>Joseph Robinson, Curate (1635?)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elton</td>
<td>William Hodgkinson, Rector (1621- d.1634)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dove Williamson, Rector (1634-1680)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epperstone</td>
<td>George Marler, Rector (1603-1633)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeremy Deacon, Rector (1633-1640)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everton</td>
<td>William Baylie, Vicar (1624 – d.1662)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farndon</td>
<td>William Howell, Vicar (1596-1632)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholas Saunderson, Vicar (1632?-1642)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Rector/Curate</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finningley</td>
<td>Daniel Jones, Rector (1619-1647 seq.)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Jackson, Curate (1638-1640)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flawborough (in Staunton/Orston)</td>
<td>(See Staunton)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flawford (in Ruddington)</td>
<td>(See Ruddington)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fledborough</td>
<td>James Clayton, Rector (1618-1639)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edward Henshaw, Rector (1639-1657 seq.)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flintham</td>
<td>Daniel Odingsell, Vicar (1621-1650)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamston</td>
<td>William Birkhead, Rector (1599-1641)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gedling</td>
<td>William Stokes, Vicar of 1 moiety (1604-1645)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christopher Forman, Rector of 1 moiety (1603-1640)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girton (annexed to S. Scarle)</td>
<td>(See South Scarle)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonalston</td>
<td>Robert Huthwet, Rector (1620-1646)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gotham</td>
<td>John Foxcroft, Rector (1619-1662)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granby</td>
<td>John Aldred, Vicar (1586-1641?)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greasley</td>
<td>Lemuel Tuke, Vicar (1628-1640)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ephraim Tuke, Curate (1635-1636)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gringley on the Hill</td>
<td>Robert Aynsworth, Vicar (1627-1643?)</td>
<td>See Bulwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove</td>
<td>Gervase Neville, Rector (1611-1642)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harworth</td>
<td>John Craven, Vicar (1604-1646)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haughton (in Walesby)</td>
<td>(See Walesby)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawksworth</td>
<td>Robert Rockold, Rector (1630-1653)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawton</td>
<td>Edward Kidd, Rector (1612-1641)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayton</td>
<td>George Longden, Rector (1620-1642)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headon</td>
<td>Roger Manners, Vicar (1627-1637 resigned)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gervase Neville, Rector (1631-1642)</td>
<td>See Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Barnes, Vicar (1637?)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Sarson, Vicar (1637-1640)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickling</td>
<td>Edmund Bardsey, Rector (1617-1641 resigned)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Bent, Curate (1630-1639)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockerton</td>
<td>Luke Mason, Rector (1618-1640)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holme Pierrepont</td>
<td>Henry Cooke, Rector (1629-1641)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoveringham</td>
<td>Peter Coates, Curate (1625-1633)</td>
<td>See Arnold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hucknall Torkard</td>
<td>John Morton, Curate (1634-1642)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matthew Moore, Vicar (1626-1634 resigned)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adam Hunt, Vicar (1634-1642)</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelham</td>
<td>Nicholas Janson, Rector (1630-1667?)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyworth</td>
<td>William Smyth, Rector (1619-1641?)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilvington</td>
<td>Clement Holder, Rector (1609-1637)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Hill, Rector (1637-1662?)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston-on-Soar</td>
<td>Thomas Bertram, Curate (1614-1635?)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkby in Ashfield</td>
<td>Tobias Waterhouse, Rector (1617-1646 seq.)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revell Vessie, Curate (1635?)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henry Denham, Curate (1639)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirton</td>
<td>William Smyth, Rector 1613-1633?</td>
<td>See Keyworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kneesall</td>
<td>Luke Bacon, Vicar (1626-1633)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Clough, Vicar (1633-1638 resigned)</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Hewitt, Vicar (1639-1640)</td>
<td>See Annesley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kneeton</td>
<td>John Langley, Curate (1630?)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Morton, Curate (1632-1642)</td>
<td>See Hoveringham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambley</td>
<td>Robert Kinder, Rector (1617-1645)</td>
<td>See Cotgrave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Holden, Curate (1636?)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langar</td>
<td>Charles Odingsells, Rector (1609-1637)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Shepperdson, Curate (1634?)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lex Lowther, Curate (1635)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liel Thorolde, Curate (1636?)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Yeomanson, Curate (1637?)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Francis Barrow, Rector (1637-1638)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Fairclough, Rector (1638-?)</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laxton</td>
<td>William Rook, Vicar (1613-1641)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenton</td>
<td>Robert Ollerenshaw, Vicar (1623-1659)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linby (Lindby)</td>
<td>Zacharias Saunders, Rector (1604-1632)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Meires, Rector (1632-1642)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleborough</td>
<td>Samuel Holden, Perpetual Curate (1620-1652)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowdham</td>
<td>John Stock, Vicar (1625-1646 seq.)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>John Price, Vicar (1628-1646)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Priest</td>
<td>Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield Woodhouse (in Mansfield)</td>
<td>John Redferne, Curate</td>
<td>1625-1635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Newton, Curate</td>
<td>1617-1639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Carte, Curate</td>
<td>1639-1642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maplebeck</td>
<td>George Jackson, Curate</td>
<td>1625?-1638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marnham</td>
<td>Edward Warren, Vicar</td>
<td>1627-1640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattersey</td>
<td>Edmund Kemp, Vicar</td>
<td>1630-1643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misson</td>
<td>Robert Horberry, Vicar</td>
<td>1601-1650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorhouse (in Laxton)</td>
<td>(See Laxton)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>John Mosely (Moseley)</td>
<td>1629-1642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normanton-on-Trent</td>
<td>Robert Addie, Vicar</td>
<td>1594-1632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Mason, Vicar</td>
<td>1632-1634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Hewes, Vicar</td>
<td>1634-1642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normanton-upon-Soar</td>
<td>Richard Caldwell, Rector</td>
<td>1628-1637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Bentley (1637-?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Clifton</td>
<td>Thomas Fukes (Fewkes), Vicar</td>
<td>1634-1638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Collingham</td>
<td>George Greene, Vicar</td>
<td>1624-1642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Wheatley</td>
<td>Thomas Beane, Vicar</td>
<td>1621-1649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norton Cuckney</td>
<td>Francis Stephenson, Vicar</td>
<td>1621-1653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham St. Mary</td>
<td>Ralph Hansbie, Vicar</td>
<td>1617-1635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Cranage, Curate</td>
<td>1633-?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edmund Lacocke, Vicar</td>
<td>1635-1642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham St. Nicholas</td>
<td>Robert Malham, Rector</td>
<td>1611-1651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham St. Peter</td>
<td>George Coates, Rector</td>
<td>1617- d. 1640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuthall</td>
<td>William Greaves, Rector</td>
<td>1612-1646 seq.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ollerton (in Edwinstowe)</td>
<td>(See Edwinstowe)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordsall</td>
<td>Edmund Mason, Rector</td>
<td>1614-1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marmaduke Moore, Rector</td>
<td>1631-1650 seq.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orston</td>
<td>John Mussom, Vicar</td>
<td>1624-1638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Jones, Vicar</td>
<td>1638-?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Thorold, Curate</td>
<td>1639?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owthorpe</td>
<td>Thomas Mountney, Curate</td>
<td>1625-1630?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papplewick</td>
<td>Zephania Saunders, Curate</td>
<td>1621-1642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perlethorpe (in Edwinstowe)</td>
<td>(See Edwinstowe)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumtree</td>
<td>Francis Chamberlain, Rector (1614-1650)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radcliffe-on-Trent</td>
<td>Daniel Wilcock, Vicar (1622?-1633)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Sherwood, Vicar (1633-1638 resigned)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Creswell, Vicar (1638-1660)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radford</td>
<td>Robert Malham, Vicar (1612-51?)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratcliffe upon Soar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rempstone</td>
<td>Anthony Major, Rector (1595-1632)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hugh Armstrong, Rector (1633-?)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolleston</td>
<td>Francis Withington, Vicar (1628-1642 resigned?)</td>
<td>See W. Bridgford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Le Lowther, Curate (1635?)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Hobson, Curate (1639)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossington</td>
<td>William Plaxton, Vicar (1614-1639?)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruddington</td>
<td>Thomas Storer, Vicar (1587-1638)</td>
<td>See Edwalton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Francis Carrington, Vicar (1638-1654)</td>
<td>See Edwalton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saundby</td>
<td>Jerome Phillips, Rector (1604-1644 resigned?)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ephraim Tuke, Curate (1625-1635)</td>
<td>See Greasley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarrington (in Orston)</td>
<td>John Staunton, Curate (1625-1630?)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screveton</td>
<td>Leonard Foster, Rector (1602-1650)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrooby (in Sutton cum Lound)</td>
<td>Hugh Shaw, Curate (1629-1666?)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selston</td>
<td>Henry Denham, Curate (1631-1642)</td>
<td>See Kirkby in A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelford</td>
<td>Henry Pratt, Curate (1630-1638?)</td>
<td>CL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Evatt, Curate (1638-1639)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ralph Browne, Curate (1640-1642?)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelton</td>
<td>William Benet, Rector (1625-1632)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Griffin Spencer, Rector (1632-1666)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Rice, Curate (1635?)</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibthorpe</td>
<td>John Langley, Curate (1625-1643)</td>
<td>See Kneeton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skegby (in Mansfield)</td>
<td>Nathaniel Wolley, Curate (1625-1632)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Westerby, Curate (1633-1634)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rowland Revill, Curate (1635?)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sneinton (annexed to Nott St. Mary)</td>
<td>(Served by Vicars of St. Mary’s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sookholme (in Warsop)</td>
<td>(See Warsop)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Rector/Vicar</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Collingham</td>
<td>George Alsop, Rector (1628-1640)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Leverton</td>
<td>Richard Mustian (Mustion), Vicar (1620-1643)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Scarle</td>
<td>Simon Read, Vicar (1625-1638)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Scarle</td>
<td>George Mason, Vicar (1638-1660?)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford Upon Soar</td>
<td>William Sarson, Rector (1631-1640)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton-on-the-Wolds</td>
<td>David Chovan, Rector (1628-1656)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stapleford</td>
<td>Richard Jepson, Curate (1631-1642)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stauton</td>
<td>Gervase Palmer, Rector (1631-1656?)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stauton Chapel (in Orston)</td>
<td>James Read, Curate (1625-1635)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strelley</td>
<td>John Martin, Rector (1624-1633)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturton le Steeple</td>
<td>William Howson, Vicar (1623-1632)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturton le Steeple</td>
<td>Edward Barnes, Vicar (1632-1650)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton Bonington (St. Anne)</td>
<td>(See St. Michael)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton Bonington (St. Michael)</td>
<td>Thomas Savage, Rector (1622-1662)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton-cum-Lound</td>
<td>Hezekiah Burton, Vicar (1614-1646)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton in Ashfield</td>
<td>Henry Pellett, Curate (1630?)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton in Ashfield</td>
<td>Robert Wallis, Curate (1632-1642)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton-on-Trent</td>
<td>William Butcher, Vicar (1604-1638?)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syerston (in East Stoke)</td>
<td>(See East Stoke)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teversal</td>
<td>James Mason, Rector (1610-1638)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teversal</td>
<td>William Smythson, Rector (1638-1640)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorney</td>
<td>Bardolphe Grigge, Vicar (1622-1639)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoronton (in Orston)</td>
<td>(See Orston)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe (<code>Thorpe by Newark</code>)</td>
<td>John Scarlett, Rector (1615-1639?)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe in the Glebe</td>
<td>Hugh Armstrong, Rector (1625-1642)</td>
<td>See Rempstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrumpton</td>
<td>Thomas Goodwin, Curate (1620-1638)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrumpton</td>
<td>Ferdinando Poole, Curate (1640?)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurgarton</td>
<td>William Brownley, Curate (1629-1634)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurgarton</td>
<td>George Darker, Curate (1634-1637)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurgarton</td>
<td>James Brecknock, Curate (1637-1639)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tithby</td>
<td>Zacharia Trig, Curate (1639-?)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tithby</td>
<td>Thomas Langdon, Curate (1617?-1637)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tollerton</td>
<td>John Pare, Rector (1604-1636)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tollerton</td>
<td>Gervase Pendock, Rector (1636-1650 seq.)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treswell</td>
<td>Christopher Fielding, Rector (1613-?) *East</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treswell</td>
<td>Henry Langley, Rector (1610-1636) *West</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trowell</td>
<td>Thomas Shipman, Rector (1636-?) *West</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trowell</td>
<td>John Kirkby, Rector (1602-1647) *2nd Mediety</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trowell</td>
<td>Francis Hill, Rector (1626-1662) *1st Mediety</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trowell</td>
<td>Owen Meredith, Curate (1630-1639)</td>
<td>See Bilborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trowell</td>
<td>Edward Graves, Curate (1635?)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuxford</td>
<td>Henry Hawden, Vicar (1627-1651)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Broughton</td>
<td>Richard Colebrand, Rector (1596-1653)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walesby</td>
<td>Henry Truman, Vicar (1624-1643)</td>
<td>See Cromwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkeringham</td>
<td>Thomas Vicars, Vicar (1590-1638)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkeringham</td>
<td>George Robson, Vicar (1638-?)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsop</td>
<td>William Spurr, Rector (1589-1630?)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsop</td>
<td>John Cundye, Curate (1630-1638)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellow</td>
<td>Gilbert Yates, Curate (1624-1637?)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Bridgford</td>
<td>Francis Withington, Vicar (1614-1650?)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Bridgford</td>
<td>Joshua Syston, Curate (1628-1636)</td>
<td>See Adbolton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Bridgford</td>
<td>Alexander Lowther, Curate (1637-?)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Burton</td>
<td>Robert Hodgson, Curate (1630-1634)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Burton</td>
<td>Richard Baylie, Curate (1635-1638)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Drayton (in E. Markham)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Leake</td>
<td>Edward Bigland, Rector (1620-1650)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Markham</td>
<td>Robert Bruen, Vicar (1620-1636)</td>
<td>CNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Markham</td>
<td>Thomas Holmstead, Vicar (1637-1643)</td>
<td>See Bevercotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Retford</td>
<td>Thomas Bishop, Rector (1600-1642)</td>
<td>See Babworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weston</td>
<td>William Fuller, Rector (1619-1631)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weston</td>
<td>Josiah Hawkesworth, Rector (1631-?)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whatton</td>
<td>Martin Silverwood, Vicar (1628-1639?)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widmerpool</td>
<td>John Rustat, Rector (1624-1656?)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Rector/Vicar</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willoughby-on-the-Wolds</td>
<td>Edmund Yorke, Vicar (1622-1650)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winkburn</td>
<td>George Jackson, Curate (*1624-1633)</td>
<td>See Maplebeck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winthorpe</td>
<td>John Chapman, Rector (1628-1643)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollaton</td>
<td>John Wagstaffe, Rector (1628-1658?)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Francis Cooke, Curate (1630?)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worksop</td>
<td>Samuel Smith, Vicar (1628-1646?)</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wysall</td>
<td>William Sharpe, Vicar (1603-1654)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Caroline Clergy of Nottingham: Origins and College Attendance

*N.B. The presence of a “*” by a county or university/college name indicates some uncertainty in the evidentiary record. For example, in some cases, the name of a clergyman may have been quite common, with several men by that name graduating from Oxford or Cambridge in the same time period. Thus, this table cannot be considered a perfect representation of counties of origin or institutions attended.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish/Chapelry</th>
<th>Clergymen</th>
<th>County of Origin</th>
<th>University/College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adbolton</td>
<td>Joshua Syston, Rector (1628-1637?)</td>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>Oxf: pleb. Gloucester Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annesley</td>
<td>William Hewitt, Curate (1630-1638)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Camb: Trinity College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Bowes, Curate (1639-1642)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold</td>
<td>Thomas Naylor, Vicar (1623-1631)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Camb: sizar Christ's College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Coates, Vicar (1631-1642)</td>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>Camb: pens. Caius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attenborough</td>
<td>Gervase Dodson, Vicar (1625-1642)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Camb: Corpus Christi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austerfield (in Blyth)</td>
<td>Thomas Johnson, Curate (1624-1635)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averham</td>
<td>Thomas Speight, Curate (1624-1637)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oliver Griffin, Rector (1637-1650)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Camb: pens. Peterhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babworth</td>
<td>Thomas Bishop, Rector (1617-1633?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Camb: sizar Christ's College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theodore Danney, Rector (? - d. 1642)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balderton (annexed to Farndon)</td>
<td>William Chantler, Curate (1629-1635)</td>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>Oxt: Lincoln College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Lovett, Curate (1636-1638?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnby in the Willows</td>
<td>Leonard Wade, Vicar (1630-1636)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oxf: Gloucester Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Matkin, Curate (1632-36), Vicar (1636 - ?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oxf: Lincoln College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnstone (in Langar)</td>
<td>Anthony Somerby, Curate (1635 - ?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>*Camb: sizar Clare College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton in Fabis</td>
<td>Ralph Hansbie, Rector (1616-1635)</td>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>Camb: pens. St. John's College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Neile, Rector (1635-1637)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Camb: pens. Pembroke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barnaby Barlow, Rector (1637-1641)</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td>Camb: schol. King's College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>College/University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bawtry (in Blyth)</td>
<td>Thomas Johnson, Curate</td>
<td>1624-1639</td>
<td>(See Austerfield)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beeston</td>
<td>Walter Kindersley, Vicar</td>
<td>1604-1645</td>
<td>Non-graduate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edward Knutton, Curate</td>
<td>1636-1646</td>
<td>Camb: sizar Magdalene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Besthorpe (in South Scarle)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bevercotes (in West Markham)</td>
<td>Thomas Holmstead, Curate</td>
<td>1637-1643</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilborough</td>
<td>Thomas Lowe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owen Meredith, &quot;Minister&quot;</td>
<td>(1634)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ralph Watson, Rector</td>
<td>1636-1641</td>
<td>*Camb: sizar Trinity College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilsthorpe</td>
<td>Gilbert Benet, Rector</td>
<td>1625-1663</td>
<td>Camb: pens. Christ's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>Matthew Wren, Rector</td>
<td>1624-1635</td>
<td>Camb: Pembroke College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Robinson, Rector</td>
<td>1635-1642</td>
<td>Camb: pens. Pembroke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edward Wethered, Curate</td>
<td>1634-1641</td>
<td>Camb: sizar Pembroke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blyth</td>
<td>Samuel Simpson, Vicar</td>
<td>1622-1633</td>
<td>Camb: sizar Trinity College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henry Priest, Vicar</td>
<td>1634-1662</td>
<td>Camb: Trinity College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bothamsall</td>
<td>Henry Bacon, Curate</td>
<td>1628-1643</td>
<td>(See Elkesley)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boughton (in Kneesall)</td>
<td>(See Kneesall)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradmore (Annexed to Bunny)</td>
<td>(See Bunny)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bramcote (in Attenborough)</td>
<td>Francis Townsend, Curate</td>
<td>1628-1630?</td>
<td>Issued a “Tolleration” in 1628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulcote (in Burton Joyce)</td>
<td>(See Burton Joyce)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulwell</td>
<td>Robert Aynsworth, Rector</td>
<td>1627-1641</td>
<td>Camb: pens. Jesus College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunny</td>
<td>Richard Towle, Vicar</td>
<td>1595-1637</td>
<td>Non-Grad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samuel Lightfoot, Vicar</td>
<td>1637-?</td>
<td>Camb: sizar Clare College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton Joyce</td>
<td>John Gifford, Vicar</td>
<td>1627-1663</td>
<td>Camb: sizar Queen's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Colston</td>
<td>Edmund Winter, Vicar</td>
<td>1631-1658?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carburton (in Edwinstowe)</td>
<td>(See Edwinstowe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarborough</td>
<td>Robert Hurst, Vicar</td>
<td>1631-1645</td>
<td>Camb: pens. Christ's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayworth</td>
<td>Robert Topham, Rector</td>
<td>1630-?</td>
<td>Derbyshire Camb: pens. St. John's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton</td>
<td>James Horbery, Curate</td>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>1635?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henry Wylde, Rector</td>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>1623-1633 resig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Thirlby, Rector</td>
<td>Northants.</td>
<td>1633-?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coddington (in East Stoke)</td>
<td>William Turnpenny, Curate</td>
<td>Camb: sizar Corpus Christi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colston Bassett</td>
<td>Roger Jackson, Vicar</td>
<td></td>
<td>1597-1633?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colwick</td>
<td>Robert Theobalds, Rector</td>
<td>Camb: pens. Trinity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cossall (in Wollaton?)</td>
<td>(See Wollaton)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costock</td>
<td>Mark Wiersdale, Rector</td>
<td>Camb: sizar Trinity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gabriel Wiersdale, Curate</td>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>1630s?; R. from 1639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotgrave</td>
<td>Robert Kinder, Rector</td>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>1617-1645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottham</td>
<td>William Chantler, Curate</td>
<td></td>
<td>1630-1638?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottam (in South Leverton)</td>
<td>(See South Leverton)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cromwell</td>
<td>Richard Hubbald, Rector</td>
<td>Camb: sizar St. John's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Williamson, Rector</td>
<td>Camb: Trinity College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henry Truman, Rector</td>
<td>Camb: sizar St. John's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Hague, Curate</td>
<td></td>
<td>1637-1638?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eakring</td>
<td>George Lawson, Rector</td>
<td>Camb: pens. Trinity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bridgford</td>
<td>John Hull, Rector</td>
<td>Oxf: pleb. Magdalen College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Leake</td>
<td>John Presbury, Curate</td>
<td>*Camb: Queen's College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Markham</td>
<td>George Ormerod, Vicar</td>
<td>Worcestershire</td>
<td>1618-1655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Retford</td>
<td>John Watt, Vicar</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>1618-1640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Stoke</td>
<td>Richard Gymney, Vicar</td>
<td>Oxf: pleb. Lincoln College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Rhodes, Vicar</td>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>1635-1641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastwood</td>
<td>Richard Holland, Rector</td>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
<td>1618-1642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwalton (See Ruddington)</td>
<td>Thomas Storer, Vicar</td>
<td></td>
<td>1587-1638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Francis Carrington, Vicar</td>
<td>*Camb: sizar Trinity College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Rigges, Vicar</td>
<td></td>
<td>1625-1641?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egmanton</td>
<td>Thomas Wright, Vicar</td>
<td>Camb: Trinity College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leonard Fifield, Vicar</td>
<td>Camb: Trinity College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkesley</td>
<td>Henry Bacon, Vicar (1628-1643)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Camb: sizar Emmanuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elston</td>
<td>John Robinson, Rector (1612-1637)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elston Chapel (in East Stoke)</td>
<td>Joseph Robinson, Curate (1635?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elton</td>
<td>William Hodgkinson, Rector (1621-1634)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Camb: pens. Christ's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dove Williamson, Rector (1634-1680)</td>
<td>Northants.</td>
<td>Camb: schol. King's College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epperstone</td>
<td>George Marler, Rector (1603-1633)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oxf: Trinity College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeremy Deacon, Rector (1633-1640)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farndon</td>
<td>William Howlett, Vicar (1596-1632)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholas Saunderson, Vicar (1632-1642)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finningley</td>
<td>Daniel Jones, Rector (1619-1647 seq.)</td>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>Oxf: pleb St. Mary's Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Jackson, Curate (1638-1640)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flawborough (in Staunton/Orston)</td>
<td>(See Staunton)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flawford (in Ruddington)</td>
<td>(See Ruddington)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fledborough</td>
<td>James Clayton, Rector (1618-1639)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edward Henshaw, Rector (1639-1650 seq.)</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Oxf: cler fil. Magdalen Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flintham</td>
<td>Daniel Odingsell, Vicar (1621-1650)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Camb: pens. Trinity College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamston</td>
<td>William Birkhead, Rector (1599-1641)</td>
<td>Yorkshire</td>
<td>Oxf: Magdalen Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gedling</td>
<td>William Stokes, Vicar of 1 moiety (1603-1640)</td>
<td>*Camb: pens. Emmanuel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christopher Forman, Rector of 1 moiety (1603-1640)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Camb: sizar Peterhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girton (annexed to S. Scarle)</td>
<td>(See South Scarle)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonalston</td>
<td>Robert Huthwet, Rector (1620-1646)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Camb: sizar Clare College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gotham</td>
<td>John Foxcroft, Rector (1619-1662)</td>
<td>Yorkshire</td>
<td>Camb: pens. Emmanuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granby</td>
<td>John Aldred, Vicar (1586-1641)</td>
<td>*Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>*Camb: sizar Caius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greasley</td>
<td>Lemuel Tuke, Vicar (1628-1640)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-graduate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ephraim Tuke, Curate (1635-1636)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gringley on the Hill</td>
<td>Robert Aynsworth, Vicar (1627-1643?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(See Bulwell)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove</td>
<td>Gervase Neville, Rector</td>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>1611-1642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harworth</td>
<td>John Craven, Vicar</td>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>1604-1646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haughton (in Walesby)</td>
<td>(See Walesby)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawksworth</td>
<td>Robert Rockold, Rector</td>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>1630-1653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawton</td>
<td>Edward Kidd, Rector</td>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>1612-1641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayton</td>
<td>George Longden, Rector</td>
<td>Derbyshire</td>
<td>1620-1642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headon</td>
<td>Roger Manners, Vicar</td>
<td>Derbyshire</td>
<td>1627-1637 resigned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gervase Neville, Rector</td>
<td>Derbyshire</td>
<td>1631-1642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Barnes, Vicar</td>
<td>Derbyshire</td>
<td>1637?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickling</td>
<td>George Sarson, Vicar</td>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
<td>1637-1640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edmund Bardsey, Rector</td>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
<td>1617-1641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Bent, Curate</td>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
<td>1630-1639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockerton</td>
<td>Luke Mason, Rector</td>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
<td>1618-1640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holme Pierrepont</td>
<td>Henry Cooke, Rector</td>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
<td>1629-1641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoveringham</td>
<td>Peter Coates, Curate</td>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
<td>1625-1633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Morton, Curate</td>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
<td>1634-1642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hucknall Torkard</td>
<td>Matthew Moore, Vicar</td>
<td>Northants.</td>
<td>1626-1634 resigned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adam Hunt, Vicar</td>
<td>Northants.</td>
<td>1634-1642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelham</td>
<td>Nicholas Janson, Rector</td>
<td>Northants.</td>
<td>1630-1667?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilvington</td>
<td>Clement Holder, Rector</td>
<td>Northants.</td>
<td>1609-1637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston-on-Soar</td>
<td>Thomas Bertram, Curate</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1614-1635?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkby in Ashfield</td>
<td>Tobias Waterhouse, Rector</td>
<td>Yorkshire</td>
<td>1617-1646 seq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revell Vessie, Curate</td>
<td>Yorkshire</td>
<td>1635?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henry Denham, Curate</td>
<td>Yorkshire</td>
<td>1639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirton</td>
<td>William Smyth, Rector</td>
<td>Yorkshire</td>
<td>1613-1633?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kneesall</td>
<td>Luke Bacon, Vicar</td>
<td>Yorkshire</td>
<td>1626-1633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kneeton</td>
<td>William Clough, Vicar</td>
<td>1633-1638</td>
<td>Camb: sizar Magdalene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kneeton</td>
<td>William Hewitt, Vicar</td>
<td>1639-1640</td>
<td>(See Annesley)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambley</td>
<td>John Langley, Curate</td>
<td>1630?</td>
<td>(See Sibthorpe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambley</td>
<td>John Morton, Curate</td>
<td>1632-1642</td>
<td>(Also listed at Hoveringham)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langar</td>
<td>Robert Kinder, Rector</td>
<td>1617-1645</td>
<td>(See Cotgrave)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langar</td>
<td>Thomas Holden, Curate</td>
<td>1636?</td>
<td>*Derbyshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langar</td>
<td>Charles Odingsells, Rector</td>
<td>1609-1637</td>
<td>*Oxf: New Inn Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langar</td>
<td>John Shepperdson, Curate</td>
<td>1634?</td>
<td>Camb: pens. Trinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langar</td>
<td>Lex Lowther, Curate</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenton</td>
<td>William Rook, Vicar</td>
<td>1613-1641</td>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenton</td>
<td>Robert Ollerenshaw, Vicar</td>
<td>1623-1659</td>
<td>Camb: sizar Pembroke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linby (Lindby)</td>
<td>Zacharias Saunders, Rector</td>
<td>1604-1632</td>
<td>*Camb: pens. St. John's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenton</td>
<td>John Fairclough, Rector</td>
<td>1638-?</td>
<td>Northants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenton</td>
<td>John Newton, Curate</td>
<td>1617-1639</td>
<td>Oxf: All Souls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenton</td>
<td>John Redferne, Curate</td>
<td>1625-1635</td>
<td>Camb: pens. Caius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenton</td>
<td>William Carte, Curate</td>
<td>1639-1642</td>
<td>Yorkhire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maplebeck</td>
<td>George Jackson, Curate</td>
<td>1625-1638</td>
<td>*Lancashire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marnham</td>
<td>Edward Warren, Vicar</td>
<td>1627-1640</td>
<td>*Oxf: pleb. Merton College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>John Price, Vicar</td>
<td>1628-1646</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield Woodhouse (in Mansfield)</td>
<td>John Redferne, Curate</td>
<td>1625-1635</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorhouse (in Laxton)</td>
<td>John Newton, Curate</td>
<td>1617-1639</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>John Mosely (Moseley)</td>
<td>1629-1642</td>
<td>Berkshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>John Mosely (Moseley)</td>
<td>1629-1642</td>
<td>Oxf: pleb. Magdalene</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>College/Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normanton-on-Trent</td>
<td>Robert Addie, Vicar</td>
<td>1594-1632</td>
<td>Yorkshire</td>
<td>Camb: pens. Caius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Mason, Vicar</td>
<td>1632-1634</td>
<td></td>
<td>Camb: Christ's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Hewes, Vicar</td>
<td>1634-1642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normanton-upon-Soar</td>
<td>Richard Caldwell, Rector</td>
<td>1628-1637</td>
<td>Staffordshire</td>
<td>Oxf: pleb. Merton College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Bentley</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yorkshire</td>
<td>Oxf: pleb. Magdalen Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Clifton</td>
<td>Thomas Fukes (Fewkes), Vicar</td>
<td>1634-1638</td>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
<td>Oxf: pleb. Lincoln College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Collingham</td>
<td>George Greene, Vicar</td>
<td>1624-1642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Wheatley</td>
<td>Thomas Beane, Vicar</td>
<td>1621-1649</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham St. Mary</td>
<td>Ralph Hansby, Vicar</td>
<td>1617-1635</td>
<td></td>
<td>(See Barton in Fabis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Cranage, Curate</td>
<td>1633-?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edmund Lacocke, Vicar</td>
<td>1635-1642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham St. Nicholas</td>
<td>Robert Malham, Rector</td>
<td>1611-1651</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Radford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham St. Peter</td>
<td>George Coates, Rector</td>
<td>1617-1640</td>
<td></td>
<td>Camb: sizar Trinity College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuthall</td>
<td>William Greaves, Rector</td>
<td>1612-1646 seq.?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Camb: pens. Corpus Christi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ollerton (in Edwinstowe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordsall</td>
<td>Edmund Mason, Rector</td>
<td>1614-1631</td>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>Camb: pens. Clare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marmaduke Moore, Rector</td>
<td>1631-1650 seq.?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Camb: St. John's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orston</td>
<td>John Musson, Vicar</td>
<td>1624-1638</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oxf: Lincoln College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Jones, Vicar</td>
<td>1638-?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Camb: Jesus College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owthorpe</td>
<td>Thomas Mountney, Curate</td>
<td>1625-1630?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papplewick</td>
<td>Zephania Saunders, Curate</td>
<td>1621-1642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perlethorpe (in Edwinstowe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumtree</td>
<td>Francis Chamberlain, Rector</td>
<td>1614-1650</td>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
<td>Camb: pens. Trinity College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radcliffe-on-Trent</td>
<td>Daniel Wilcock, Vicar</td>
<td>16227-1633</td>
<td></td>
<td>Camb: sizar Trinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Sherwood, Vicar</td>
<td>1633-1638 resigned</td>
<td></td>
<td>Camb: sizar St. John's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Creswell, Vicar</td>
<td>1638-1660</td>
<td>Staffordshire</td>
<td>Camb: sizar St John's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>College/University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radford</td>
<td>Robert Malham, Vicar</td>
<td>(1612-1651?)</td>
<td>Camb: Trinity College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratcliffe upon Soar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rempstone</td>
<td>Anthony Major, Rector</td>
<td>(1595-1632)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hugh Armstrong, Rector</td>
<td>(1633-?)</td>
<td>*Oxf: Magdalen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolleston</td>
<td>Francis Withington, Vicar</td>
<td>(1628-1642 resigned?)</td>
<td>Oxfordshire Oxf: Brasenose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Le Lowther, Curate</td>
<td>(1635?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Hobson, Curate</td>
<td>(1639)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossington</td>
<td>William Plaxton, Vicar</td>
<td>(1614-1639?)</td>
<td>Camb: St. John's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruddington</td>
<td>Thomas Storer, Vicar</td>
<td>(1587-1638)</td>
<td>(See Edwalton)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Francis Carrington, Vicar</td>
<td>(1638-1654)</td>
<td>(See Edwalton)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saundby</td>
<td>Jerome Phillips, Rector</td>
<td>(1604-1644 resigned?)</td>
<td>Middlesex Camb: pens. Corpus Christi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ephraim Tuke, Curate</td>
<td>(1625-1635)</td>
<td>(See Greasley)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarrington (in Orston)</td>
<td>John Staunton, Curate</td>
<td>(1625-1630?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screveton</td>
<td>Leonard Foster, Rector</td>
<td>(1602-1650)</td>
<td>Camb: sizar Clare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrooby (in Sutton cum Lound)</td>
<td>Hugh Shaw, Curate</td>
<td>(1629-1666?)</td>
<td>*Nottinghamshire *Camb: sizar Corpus Christi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selston</td>
<td>Henry Denham, Curate</td>
<td>(1631-1642)</td>
<td>(See Kirkby in Ashfield)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelford</td>
<td>Henry Pratt, Curate</td>
<td>(1630-1638?)</td>
<td>*Norfolk *Camb: Clare College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Evatt, Curate</td>
<td>(1638-1639)</td>
<td>*Oxf: pleb. Oriel College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ralph Browne, Curate</td>
<td>(1640-1642?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelton</td>
<td>William Benet, Rector</td>
<td>(1625-1632)</td>
<td>*Camb: Sidney or Trinity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Griffin Spencer, Rector</td>
<td>(1632-1666)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Rice, Curate</td>
<td>(1635?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibthorpe</td>
<td>John Langley, Curate</td>
<td>(1625-1643)</td>
<td>*Camb: Trinity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skegby (in Mansfield)</td>
<td>Nathaniel Wolley, Curate</td>
<td>(1625-1632)</td>
<td>*Nottinghamshire *Camb: sizar Corpus Christi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Westerby, Curate</td>
<td>(1633-1634)</td>
<td>*Camb: St. John's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sneinton (annexed to Nott St. Mary)</td>
<td>Rowland Revill, Curate</td>
<td>(1635?)</td>
<td>*Camb: St. John's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Served by Vicars of St. Mary's)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sookholme (in Warsop)</td>
<td>George Alsop, Rector</td>
<td>(1628-1640)</td>
<td>Camb: sizar Pembroke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Collingham</td>
<td>George Alsop, Rector</td>
<td>(1628-1640)</td>
<td>Camb: sizar Pembroke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Leverton</td>
<td>Richard Mustian (Mustion), Vicar</td>
<td>(1620-1643)</td>
<td>Camb: pens. Christ's College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Names and Years</td>
<td>Location or College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Scarle</td>
<td>Simon Read, Vicar (1625-1638)</td>
<td>Northants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Mason, Vicar (1638-1660?)</td>
<td>Camb: sizar Christ's College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford Upon Soar</td>
<td>William Sarson, Rector (1631-1640)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton-on-the-Wolds</td>
<td>David Chovan, Rector (1628-1656)</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stapleford</td>
<td>Richard Jepson, Curate (1631-1642)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staunton</td>
<td>Gervase Palmer, Rector (1631-1656?)</td>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Read, Curate (1625-1635)</td>
<td>Camb: Corpus Christi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staunton Chapel (in Orston)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(See Orston)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strelley</td>
<td>John Martin, Rector (1624-1633)</td>
<td>Oxf: All Souls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Waring, Rector (1633-1636)</td>
<td>Camb: pens. Trinity College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Bee, Rector (1636-1640?)</td>
<td>Camb: pens. Trinity College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturton le Steeple</td>
<td>William Howson, Vicar (1623-1632)</td>
<td>Camb: Trinity College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edward Barnes, Vicar (1632-1650)</td>
<td>Camb: sizar Peterhouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton Bonington (St. Anne)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(See St. Michael)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton Bonington (St. Michael)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Savage, Rector (1622-1662)</td>
<td>Oxf: Magdalen College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton-cum-Lound</td>
<td>Hezekiah Burton, Vicar (1614-1646)</td>
<td>Camb: Trinity College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton in Ashfield</td>
<td>Henry Pellett, Curate (1630?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Wallis, Curate (1632-1642)</td>
<td>Trinity Dublin; Sidney Sussex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton-on-Trent</td>
<td>William Butcher, Vicar (1604-1638?)</td>
<td>*Camb: sizar Pembroke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syerston (in East Stoke)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(See East Stoke)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teversal</td>
<td>James Mason, Rector (1610-1638)</td>
<td>Camb: sizar St. John's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Smythson, Rector (1638-?)</td>
<td>Yorkshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oxf: pleb. University College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorney</td>
<td>Bardolph Grigge, Vicar (1622-1639)</td>
<td>Camb: St. John's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoroton (in Orston)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(See Orston)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe ('Thorpe by Newark')</td>
<td>John Scarlett, Rector (1615-1639?)</td>
<td>Camb: Pembroke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe in the Glebe</td>
<td>Hugh Armstrong, Rector (1625-1642)</td>
<td>(See Rempststone)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrumpton</td>
<td>Thomas Goodwin, Curate (1620-1638)</td>
<td>Non-graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ferdinando Poole, Curate (1640?)</td>
<td>Trinity Dublin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurgarton</td>
<td>William Brownley, Curate (1629-1634)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tithby</td>
<td>George Darker, Curate</td>
<td>1634-1637</td>
<td></td>
<td>Camb: sizar Trinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Brecknock, Curate</td>
<td>1637-1639</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zacharia Trig, Curate</td>
<td>1639-?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Langdon, Curate</td>
<td>1617?-1637</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tollerton</td>
<td>John Pare, Rector</td>
<td>1604-1636</td>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gervase Pendock, Rector</td>
<td>1636-1650 seq.?</td>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christopher Fielding, Rector</td>
<td>1613-? *East</td>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treswell</td>
<td>Henry Langley, Rector</td>
<td>1610-1636</td>
<td>Camb: schol. Christ's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Shipman, Rector</td>
<td>1636-? *West</td>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>Camb: pens. Trinity College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trowell</td>
<td>John Kirkby, Rector</td>
<td>1602-1647 *2nd Mediety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Francis Hill, Rector</td>
<td>1626-1662 *1st Mediety</td>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
<td>Camb: pens. Emmanuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owen Meredith, Curate</td>
<td>1630-1639</td>
<td>(See Bilborough)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edward Graves, Curate</td>
<td>1635?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuxford</td>
<td>Henry Hawden, Vicar</td>
<td>1627-1651</td>
<td>No degree (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Broughton</td>
<td>Richard Colebrand, Rector</td>
<td>1596-1653</td>
<td>Camb: sizar Trinity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walesby</td>
<td>Henry Truman, Vicar</td>
<td>1624-1643</td>
<td>(See Cromwell)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkeringham</td>
<td>Thomas Vicars, Vicar</td>
<td>1590-1638</td>
<td>Camb: sizar Trinity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Robson, Vicar</td>
<td>1638-?</td>
<td>Camb: sizar Trinity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsop</td>
<td>William Spurr, Rector</td>
<td>1589-1630?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Cundye, Curate</td>
<td>1630-1638</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellow</td>
<td>Gilbert Yates, Curate</td>
<td>1624-1637?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Bridgford</td>
<td>Francis Withington, Vicar</td>
<td>1614-1650?</td>
<td>(See Rolleston)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joshua Syston, Curate</td>
<td>1628-1636</td>
<td>(See Adbolton)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alexander Lowther, Curate</td>
<td>1637-? *Camb: Emmanuel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Burton</td>
<td>Robert Hodgson, Curate</td>
<td>1630-1634</td>
<td>Yorkshire</td>
<td>Camb: pens. Sidney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Baylie, Curate</td>
<td>1635-1638</td>
<td>Camb: sizar Emmanuel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Drayton (in E. Markham)</td>
<td>Edward Bigland, Rector</td>
<td>1620-1650</td>
<td>Camb: pens. Queens' College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Rector/Vicar</td>
<td>Diocese</td>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Markham</td>
<td>Robert Bruen, Vicar (1620-1636)</td>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>Oxf: Brasenose College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Holmestead, Vicar (1637-1643)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(See Bevercotes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Retford</td>
<td>Thomas Bishop, Rector (1600-1642)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(See Babworth)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weston</td>
<td>William Fuller, Rector (1619-1631)</td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>Camb: sizar Trinity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Josiah Hawkesworth, Rector (1631-?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Camb: sizar Caius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whatton</td>
<td>Martin Silverwood, Vicar (1628-1639?)</td>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
<td>Oxf: cler fil. Lincoln College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widmerpool</td>
<td>John Rustat, Rector (1624-1656?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Camb: pens. Christ's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willoughby-on-the-Wolds</td>
<td>Edmund Yorke, Vicar (1622-1650)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winkburn</td>
<td>George Jackson, Curate (*1624-1633)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(See Maplebeck)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winthorpe</td>
<td>John Chapman, Rector (1628-1643)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Camb: sizar Magdalene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollaton</td>
<td>John Wagstaffe, Rector (1628-1658?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Francis Cooke, Curate (1630?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worksop</td>
<td>Samuel Smith, Vicar (1628-1646?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Camb: pens. Trinity College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wysall</td>
<td>William Sharpe, Vicar (1603-1654)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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