

Winchester Cathedral: Its Clergy and their Duties before and after the Interregnum

Part 2: The Business of the Cathedral Chapter

Andrew Thomson

An earlier article published in this journal (vol.26, 2004) posed the question of the effect of the political and religious upheavals of the Interregnum on the church of the Restoration. It proceeded, in part one, to analyse two groups of cathedral clergy – the men of 1631 and those of 1675 – and came to the conclusion that, while there were some improvements, serious failings – including too much wealth, too much pluralism, and too many canons working into old age – continued into the Restoration.

The character of its clergy was bound to affect the quality of the cathedral's ministry. The focus of this article is the duties themselves. These duties emerge clearly enough from an examination of the cathedral statutes. They were, in sum, to be responsible for the conduct of divine service, preaching, fabric, management of their property, charity, and discipline.¹ Other duties, such as the appointment of a host of 'ancillaries' – from minor canons, lay clerks, and sacristans to cooks, vergers, and bellringers – have to be assumed; and at least one central duty, the election of the bishop,² however cosmetic the exercise, is not in the cathedral statutes at all! All these and many more – even highways and the militia – make their appearance in other cathedral documents.

This enquiry will proceed to dissect performance of the dean and chapter of Winchester in the 1630s and the 1670s. Not all the duties can be considered for want of space and because of the unevenness of the information. The cathedral registers are excellent for leasing policy, the act books likewise for attendance at chapter meetings. Young's Diary

gives vivid if sometimes biased glimpses of business before the Interregnum; and, while much of the act book of the 1620s and 1630s is bland and mechanical, its counterpart of the 1660s and 1670s records important decisions about preaching and charity. Five aspects have been chosen for examination because they are representative of the range of business, they are important issues, and the documentation is good or excellent. These are attendance, worship, charity, fabric, and property.

I. Attendance at Chapter Meetings

Statistics of attendance, while not complete or perfect evidence, must indicate something of the health and vigour of life at the cathedral. At least they are measurable since surviving act books record, with 'cardiographic' regularity, attendance by all officials of the cathedral, from bell-ringers and janitors at one end of the scale to the dean and canons at the other, at the six monthly major meetings of the cathedral chapter.

Examination of the roll calls for the ten meetings from June 1631 to November 1635 shows that the dean never failed to attend in those years. Attendance by the canons fluctuated between fifty per cent and 91 per cent; and their average attendance over the five years was fractionally below seventy per cent.

Attendance of the Canons at Chapter Meetings June 1631 to November 1635

	6/31	11/31	6/32	11/32	6/33	11/33	6/34	11/34	6/35	11/35
Present	6	8	7	11	7	10	8	11	9	11
Maximum	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
Percent	50.0	66.6	58.3	91.6	58.3	83.3	58.3	83.3	66.6	83.3

There appears to have been no appreciable change three months into the Civil War but attendance fell dramatically in 1643 and especially in 1644, to return almost to normal by June 1645. Matters were at their worst in June 1644 when only a quarter of the canons mustered and even the dean chose to stay in his rectory at Over Wallop. In the five sample years of the War, average attendance was markedly down for the canons at fifty per cent.

Attendance of the Canons during the Civil War

	11/41	11/42	11/43	6/44	11/44	6/45
Present	10	10	6	3	4	7
Maximum	12	12	12	12	11	12
Percent	83.3	83.3	50.0	25.0	36.3	58.3

Attendance after the Restoration showed noticeable improvement on both the 1630s and the war years, judging from the five years 1671-5. Admittedly the attendance of Dean Clarke – he missed twice – was not so impressive as Young's. There was a remarkable improvement, however, among the canons; while again, there was more volatility in this group, average attendance rose from seventy per cent in the 1630s to 84 per cent in the 1670s, passing ninety per cent three times and on one occasion reaching one hundred per cent.³

Attendance of the Canons June 1671 to November 1675

	6/71	11/71	6/72	11/72	6/73	11/73	6/74	11/74	6/75	11/75
Present	9	10	8	11	8	10	12	11	11	11
Maximum	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
Percent	75.0	83.3	66.6	91.6	66.6	83.3	100.0	91.6	91.6	91.6

Whatever the difficulties in charting attendance, problems are even greater when it comes to explaining, as distinct from describing, these developments. There are many comments written beside names, but the ubiquitous 'abest' or even the slightly more specific 'excusatur', are too laconic to make plain the real reasons for someone's absence.

A bout of illness among the canons helps to explain the low attendance in June 1631, and one of the canons – Kercher – was ill and eventually died in October 1644.⁴ Haswell in 1668 and Beaumont in 1675 were both encumbered with infirmities and both acquired dispensations from the crown, exempting them from duties and residence, while protecting their 'benefits, profitts and emoluments'. Beaumont was particularly in a bad way, with afflictions 'prejudiciall to his eyes and limbs'. Neither man appeared again at meetings.⁵

Pluralism may well explain the absence of many of the canons. The clerk in the 1630s sometimes lists another post by the names of some of the canons and, while this may not be meant to explain absence – indeed, some of these men were present at the roll call in question – it may help to do so when they were in fact absent.⁶ Occasionally he links posts with absence – Lany's absence in Cambridge and Halsey's, as chaplain to the Lord Treasurer, for example – which seems to acknowledge the problem.⁷ Jackson's case was most explicit since he had a royal dispensation permitting absenteeism; his other posts are listed on one occasion, and he never appeared once at chapter in his five years as canon between 1635 and 1640.⁸ All the canons were, to a greater or lesser extent, pluralists. All had at least one parish and many canons – especially in the earlier period – were loaded with posts: none more so than Wren, quickly followed by Dunckon, Goade, and Andrewes, and –

in the later period – possibly by Dayrell.⁹

The result of all this pluralism for attendance was that, in the earlier period, the biggest pluralists – Wren, Dunckon, Goade, Halsey, and Jackson – were the worst attenders, though Lany and Roger Andrewes managed most meetings. In the later period, Dayrell, the worst pluralist, never missed a meeting perhaps because all his commitments were in Hampshire; and Hawkins, in spite of commitments in Norfolk, only missed once. The worst attenders in this period were Gumble and Ken, with relatively modest looking accumulations, but mainly outside the diocese.¹⁰

Royal service was more material in the 1630s than the 1670s. One lay clerk, John Frost, was also a Gentleman of the Chapel Royal and ‘in service’ throughout the roll calls of 1631 to 1635. The organist, Thomas Holmes, was likewise attached to the Chapel Royal by November 1633, and absent for this reason from both roll calls in 1635.¹¹ The Coronation in Scotland in June 1633 drew several more men into royal service; in particular, Wren, Frost, and up to three almsmen; and none of them was present at roll calls to November 1635.¹²

The English Civil Wars, with royal service now more political or military than ceremonial, coupled with the brutality and dislocation of events, must account for most of the absence at that time. The parliamentary forces of Waller attacked twice in 1642–43¹³ and a number of canons – Meetkirke and Stanley among them – appear to have taken refuge in their parishes. Others went to Oxford, probably to the king’s headquarters in the case of Lewis, or to his college in the case of Oliver.¹⁴ A royalist garrison captured the castle and the city in 1643, explaining the return of most of the chapter by June 1645, only to be scattered by Cromwell’s army soon afterwards.

Attendance – or residence – was a source of friction between dean and chapter on at least one occasion. Young tried to insist at the meeting in November 1635 that – in line with the statutes¹⁵ – all office holders should be resident; there were objections from several canons – all pluralists – whereupon the matter was deferred until a later meeting, and then quietly dropped.¹⁶ Young in fact urged attendance on several occasions in the 1630s but was always, as an absentee canon himself, on weak ground. Although armed with a dispensation from James I, he was just emerging from exactly the same kind of dispute with his dean at Wells.¹⁷

It follows, from improved attendance, that there is no evidence of this kind of friction in the 1660s and early 1670s but the corresponding act book for Wells Cathedral, recording numerous collisions over residence, shows it could still be very much an issue for cathedrals in the Restoration period.¹⁸ When assessing attendance it should be remem-

bered that there was a body of between forty and fifty ancillaries who could, in the absence of the dean and canons, maintain the daily functions of the cathedral. Their attendance was fractionally higher than the canons' in the 1630s, and more like 61 per cent – when fifty per cent of the canons' were present during the war – though it only rose to 76 per cent (when canonical attendance was vastly improved) in the 1670s. Twelve of these ancillaries were almsmen, poor by definition, usually old and probably sick; seven were always absent and frequently eight or nine.¹⁹

II. Worship: the Spiritual Duties of the Dean and Chapter

Three aspects of worship appear in cathedral documents: the conduct of services, preaching, and ceremonial. Documents crammed with the secular business of the chapter – leases, appointments, and the like – are largely silent about conduct of the services until the Restoration. In December 1670 the chapter ordered division of the canons into four groups of three, each to conduct services for a quarter of the year, on pain of fine, except at 'the great festivalls' when the dean was to be the celebrant.²⁰ Much the same is true of preaching. An order issued in December 1660 required the dean, a canon, or one of the archdeacons to preach on Sunday mornings or '[an]other extraordinary day'; defaulters could be fined, and they promised more preaching on Sunday afternoons. This order was renewed in June 1666 and there was another reminder in December 1669.²¹ Margaret Bowker, writing about parallel developments at Lincoln, suggests that the necessity to repeat orders implies failure in practice.²² The Winchester chapter further agreed in February 1666, in line with its promise six years earlier, to establish a lecture programme on Sunday afternoons and a lecturer was appointed the following November.²³ By December 1669 a subsequent lecturer had resigned and it was agreed as a stop-gap that either a canon or one or two of the minor canons should supply the lectures.²⁴

These issues seem not to have arisen in the 1630s. This may imply neglect or, alternatively, that all was well with services and preaching being carried out at the right times. There is likewise little evidence about the quality of preaching in either period. In the Visitation of 1663 the canons claimed they were observing the requirements about preaching (and vestments and the use of the Book of Common Prayer); but it would have been much more informative to have had the verdict of the inquisitors in 1635 and 1663.²⁵

Issues of ceremonial appear to have been less pronounced in the 1660s

than in the 1630s during the ascendancy of Laud, Neile, and Curl. Young records Canon Moore's objections to bowing – before the altar and at the name of Jesus – and to standing for the Gloria. The crisis appears to have begun in November 1629 and within thirteen or fourteen months Moore had resigned the canonry and returned to his incumbencies at East and West Meon.²⁶

During the Visitation of 1635 Young himself was at the centre of debate. Over dinner and in the presence of the Vicar General, there were exchanges between Young and three of the canons about standing for the Creed and bowing before the altar. Young's exact response is not clear but he devoted several lines in his diary attempting to justify his views.²⁷ The new statute, imposed soon after this discussion, specifically required bowing before the altar and settled one of these issues.²⁸ It would seem that if Young, from Presbyterian Scotland, was reluctant about ceremony, he ought to have been sympathetic towards Moore. Whatever his own views, he was merely an intermediary in 1629-32 however, and must by 1638 have been prepared to oblige. The records are silent over the continuation of bowing before the altar during the Restoration period, which implies that there was more controversy about ceremony in the 1630s, and greater concern over preaching in the 1660s; but it would be unwise to draw such definite conclusions from occasional 'glimpses' in surviving documents.

III. Charity

The Winchester statutes required the cathedral to maintain a body of twelve almsmen: the crown nominated, the cathedral then admitted.²⁹ The match between nominations and admissions for two seven year periods, 1628-35 and 1668-75, is interesting. In the earlier period not one of eight crown nominations seems to have been admitted while, at the same time, five new almsmen appear seemingly from 'nowhere'.³⁰ The correlation is much better between 1668 and 1675 when there were nine nominees whose admissions can all be traced.³¹ The shortest waiting time was five days; the longest – 35 months – is not explained in the surviving documents, but George Finlawson had to wait over two years for the removal of an impostor.³² Whether before or after the Interregnum, these men were paid £6-13-4 p.a.³³

Individual canons in addition, both before and after the Civil War, remembered the poor in their wills;³⁴ but charity could involve the chapter and in the 1630s it had to make several distributions arising from Michael Reniger's will.³⁵ In December 1662 the dean and chapter agreed a detailed scheme of charity by which rotating groups of sixty from a

potential list of 240 'poore people', kept by the Treasurer, were to receive one groat each on Sunday once a month. Twenty loaves, meanwhile, were to be given to twenty poor people – one each – 'evry day in the yeaere' and names were to be supplied by the Mayor and Aldermen, joined by nominees from surrounding parishes. At the chapter meeting in June 1666, more relief to the 'visited' – presumably by plague – was promised.³⁶ There is no information in surviving documents to reveal how effectively these schemes worked, or for how long. Cathedral records show other sums, in addition to costs of almsmen, paid for charitable purposes. These arose from an annual average of £67 in the 1620s and 1630s to £83 – an increase of some 23 per cent – in the 1660s and 1670s. Since the later payments mention bread and groats for the year, the increased spending may reflect the costs of the new schemes.³⁷

All this puts the cathedral of the Restoration in a favourable light especially when it was faced with a massive building programme and its costs. Critics could say that the cathedral enjoyed large revenues and could afford it; that canons' incomes, taking stipends and dividends together, were good; and that much of the spending was on their own comfort.³⁸ Whatever the truth of these charges, however, there can be no doubt that greater efforts were made to help the poor during the Restoration era. However, motives are none too certain. They may have been purely philanthropic; but the warning against begging which accompanied the two schemes of 1662 and 1666 and the deployment in 1666 of a porter at Kingsgate to keep out not only 'infectious persons' who were 'very unruly', but also 'any idle boyes, girles or stragling beggars', suggests less altruism and considerable fear of disease and trouble from importuning figures congregating in the street.³⁹

On a somewhat larger scale, and surely free from baser motives, the chapter was involved with the bishop in establishing almshouses for ten clergy widows in December 1672. This scheme was essentially Morley's but the chapter found the land.⁴⁰

The cathedral made attempts to augment stipends of the parish clergy. These were causing concern before Cromwell,⁴¹ and generated a chorus of protest towards the end of the seventeenth century.⁴² Charles I encouraged by Laud, no doubt, after the visitation of the cathedral in 1635, urged the Winchester chapter to establish a clerical annual minimum of £80 from their 'profitts'. Twenty-three years later his son was writing in almost identical terms to all bishops and cathedral authorities.⁴³ It is more difficult to find much action, but it must be said again that evidence may have disappeared and what survives may mislead. Leases and accounts show that before the Interregnum modest amounts, ranging from eight shillings to £8 annually were paid to several of its

vicarages. Dean Young, intentionally or otherwise, gives the impression that some of these came from cathedral funds but one of his claims cannot be traced and examination of leases shows in two cases that the lessee was to be responsible.⁴⁴

Christchurch	Nutley	Romsey
£8-0-0	£3-6-8	£0-8-8

Though the evidence is still questionable, there is more of it after the Interregnum. Augmentation can be identified for another group of three of Winchester's impropriations, in common with other cathedrals,⁴⁵ and the amounts ranged from £23 to £54 annually. One might conclude again that this represents a cathedral sacrifice but leases and terriers make it quite clear that the lessees had to pay.⁴⁶

Barton Stacey	Christchurch	Nutley/Preston
£30-0-0	£54-0-0	Candover £23-10-0

Total cathedral augmentations, inside and outside the diocese, may have risen from £77 annually before, to £470/573 after, the Interregnum.⁴⁷

Mid-Seventeenth Century Winchester Cathedral Impropriations

	Alton	B Stacey	C'Church	Hursley	Nutley	P C'dover	Romsey	Titchfield	W St L
Profit	£200	£240	£800	£180	£33	£66	£200	£550	£100
Fine		100	£450	£330		£60			
Rent	£25	£23	£58	£35	£4	£6	£26	£30	
Stipend		£7	£8		£13	£20		£31	£19

Notes:

Profit = the gross annual profit; *Fine* = the entry fine; *Rent* = the annual rent payable to the cathedral; *Stipend* = the amount payable by the lessee.

Most information is drawn from Winchester Cathedral Commonwealth Surveys, WCL. Information about *entry fines* comes from Goodman, *Young's Diary*, pp.96, 122 (Barton Stacey), 121 (Christchurch) and 148 (Preston Candover) but the names of lessees of the latter conflict with WCL, L7/R12 f.144v. Hursley's fine of £330 appears as £230 with £100 owing; Audit Book, T4/3/3, 15+16, 1667-8).

Stipends are the amounts payable by the lessee to vicars and not necessarily the total stipend: e.g. the vicar of Candover was to receive in addition the smaller tithes; while at Christchurch he was paid further amounts by the cathedral (WCL. W41/9; W52/7; and Treasurers' Books), before and after the Civil Wars.

Moreover, amounts creamed by the cathedral from their impropriated rectories in rents and entry fines puts their largesse in better perspective. Through the vagaries of survival, the Commonwealth Surveys are most informative about cathedral impropriations. Winchester Cathedral owned nine vicarages within the diocese which it leased out for rent, ranging from a yearly £4-6-8 to £58. Leasing inevitably involved entry fines and the three or four for which there are figures show substantial sums. Through early surrendering policy, most leases came up for renewal much more frequently than 'life' or fixed terms might suggest.⁴⁸ There were, finally, occasional gifts – from the cathedral as distinct from individual canons – to other ecclesiastical buildings.⁴⁹ Although individual members of the chapter before and after the Interregnum remembered St Paul's, there is no evidence of a cathedral donation, even after the Great Fire – a case, no doubt, of charity beginning at home.

Charity was, thus, a recurring feature of chapter business both before and after the Interregnum. There are questions about motives and the cathedral could certainly have done more. Account must also be taken of a certain amount of inflation and some expensive commitments.⁵⁰ It is possible, therefore, to conclude that the cathedral was making somewhat greater efforts to help the poor in the 1660s and 1670s than in the 1630s.

IV. Fabric

Maintenance of the fabric or structure of the cathedral and its other buildings was bound to be a continual problem and, thus, a recurring item among the business of the chapter. Dean Young noted in his diary, details of a discussion over the wooden vaulting of the tower – how the work was to be done and payments made to the 'workmen' – in December and January 1633-4. He refers to 'new building a front to the Queer' – presumably the screen of Inigo Jones – and the demolition of the old chapter house.⁵¹ Other records, referring to the period 1635-7, speak of repairs to the north aisle, the 'arching' of the tower, the 'paving of the church', and 'our extraordinarie reparations this year'.⁵² Further records show costs rising accordingly from well below £84 in 1629 to perhaps £300 or £400 in 1637, over half of it on the screen and tower. They also show work on a new window for the west front in 1640, involving '551 foote of glasse' and an outlay of nearly £23.⁵³

With the Restoration came problems of a much larger order, though these were not as calamitous, apparently, as at Carlisle, which suffered the worst damage, and Lichfield, the next major sufferer. Compared with these, Winchester escaped lightly: organ, altar, and stalls were damaged. Otherwise it was loss of 'adornments' – plate and statues – though,

according to another authority, the library and cloisters were in ruins.⁵⁴

It is rather surprising that there are so few references in the act book of the Restoration to the condition of the cathedral, beyond one statement about the 'great damage' to the cathedral itself and 'buildings belonging thereto'. A parallel dearth of recorded repairs obtains, apart from an order for this purpose in March 1661.⁵⁵ The total cost of rebuilding appears to lay between £18,000 and £22,500, unquestionably large in the first decade of the Restoration.⁵⁶

Spending on Fabric

	1629	1637	1639	1661	1662	1663	1664	1665	1666	1674	1679
Cathedral		234			137	152		33		229	38
Prebendal		73			3303	1193		437		58	30
Combined	84	225	162	8517			1365		87		
Totals	84	532	162	8517	3440	1345	1365	470	87	287	68

Notes: Sources: an amalgam from WCL, Treasurers' Books 4 3/7/4 and Accounts Box W41/9. These overlap in the 1660s; they agree on 1665 but conflict on 1662, where I have had to make an arbitrary choice. I have used these sources because Tanner's do not distinguish between the cathedral and the houses.

'Combined': sometimes an overall figure – not distinguishing between cathedral and houses – is given only.

The dean and chapter claimed in their answer to a visitation inquiry in 1662 that the cathedral was 'well repayed'.⁵⁷ If this was so, it is remarkable, though exact spending amounts for the cathedral, as distinct from the close, are difficult to establish until 1662. Most cathedrals were involved in similar activity and, while exact comparisons are difficult, the pace of repair and the sums of money at Winchester seem to have been much greater than elsewhere.⁵⁸ Work was never completely done of course and at Winchester, to return to the chapter house, rebuilt in the 1630s, more work seems to have been necessary in 1676.⁵⁹

Activity surrounding prebendal housing, however, quite overshadowed the work on the cathedral. Rebuilding canons' houses consumed not only far more money than was spent on them in the 1620s or 1630s but also a great deal more than on the cathedral at the Restoration. There are numerous references in surviving documents to the condition of cathedral houses at that time. According to the fullest description, in May 1670, the houses of the dean and seven canons were by 1660, 'totally demolished'; two were 'utterly unserviceable' and three 'very ruinous'.⁶⁰ It is impossible to say whether this was accurate, or inflated as

'propaganda' to justify the scale of spending. However, in December 1661, builders were appointed for the deanery and two other houses. Supplies of timber and other materials were organised on several occasions and more extensive 'stockpiling' subsequently planned.⁶¹ The order of repairing or rebuilding was established by February 1662 – the deanery first, the senior prebendary's house next, and then the rest by seniority; and this was refined somewhat in November 1672.⁶² Sums of money – £1100, £900, and £100 – were discussed and considered likely to be insufficient; and it looks as if most of the £15,500 spent on fabric in the earlier 1660s went on these houses.⁶³ There were frequent warnings against spending without the dean and chapter's approval. Refinements were introduced over time and the treasurer, for example, was – at one stage – given more latitude over lesser sums.⁶⁴ All this did not, sadly, prevent a dispute with one of the canons about spending on houses.⁶⁵ As if this was not enough, concern about the possibility of legal action exercised the chapter and led on one occasion to petition the king, and on another to a suit against a bankrupt builder.⁶⁶ Allocation of houses among the canons had to be reviewed from time to time and, after another petition to Charles II, a whole new system was eventually agreed.⁶⁷ Housing and the precedence involved were clearly subjects dear to the hearts of the canons.

Annual inspection of 'the ffabric...walls, wayes, and watercourses and buildings' of the cathedral and the prebendal houses, was decreed in November 1672.⁶⁸ This again shows that much time was continually spent on both. There was always some project to do with the fabric of the cathedral – on the tower or with the windows, for example – and work was proceeding on the chapter house in both periods. Curl – and Laud – may explain the rise in spending in the mid-1630s and there was inevitably much greater activity at the Restoration. It was over prebendal housing, however, that the most striking difference before and after the Civil Wars occurred and on which, it appears, most time and money were spent. The opposite seems to have been true of Norwich where the balance favoured the cathedral and overall spending was lower.⁶⁹ What explains this – less damage, fewer resources, slower repairs, or different priorities – is difficult to establish.

V. Estates and income

Management of estates, though a secular activity, were central to the operations of the cathedrals. Property generated the money which enabled them to finance and thus fulfil their duties. Cathedrals could not have maintained their buildings, paid stipends, sustained lectureships,

offered charity, or supplied a musical establishment without it.

Leasing was a major aspect of estate management. Leasing for lives was usually thought to be safer if only because the lessee would never face renewal problems if his was one of the lives and cathedrals were able to exact larger fines for these leases. Leasing for a 'term' of years brought lower entry fines but was likely to present more frequent opportunities to review leases and raise rents in line with costs, which meant better returns in the long run. The cathedral statutes of 1544 and 1638 are explicit about leasing policy: for land, no leasing for lives but for terms of twenty-one years; for buildings, up to fifty or sixty years maximum from 1544 reduced to thirty years in 1638.⁷⁰ A letter, moreover, from Laud to the dean and chapter of Winchester in September 1637 underlined the ban on lives.⁷¹ This was in line with general government policy on the subject and royal letters banning leases for lives had been addressed to 'all the bishops in the kingdom' in June 1634.⁷²

Leasing records reveal that while the rules were being observed in the majority of cases, significant numbers of properties were being let for lives in the early 1630s. One of its manors in fact named two children aged five and eight.⁷³ As in Winchester, so in Chichester and Canterbury, law and practice diverged and, on admittedly somewhat less certain evidence, leases for lives and years were issued in similar proportions to those in Winchester.⁷⁴

Cathedral Leasing March 1631 – November 1635

Property	Number	21 Years	40 Years	Lives
Manors	13	8	0	5
Rectories	13	10	0	3
Tenements	14	3	6	5

Leasing November 1660 – December 1660

Property	Number	21 Years	30 Years	Lives
Manors	10	10	0	0
Rectories	16	16	0	0
Tenements	29	0	29	0
Miscellaneous	11	10	1	0

Leasing June 1671 – November 1675

Property	Number	21 Years	30 Years	Lives
Manors	19	18	0	1
Rectories	14	14	0	0
Tenements	25	0	25	0
Miscellaneous	34	31	3	0

Several historians have claimed that there was a repeat of the royal letter banning leasing for lives at the Restoration,⁷⁵ but this would seem to be a misreading of the evidence. Charles I appears, in fact, to have at least cancelled his instructions for Winchester on the eve of the Civil War,⁷⁶ but the new statute of 1638, with its leasing requirements, should still have applied in the 1660s. Certainly in the inevitable rush of renewals and new leases at the Restoration, Winchester Cathedral, now under Dean Alexander Hyde (1660-5), observed its statutes more closely. All the substantial properties – manors and rectories – were leased for twenty-one years, as were nearly all the other ‘miscellaneous’ category, comprising woods and farms. Even larger numbers of tenements were leased, every one for thirty years, in accordance with the statute of 1638. This continued in the 1670s under Dean Clarke (1666-79). Manors, rectories, and miscellaneous properties were leased for twenty-one years, tenements for thirty. The one exception, the granting of the lease of Manydowne in November 1674, was made after the crown's specific intervention.⁷⁷ There is evidence at Wells and Canterbury of persistent leasing for lives but at Winchester – and at Lincoln and Norwich – the chapter appears to have conformed with the law.⁷⁸ To clinch matters leases issued for lives between 1631 and 1645 became leases for terms in the 1660s and 1670s. The four rectories leased for lives in the 1630s and 1640s were changed to terms at the Restoration,⁷⁹ together with seven manors.⁸⁰

The standing of the Deans may have been a factor. Young, son of the ex-tutor of James I, was presumably in a favoured position and certainly had access to the royal presence, though, if he entertained Calvinist sentiments, his standing might have been damaged.⁸¹ He would have been encouraged by Charles I's retreat over leasing in the 1640s. Hyde was a relation of Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon and Lord Chancellor, though whether this made him more compliant or more favoured, thus enjoying more latitude, is difficult to say.⁸² Clarke appears to have had no such connexions which possibly made him more co-operative. Clergy blessed with more foresight may have governed the cathedral after the 1640s and 1650s and realised that church finance required a

stronger basis.

Early surrender of a lease and its renewal offered another opportunity for the cathedral either to impose new terms – rents and fines – on former tenants before a lease had run its course or, if the tenant declined to renew, to find a new lessee. But, it was rare for a cathedral lease to run its course. We can be fairly certain about this, especially by the 1670s, since most of these leases were for terms – usually twenty-one years – and measuring is an easy business. Matters are less certain for the 1630s, particularly with manorial leases since five of these, from a sample of thirteen, were for lives. These would only count as early if surrendered before all three lives had died and this raises problems of identification of particular ‘lives’ and of establishing their fate.⁸³

Early Surrenders of the Cathedral

	1631-35	1671-75
Manors		
Total Leases	13	19
Early Surrenders	12	17
Rectories		
Total Leases	13	14
Early Surrenders	13	14

The critical question is on whose initiative the early surrender was precipitated and this must largely remain a matter of interpretation. The reasons are never given in the documentation and must be inferred, often somewhat arbitrarily. Exaction of the entry fine or a rise in rent would have been strong cathedral motives on every occasion. For ‘term’ leases, much time remaining might suggest a ‘cathedral’ initiative, while little time left probably would reflect lessee worries about security of tenure, and their initiative to obtain it. A switch in the lease from lives to term would not have been popular with lessees and suggests a cathedral initiative. Change of lessee is most difficult to assess: surrender might have been his problem (or ‘initiative’) – a change in his circumstances, even his death – or he might have found the new terms the bishop was proposing, or ‘initiating’, quite unacceptable.

Early Surrender Initiatives by the Cathedral

	1631-35	1671-75
Manors		
Early Surrenders	12	17
Cathedral Initiatives	5	11
Rectories		
Early Surrenders	13	14
Cathedral Initiatives	5	4

Taking these factors into account, well under half the cathedral's early surrenders may have been at the initiative of the cathedral in the five year period from 1631 to 1635; and, while by the 1670s the cathedral may have been responsible for surrender and renewal of more manorial leases, its part in early surrender of rectorial leases remained small. Most are single figures and all are spread over five year periods. It does not seem as if the cathedral devoted much effort to this kind of policy.

Another course would have been to take more properties back into direct management. There were advantages in leasing, for example no more fees for bailiffs or bills for repairs, but the lessor lost the regular copyhold rents, profits from produce, and proceeds from the manorial courts. These went to the lessee who would not have leased unless there had been the prospect of profits after paying the fine and the annual rent. But the cathedral does not appear to have considered this approach. Comparison of the compotus rolls of the 1630s and the 1670s shows a change of arrangements for one manor only and this was from a mixture of leasing and direct managing to wholly leasing – the wrong direction from the point of view of generating income.⁸⁴

Other documents indicate how much larger could have been the cathedral's income if it had directly managed all its properties. Instead of annual rents and occasional fines they could have had annual profits running into thousands of pounds. The cathedral was apparently satisfied, for example, with rent of £58 a year, plus an occasional renewal fine – which came to £450 in 1636 – from its rectory of Christchurch, when it could have had annual profits of £800.⁸⁵ It was as if the episcopal and cathedral authorities were content with half a loaf while their lay neighbours wolfed the plentiful products of the bakery. All these manoeuvres – leasing for terms instead of lives, more early surrenders and renewals, direct farming instead of leasing – could have brought in more money. Rental income, however, seems to have been largely static and for some properties does not seem to have changed since the Reformation! Leasing records can be traced in cathedral ledger books for eighteen

manors and twenty-one rectories leased out before and after the Interregnum and each of the eighteen manors and twenty-five rectories bore the same rents at both times.⁸⁶ There are difficulties in comparing rents from cathedral manors over the longer period but the matter is much easier – and the results most striking – with its rectories.⁸⁷ Eighteen have records common to the 1540s and the 1680s; and of these the cathedral continued to draw the same rents from fifteen, while there was very little movement – within five pounds – among the other three. Not surprisingly in view of this, overall figures from rents, at some £1700 per annum, remained ominously stable between the 1630s and the 1670s.⁸⁸

Fine income was much better, reflecting the many early renewals, whoever was responsible. Fines ranged from about £800 to £1350 annually in the 1630s and from around £1500 to £3000 in the 1670s.⁸⁹ These figures seem to be in line with proceeds from fines at Canterbury and Durham Cathedrals in the Restoration.⁹⁰ At the same time, many fines were abated below market levels – thousands of pounds below at the Restoration – and cathedral fine revenue of £64,483 was apparently cut by abatements of £24,666 in the 1660s.⁹¹ It should be said that neither static income,⁹² nor abatement of fines⁹³ – was unique to Winchester. To its credit, the latter switched leasing from lives to term and increased its fine income. Over raising rents or more direct farming, however, it was less successful. Whether this reflects wisdom – averting gentry wrath – or lethargy is again difficult to say.

VI. Conclusion

Much about Winchester Cathedral had changed over the period from the 1630s to the 1670s. What emerges most strikingly is the impact of people and events on the cathedral. The influence of Laud and Brent, his Vicar General, together with Curl, can surely be traced in developments of the 1630s: stress on ceremony, improvements to the fabric such as the screen by Inigo Jones, and leasing for terms rather than for lives. The Civil Wars shook the cathedral to its foundations, almost literally, scattering the clergy and many ancillaries. The Restoration inevitably involved a huge wave of leasing and a heavy building programme. The dean and chapter seem to have learned lessons from these events. If they observed better leasing practice, perhaps the efforts of Laud had not been in vain. If they were more charitable, perhaps fear of more trouble from the mob was in their minds. Greater regard for preaching and improvements in attendance may also be explained in these ways. Unfortunately this is where the documents fall silent.

The cathedral of the Restoration was, thus, certainly different and in

most respects a better place than it had been before the Interregnum. It follows that better performance of duties ought to have meant that the cathedral had advanced considerably over the forty years or so of this enquiry as a centre of excellence. Recent research is mixed on the overall verdict. Hereford and Lincoln are examples where there were persistent problems with finance, fabric, and the music.⁹⁴ Attitudes were depressingly conservative at Chichester, Norwich, and York in the immediate aftermath of the Restoration and Sheldon's warning to the authorities at Canterbury – 'having much and doing little good' – strikes a disturbing note.⁹⁵ There were, on the other hand, signs of improvement by the 1670s and 1680s in most of the same places, to which we should add Gloucester: regular services at Lincoln and York; frequent communion at Canterbury, Norwich, and York; lawful leasing at Lincoln and Norwich; better fabric and finance at Hereford, Gloucester, and Lincoln.⁹⁶

It is difficult to conclude that Winchester or the other cathedrals were by the 1670s really centres of excellence if only because there can be no certainty, only indications, from surviving documents. Whether, having lost a vocation, they had begun to find a role must remain in question. Paradoxically, cathedrals making the greatest efforts to recover may have had less time for wider considerations.⁹⁷ It remains to repeat that, if not a centre of excellence, the Winchester Cathedral of the 1670s appears to have improved in many respects on the Winchester Cathedral of the 1630s.

This requires explanation. It is not very likely that the canons at Winchester were more conscientious or retained stronger memories of the upheavals of the 1640s and 1650s than their counterparts elsewhere. One reason may lie, at a more practical level, in differences over problems and resources. Winchester suffered less and was richer than most of cathedrals: and this would obviously explain the improvements in charity, fabric, and even lecture sessions. The reduction in pluralism, itself possibly because of the growing resources of the cathedral, implied fewer external commitments, and more time to consider the cathedral's role. Here the documents fall silent again – and not just at Winchester. Improvements or not, the canons cannot escape criticism. Their lavish housing, their modesty with augmentations, their exploitation of impropriations, their lethargic estate management, and, harking back the earlier analysis of character, their tendency to work into old age, their bloated incomes, and their pluralism all amount to a substantial indictment. A leaner, fitter, body of canons could have done more. It could even be said, in a final paradox, that Winchester's relative success enhanced its appearance of privilege, and – with it – multiplied its enemies.

Notes

1. The most relevant sections are 4, 6, 13/14, 17/18, 18/19, 20/21, 31/32, 34/35, 35/36. See G W Kitchin and T F Madge (eds.), *Documents of Winchester Cathedral* (Winchester, 1889) – for 1544; W R W Stephens and T F Madge (eds.), *Documents of Winchester Cathedral* (Winchester, 1897) and A W Goodman and W H Hutton (eds.), *Statutes Governing the Cathedral Church of Winchester* (Oxford, 1925), – for 1638.
2. 25 Henry VIII, c.20.
3. There appears to be little detailed research on prebendal attendance. At York 1520-1670 'a majority...never set foot in the Minster' and half were never at chapter meetings; however, as an old foundation, there was a much larger body of canons and that attendance of office holders was much better. C Cross, 'From the Reformation to the Restoration', in G E Aylmer and R Cant (eds.), *History of York Minster* (Oxford, 1977), pp.216, 218.
4. W[inchester] C[athedral] C[hapter] A[ct] B[ook], 1622-45: Aegrotat appears by three names, June 1631 (f.28v); Kercher died October 1644 (f.81v).
5. WCL: CAB, 1660-95, pp.151, 299, records dispensations for Haswell and Beaumont.
6. For example, Burbie, 'Archdeacon of Winchester', and he was present, WCCAB, 1622-45, f.28v.
7. WCL: CAB, 1622-45, ff.37v, 39r Lany and Halsey.
8. WCL: CAB, 1622-45, ff.44r/f, 47r, 59v, 64r.
9. A Thomson, 'Winchester Cathedral: its clergy and the duties before and after the Interregnum. Part I: the characteristics of the Cathedral clergy', *Southern History*, 26 (2004), pp.38-65.
10. WCL: CAB, 1631-5; Wren missed seven out of eight meetings, but Roger Andrewes missed one out of nine; 1671-5, Gumble and Ken missed three and four out of ten.
11. WCL: CAB, 1622-45, f.39r, 44r.
12. Comments in WCL: CAB, 1622-45, f.37v, are not precisely placed by names, leaving the possibility that three joined the king. Certainly the two Partridges did so, and the clerk added that they both joined the royal household, one in charge of the laundry!
13. B Carpenter Turner, *History of Winchester* (1992), p.95, and T B James, *Winchester* (1997), p.91.
14. WCL: CAB, 1622-45, ff.80v, 81v, 82v. Others are rector Buckner of Merstham, Surrey, Haswell less explicably at 'Somborne', Crooke less decipherably at 'Dorc' (Dorchester on Thames?). Three lay clerks, a verger, an almsman, and the organist, incidentally, had joined the king by November 1643: of these six, half were still with him in June 1645.
15. Section 12 of the 1638 Statute strengthened the residence requirement and the office holders (Vice Dean, Treasurer, and Receiver) were to be there all the time. Young, in 1635, seems to have been anticipating this change.
16. F Goodman (ed.), *Diary of John Young* (1928), pp.112, 125.
17. For Young's pluralism, Thomson, *loc.cit.* See also D Sherwin Bailey (ed.), *Wells Cathedral Chapter Act Book, 1666-83*, (1973), p.xxvii.
18. *Ibid.*, p.xxiv-xxvii shows six disputes between 1669 and 1681, one threatening to end in the Court of Arches.
19. Few ages, either at admission or death, appear in the record, but for example

- see entries 'senex' died aged 82 or 83 in the 1640s, WCL: CAB, 1622-45, ff.67r, 78v). 'Aegrotat' appears four times and 'infirmus' twice, June 1631 to November 1635; neither reason is given between 1642-5 or 1671-5; but five admissions between 1672 and 1675, are described a 'manci', and doubtlessly during the Dutch War, CAB, 1660-95.
20. *Ibid.*, p.209. Plans in the Restoration for regular morning service at York may not have worked; D M Owen, 'From the Restoration to 1822', in Aylmer and Cant, *op.cit.*, pp.237-8.
 21. WCL: CAB, 1660-95, pp.25, 117, 179.
 22. M. Bowker, 'Historical Survey, 1450-1750', in D Owen (ed.), *History of Lincoln Minster* (Cambridge, 1994), p.195.
 23. WCL: CAB, 1660-95, p.125. They chose Thomas White of St. Mary at Hill, London, for 20/- a Sunday throughout the year from November 1666. Though the dates do not quite fit, this exact sum – £52 p.a. – was being spent 1660-70 according to the Accounts in B[odleian] L[ibrary, Oxford], Tanner 140, f.120. A similar scheme may have been run by Canterbury Cathedral; *ibid.*, 128, f.57.
 24. WCL: CAB, 1660-95, p.180. The resigning lecturer was Thomas Pittis, rector of Gatcombe, Isle of Wight, 1662-88 and Holy Rood, Southampton, 1666-75. There is nothing about his appointment in the act book. Waferer (1660-80) was the canon; Standish (1669-82) and Taylor (1661-87) were the minor canons.
 25. The questionnaire and '5th Amendment' replies of 1663 are in Stephens and Madge, *op.cit.*, p.107. There appears to be nothing about Brent's verdict in 1635 in Goodman, *loc.cit.*
 26. *Ibid.*, p.84.
 27. *Ibid.*, p.108. The canons were Halsey, Lany, and Lewis.
 28. Cathedral Statute 1638, section 32.
 29. Cathedral Statutes, 1544 and 1638, sections 1 and 26-7.
 30. WCL, Royal letters, L7/R12, ff.60v, 84v 100v. WCCAB, 1622-45, ff.17v, 35v45v. A sixth, Partridge, was admitted November 1632, CAB, 1622-45, f.35v, but there is confusion over his name – James or John – and, if it is the same man, his royal letter was before 1628.
 31. WCL, L10/R16, f.19r and L12/R18, f.3r; CAB, 1660-95, pp.149-291.
 32. Shortest waiting, WCL, L10/R16, f.19r; CAB, 1660-95, p.149; 35 months, L12/R18, f.3r; CAB, 1660-95, p.231; Finlawson, L10/R16, f.70r; CAB, 1660-95, p.229.
 33. WCL, Treasurers' Books, 1628-9 and 1674-5 show the payments.
 34. Thomson, *loc.cit.*
 35. Under its terms they offered £4 to the 'pour scholars at Oxfourd' in June 1631, and at least one sum of £10 to be shared between 'five pour scholars' in January 1635, Goodman, *op.cit.*, pp.80, 103, 110. A Dr Michael Reniger was a canon and Archdeacon of Winchester 1581-1609; J Horn, *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, Winchester* (1974), p.105.
 36. WCL: CAB, 1660-95, pp.66, 117-20.
 37. These figures come from WCL, Treasurers' Books and Accounts, W41/9: the latter are separate sheets; one stipulates an annual £160 to the poor in the 1660s. BL, Tanner, 140, f.120, lists about £162 annually spent likewise. Stephens and Madge, *op.cit.*, p.122, claim £1,600 spent on charity in the 1660s. A figure of around this sum could well represent the combined

- spending on almsmen and the new scheme over ten years.
38. Thomson, *loc.cit.*.
 39. See WCL: CAB, 1660-95, pp.66, 117.
 40. *Ibid.*, pp.249-50.
 41. W A Shaw, *History of the English Church, 1640-60*, 2 Vols. (1900), II, p. 496. C Firth and R S Rait, *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum* (1911) Vol.2, pp.81, 200. A Hughes and R O'Day, 'Augmentations and amalgamations', in F Heal and O Day (eds.) *Princes and Paupers* (Leicester, 1981), p.167.
 42. See J H Overton, *Life in the English Church* (1885), p.302. J H Pruett, *Parish Clergy Under the Later Stuarts* (Illinois, 1978), pp.97-8.
 43. WCL, T4/3/7/3, August 1637, and C[alendar of] S[tate] P[apers] D[omestic], 1660-1, p.183.
 44. Romsey's 8s.8d. is specifically marked 'augmentation', WCL, W39/A2, 1625-6 only. Christchurch, L7/R12, f.109r, but Young's statement that 'we increased the vicarage neere 20 lib' cannot be substantiated, Goodman, *op.cit.*, p.121. Nutley, *ibid.*, p.148 and L7/R12, f.144v, agree on the amount; the lessees of Christchurch and Nutley were to pay.
 45. For example, Canterbury, and Carlisle, BL, Tanner 128, f.57; 144, f.9. For other efforts to augment, see I M Green, *Re-establishment of the Church of England* (Oxford, 1978), p.110.
 46. WCL, Accounts, W41/9, W52/7 for all three; but leases, Barton Stacey and Christchurch L10/R15, pp.144, 186; Nutley/Preston Candover, *ibid.*, R16, f.30v, while agreeing the figures, say the lessee had to pay. Illustrating the minefield, a Barton terrier stipulates that £30 was payable by the 'impropriator', Hampshire Record Office, E15/7; in 1705, the vicar of Preston flatly denied that there was any augmentation, Lambeth Palace Library, *Notitia Parochialis*, p.861.
 47. Stephens and Madge, *op.cit.*, p.122; figures for the 1660s are in WCL, Accounts – £573 (W41/9) and £470 (W52/7); and confirmed in BL, Tanner 140, ff.117, 120, 123.
 48. I found only one renewal of the lease of Titchfield in the cathedral registers 1631-75, WCL, L10/R16, f.43v, but renewals of – for example – Christchurch arise often; some were as short as five years and even 21 year terms were cut short, L7/R12, ff.80r, 109r, 137r, 145r; L9/R13 2nd, p.39; L10/R15, p.186; L10/R16, f.47r; L12/R18 f.22v.
 49. For example, Winchester St Maurice, June 1630, Goodman, *op.cit.*, p.86. Wills of individual canons – not the concern of this chapter – left sums mainly for St Paul's.
 50. For inflation, see Thomson, *op.cit.*, respecting incomes; for fabric, section IV here.
 51. Goodman, *op.cit.*, pp.102, 129.
 52. WCL, Ecclesiae Cathedralis Wintoniensis, ff.25r, 27r+v.
 53. WCL, Treasurers' Books, 1628-9, 1636-7, and 1639-40.
 54. S E Lehmberg, *Cathedrals under Siege* (Exeter, 1996), pp.35, 37, 60, 65. F Bussby, 'Life...of...Morley' (WCL, typescript, 1962), pp.148, 162.
 55. WCL: CAB, 1660-95, pp.4, 27.
 56. Cf. BL, Tanner 140, ff.118, 120. See also Stephens and Madge, *op.cit.*, p.122, Green, *op.cit.*, p.109, and Lehmberg, *op.cit.*, p.145.
 57. Stephens and Madge, *op.cit.*, p.107.
 58. Comparisons are problematic because of imprecision about spending items

and timescales. At Canterbury, the best comparison, £7921 was expended on the Cathedral, £1000 on houses in the Cloese between 1660 and 1670, BL, Tanner 128, f.57; and for Wells and Carlisle, *ibid.*, 140, f.12, and 144, f.9. These all show lower spending and a balance towards the Cathedrals. See also Bowker, *op.cit.*, pp.198-200; I Atherton and V Morgan, 'Revolution and retrenchment: the Cathedral, 1630-1720', in I Atherton (ed.), *Norwich Cathedral: Church, City, and Diocese, 1096-1996* (1996), p.560; A W Foster, 'Dean and Chapter, 1570-1660', in M Hobbs (ed.), *Chichester Cathedral* (1994), p.88; R Holtby, 'Restoration to 1790', *ibid.*, p.103; H Tomlinson, 'Restoration to Reform', in G E Aylmer and J Tiller (eds.), *Hereford Cathedral* (2000), pp.114, 119.

59. See Goodman, *op.cit.*, p.50, corroborative evidence is not to be found.
60. WCL: CAB, 1660-95, p.184.
61. *Ibid.*, pp.43, 141, 245.
62. *Ibid.*, pp.45, 245.
63. The discussions are in *ibid.*, pp.144, 161, 244. The spending total of £15,500 is from W41/9. There are higher figures for the decade in BL, Tanner 140, ff.118, 120, 123.
64. Warnings appear WCL: CAB, 1660-95, pp.98, 114, 144, 161, 181, 245; latitude, *ibid.*, p.246.
65. For the dispute, *ibid.*, pp.281, 283. See also Stephens and Madge, *op.cit.*, p.159.
66. WCL: CAB, 1660-95, pp.75, 247.
67. *Ibid.*, pp.45, 83, 184.
68. *Ibid.*, p.244.
69. Atherton and Morgan, *op.cit.*, p.560.
70. Section 6 of both statutes.
71. Stephens and Madge, *op.cit.*, p.19.
72. CSPD, 1634-5, p.88: there are three to the ecclesiastical authorities at Chichester but attached is a note, 'all the bishops in the kingdom had the like'.
73. WCL, L7/R12, f.98r.
74. I calculate, from W D Peckham (ed.), 'Acts of the Dean and Chapter of...Chichester', *Sussex Record Society*, (1959), for 1631-5, twenty leases for 21 years, nineteen for forty years, and sixteen for lives. Infractions without detail appear in P Collinson, 'Protestant Cathedral, 1541-1660', in *idem.* (ed.), *History of Canterbury Cathedral* (Oxford, 1995), p.189.
75. This claim was made by P Meadows, 'Dean and Chapter restored, 1660-1832', in *idem.* (ed.), *History of Ely Cathedral* (2003), p.196; Tomlinson, *op.cit.*, p.110, and J Gregory, *Restoration, Reformation, and Reform* (Oxford, 2000), p.112; *idem.* 'Canterbury and the Ancien Regime', in Collinson, *op.cit.*, p.243. The letters of Meadows, Ely Cathedral Library, 61/EDC 6/1A/1660-61, and Tomlinson, Hereford Cathedral Library, 7031/3, p.162, mention 'Charles R' (without number), while Greenwich refers to 'the tenth year of our reign' (modernised); both latter points rule out Charles II. Gregory's reference, BL, Tanner 128, f.41, refers to royal letters of June and October 1634. Section 6 of the Canterbury's new statute of 1636, *ibid.*, f.5v, appears to be very similar to Winchester's of 1638 and would, like Winchester's, have applied in the 1660s.
76. WCL: CAB, 1622-45, f.73v; CSPD, 1641-3, p.298.

77. WCL, CA3, p.282, and L12/R18, f.52v.
78. Bailey, *op.cit.*, pp.30, 34, 412; BL, Tanner 123, f.36, Canterbury 1682, but see Gregory, *Restoration*, p.113, and Gregory, *Canterbury*, p.243; Bowker, *Lincoln*, p.198; I Atherton and B.A. Holderness, 'Dean and Chapter estates since the Reformation', in Atherton (ed.), *op.cit.*, p.669. At Winchester the cathedral's contrasts with the bishop's estates where by the mid-eighteenth century there was a 'preponderance' of leasing for lives. C Clay, 'Greed of Whig Bishops', *Past and Present*, 87 (1980), p.128.
79. Alton, Benstead, Bulkington, Quidhampton, WCL, L7/R11, f.57v, L7/R12, ff.82r, 89v, 151r; L10/R15, pp.162, 172, 254; L12/R18, f.2v.
80. Exton, Hannington, Littleton, Longstreete, Silkstead old, Silkstead new, Wonston, WC, L7/R12, ff.87v, 150r, 158r, 158v, 156r, 157r, 149r; L10/R15, pp.132, 256, 59, 61, 155; L10/R16, ff.61v, 69r.
81. Goodman, *op.cit.*, p.133, for royal contact, and ambivalent references to Calvinism, pp.84, 107, 108. DNB, (1885-1900), Young's entry for tutoring.
82. *Ibid.*, Hyde's entry.
83. For problems of identification, see the William Blakes in the Exton leases, WCL, L7/R12, ff.61r, 87v; for the fate of 'lives', namely Manydowne, *ibid.*, ff.45r, 101r.
84. Oxenbridge Manor, WCL, Compotus Rolls 1631-2, 1674-5.
85. WCL, Commonwealth Survey, W52/82, f.85; Goodman, *op.cit.*, p.121.
86. This information is drawn from the ledgers, WCL, L7/R12, L9/R13 2nd, L10/R15-6, L12/R18.
87. Comparisons of cathedral rents in the 1540s and 1680s are based on Kitchen and Madge, *op.cit.*, pp.9, 83, 183. The issue at this point is rents but the documents here – indeed all Compotus Rolls – are bedevilled by arrears (some paid, some not), and it is not always possible to demarcate between leased and rented properties. However, all the rectories were simply leased out, and comparison of their rents is relatively straightforward.
88. *Ibid.*, pp.83, 183. WCL, Compotus Rolls, T4/1/5 (cathedral).
89. WCL, W56-2/6, 1630s, and Audit Books, T4/3/3.
90. BL, Tanner 217, f.151, Canterbury; 92, f.6, Durham.
91. *Ibid.*, 140, f.123.
92. See Atherton and Holderness, *op.cit.*, p.668; Bowker, *op.cit.*, p.187; Gregory, *Restoration*, p.113; Gregory, *Canterbury*, p.244; S E Lehmberg and G. Aylmer 'Reformation to Restoration', in Aylmer and Tiller, *op.cit.*, p.105.
93. Canterbury, and Carlisle, BL, Tanner 123, f.57; 144, f.9. Gregory, *Restoration*, p.111; Gregory, *Canterbury*, p.214; Norwich, Atherton and Holderness, *loc.cit.*, pp.674, 676. Clay, *op.cit.*, esp. pp.87, 129, 133, 138, 145, 148, argues that the Church – bishops and cathedral chapters – did not gain anything like market value in terms of rents and fines from its land, and indeed attempts to do so in the eighteenth century floundered.
94. Tomlinson, *Hereford*, pp.117-8; R Bowers, 'Music and Worship', in Owen, *op.cit.*, p.80.
95. BL, Tanner 128, f.57; Foster, Chichester, pp.88, 100; Holtby, *Chichester*, pp.103, 116; R Houlbrooke, 'Refoundation and Reformation', in Atherton, *op.cit.*, p.538; Atherton and Morgan, *op.cit.*, p.562; Cross, *op.cit.*, pp.216, 232; Collinson, *Canterbury*, p.203; Gregory, *Canterbury*, p.207.
96. Services: Bowker, *op.cit.*, p.199, Owen, *York*, p.237; Communion: Gregory, *Canterbury*, p.230, Tomlinson, *Hereford*, p.112; Atherton and Morgan,

op.cit., p.545; Owen, York, p.238; Leasing: Bowker, *op.cit.*, pp.198-9. Atherton and Holderness, *loc.cit.*, p.669; Fabric/Finance: Tomlinson, Hereford, p.119, Bowker, *op.cit.*, pp.199-200; D Welandar, *History of...Gloucester Cathedral* (1991) p.372.

97. Atherton and Morgan, *op.cit.*, p.562.