

Restorer or Reformer?

George Morley's Spiritual Jurisdiction over the Diocese of Winchester, 1662–1684

Andrew Thomson

May 1662 saw the translation of George Morley from Worcester to the see of Winchester.¹ Morley promised much in view of his education and experience. From a scholarship at Westminster School, he had entered Christ Church Oxford and gained a doctorate in theology. His subsequent appointments ranged from chaplaincies, noble and royal, to parishes, canonries, a deanery, and a bishopric. He came, moreover, with considerable experience of the wider world of ecclesiastical and political affairs: in the Civil Wars as a royalist delegate in the negotiations at Uxbridge and Newport; in exile as a link between royalists abroad and Presbyterians in England; and, at the Restoration as a leading figure at Worcester House and the Savoy Conference. It would have been difficult, formidable though his new responsibilities were, to find anyone more eminently qualified for the post.

Such a role – governance of a premier diocese – would have been challenging at the best of times; but much more so in the 1660s after nine years of civil wars, eleven years of interregnum, and twenty years of religious upheaval. In every diocese there were problems: of integrating ‘intruders’ – non-episcopal appointees from the Interregnum – and ‘sufferers’ – ejectees in the 1640s/50s – into a coherent body of parish clergy; of repairing churches, cathedrals, and residences; and of recovering the endowments – mainly lands – belonging to the Church; while, at the national level, religious policy remained to be settled.

1 *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 1541–1857*, III, *Canterbury, Rochester and Winchester Dioceses*, edited by J.M. Horn (London, 1974), p. 82.

Surprisingly little has been researched or written on the episcopates of the Restoration. Anne Whiteman, Edward Carpenter, and Victor Sutch have examined the careers of three of Morley's contemporaries, Seth Ward, Bishop of Salisbury, Henry Compton, in turn Bishop of Oxford and London, and Gilbert Sheldon, Morley's Archbishop of Canterbury. They provide useful comparisons with aspects of Morley's record.² W.G. Simon's is the only complete survey of the bishops of the period, John Spurr's the only recent account of Morley; the former with little on internal administration, the latter an excellent summary of Morley's career and achievements but not a detailed treatment of his internal government of the Winchester Diocese.³

Morley was preceded at Winchester by Brian Duppa who had been translated from Salisbury to serve as the diocese's first post-Restoration bishop.⁴ Few records survive from Duppa's short time at Winchester; information about ordinations and confirmations, the revival of the consistory court and visitations at the Restoration – or, even more frustratingly, the process of recovering episcopal and cathedral estates – all this is missing. The leasing of land began in August 1660, the court resumed its sessions by October 1661, and much time was spent on appointments because of the usual round of resignations, promotions, and death and because of the special circumstances – at least 27 expulsions (out of some 390 incumbents) – of 1660–61.⁵ Duppa had been at Winchester for barely eighteen months, when he died in March 1662 at the age of 73. In spite of his age and short episcopate, his achievements, especially the recovery of church lands and the lack of vindictiveness towards intruders, must be viewed, even without fundamental reforms, as impressive.

2 A. Whiteman, 'Episcopate of Seth Ward Bishop of Exeter 1660–1667 and Salisbury 1667–1689', unpublished D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford, 1951; E. Carpenter, *The Protestant Bishop: being the Life of Henry Compton, 1632–1713, Bishop of London* (London, 1956); V.D. Sutch, *Gilbert Sheldon Architect of the Anglican Survival, 1640–1675* (The Hague, 1973).

3 W.G. Simon, *The Restoration Episcopate* (New York, 1965); J. Spurr, 'George Morley', H.C.G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (eds), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 60 vols (Oxford, 2004), XXIX, pp. 216–20.

4 *Fasti*, p. 82.

5 Hampshire Record Office, Winchester [hereafter HRO], 11M59 E2 15564-3, p. 1; HRO, C2/72, C1/37 (earlier books and therefore court activity may have been lost); *Annual Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records*, 46 (London, 1885); The National Archives, Kew, London [hereafter TNA], E331/Winchester 1; *Calamy Revised; being a Revision of Edmund Calamy's Account of the Ministers and others Ejected and Silenced, 1660–2*, edited by A.G. Matthews (Oxford, 1934).

It was at this point that stewardship of the diocese passed to George Morley. Morley was, at 64, a somewhat younger man than Duppa, and he clearly possessed the potential to tackle the challenges of his new post. These were, in the first place, the 'routine business' of ordinations, institutions, visitations, confirmations, and the operation of the consistory court. The Restoration of 1660 had raised, moreover, much hope of ecclesiastical reform. Of this, the Church was in urgent need: not only had its failings contributed to the showdown of 1640–41 but the 'puritan' reformers had proceeded to point the direction reform should take. Winchester was an influential diocese which could have set the pace, Morley the bishop with the potential to seize the opportunity. Before all this, however, lay the immediate and overriding issue of Uniformity. The enactment of Uniformity at Westminster and Morley's enthronement at Winchester took place within days of each other in May 1662 and it fell therefore to Morley to enforce its terms within his new diocese.⁶

The remit of this article is not the bishop's secular responsibility as landlord, managing his estates, nor his political activities at Court, in the House of Lords, and on the Privy Council. The article attempts instead to decide how well he shouldered the routine business – ordinations, institutions, visitations, confirmations – and whether he had the appetite or the energy for major reform of such matters as the consistory court, parish boundaries, and clerical incomes in the 'mainland' areas of the diocese. The diocese ran from the Thames, through Surrey, Hampshire, and the Isle of Wight, to the Channel Islands. The Channel Islands with their unique ecclesiastical system will not be considered as part of this article.

I '1662'

The Act of Uniformity was the cornerstone of the Clarendon Code of the 1660s and clearly signalled, for a time, at least, the direction of official religious policy. Its background lay in the upheavals of the Interregnum and an explosion of religious sects – Seekers, Ranters, Baptists, Quakers, Fifth Monarchy Men – with social, economic, and political ideas clearly threatening the 'establishment'.⁷ The

6 14 Charles II c.4; R. Hutton, *The Restoration: A Political and Religious History of England and Wales 1658–1667* (Oxford, 1985), p. 176; Winchester Cathedral Library [hereafter WCL], L10/R15, p. 99.

7 C. Hill, *World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas during the English Revolution* (London, 1972), *passim*.

newly revised Book of Common Prayer, annexed to the Act, made few concessions to those disparate religious groups, or even the Presbyterians, and the Act itself required all incumbents to undergo episcopal ordination and to take oaths giving 'assent and consent' to the newly revised Prayer Book and renouncing the Covenant and arms against the king.

On assuming control of the diocese in May 1662, Morley's first task was the enforcement of the oaths on all parish clergy. He seems to have thought the problem slight, the likely numbers of refusers – 12 – small, and to have offered to discuss matters with potential dissidents 'publicly and privately'.⁸ If so, he was to be disabused and examination of *Calamy*, refined by Matthews, together with a surviving visitation book, suggest a total of at least 54 incumbents who balked at subscription and resigned their livings; and there were still over 40 vacancies in 1663–64, far higher than in earlier or later years.⁹

The episode shows Morley, initially, as a conciliator, if we trust the documents, but somewhat ignorant of the mood of his clergy and, when it came to the point and whatever his Calvinist sympathies, a faithful executioner of the government policy.¹⁰ The scale of known expulsions – 54 out of some 390 incumbents – was a significant disruption but not disastrous and, though a little above the national average (ten per cent), was apparently quite moderate compared with percentages of 20 in Leicestershire and 33 in London.¹¹

The effect on clerical relations is difficult to gauge for want of evidence but it was hardly an auspicious start. All the new men were, of course, subscribers to the Prayer Book, its doctrine and liturgy, and presumably a loyal body of men; but how sincerely or enthusiastically must be left to speculation. There were also thereafter in the diocese residual groups of non-conformists, ministerial and lay, outside the Church. They suffered a clandestine existence and persecution for most of the time, surfacing when dragged to court and when temporarily licensed under Charles II's Declaration of Indulgence in 1672. Numbers are difficult to estimate.

8 Bodleian Library, Oxford [hereafter BodL], Clarendon 73, f. 217; 77, f. 307.

9 *Calamy Revised*; HRO, Visitation Book [hereafter VB] 1663, B1/35; London Metropolitan Archives [hereafter LMA], DW/VB 1 (1662, 1664); D.L. Wykes, 'Early Religious Dissent in Surrey', *Southern History* 33 (2011), 54–77, gives a somewhat higher figure (40 expulsions of ministers) than mine (23), a discrepancy in part because he includes diocesan 'peculiars' and mainly because he combines expulsions of 1660–61 with those of 1662.

10 A. Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, 2 vols (London, 1721), II, col. 768.

11 Hutton, *Restoration*, p. 175; J.H. Pruett, *Parish Clergy under the Later Stuarts: the Leicestershire Experience* (Urbana IL, 1978), p. 13.

They may have run to five or six thousand in the Archdeaconry of Surrey but, with an adult population of 75,000, perspective must be borne in mind.¹² It should be said, finally, and in Morley's favour, that he was involved in attempts at national level to resolve matters through contact with Presbyterians and Independents in the 1670s.¹³

II Morley and the Recovery of Diocesan Business

Ordinations

Morley's immediate agenda, building on the work of Duppa, was the routine business of the diocese. No ordination registers survive from before 1665, but the earliest ones show that numbers were modest; they doubled to about 14 a year by the mid-1670s, half way through his episcopate but were declining to earlier and lower levels by the early 1680s. Only half of the earliest group had degrees, four fifths by the mid-1670s, rising to a hundred per cent by the early 1680s.

Comparisons with his immediate predecessors, Andrewes, Neile, and Curl or with Peter Mews, his successor, are not possible as their ordination registers are missing. We know that Andrewes was 'a careful ordainer', Neile a conscientious gatekeeper, so Morley may have ordained more men, particularly in the mid-1670s. Andrewes preferred MAs and Neile, who had to be more flexible elsewhere, depending on numbers of candidates, would probably have been able to insist similarly at Winchester.¹⁴ Proportions of ordinands with a university education were high in a number of dioceses before the Interregnum and reached levels of 85 and 90 per cent in Salisbury and Leicestershire after the Restoration.¹⁵ Morley may have had difficulty in matching such quality, in common with others, no doubt, in the 1660s, but all his candidates had degrees in his last two or three years.

The drop in numbers and degree standards at Winchester in the early 1660s probably reflects the turbulence of the Interregnum and

12 Wyke, 'Early Religious Dissent', 64; A. Whiteman, *The Compton Census of 1676: A Critical Edition* (Oxford, 1976), p. 75.

13 Simon, *Restoration Episcopacy*, pp. 83, 171.

14 K.C. Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor: The Episcopate of James I* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 179, 183; A. Foster, 'Archbishop Richard Neile Revisited', in P. Lake and M. Questier (eds), *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church 1560-1660* (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 172.

15 Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor*, p. 182; R. O'Day, *English Clergy: the Emergence and Consolidation of a Profession, 1558-1642* (Leicester, 1979), p. 136; Pruett, *Parish Clergy*, p. 82; Whiteman, 'Seth Ward', p. 210.

Morley's Ordinations to the Priesthood

	BA	MA	DD	LLB	LLD	None	Total
1666-1667							
Totals	2	3	0	2	0	6	13
%	(15.4%)	(23.1%)	(0.0%)	(15.4%)	(0.0%)	(46.2%)	
1674-1675							
Totals	11	11	0	1	0	5	28
%	(39.3%)	(39.3%)	(0.0%)	(3.6%)	(0.0%)	(17.9%)	
1682-1683							
Totals	10	8	0	0	0	0	18
%	(55.5%)	(44.4%)	(0.0%)	(0.0%)	(0.0%)	(0.0%)	

Restoration and concerns among potential ordinands about the future of the Restoration Church; the subsequent improvement in both respects a growing recovery of interest in the ministry – or greater recruiting efforts by Morley; the latter day decline in numbers due possibly to his flagging energies. It should be said, finally, that possession of a university degree is, of course, only one measure of suitability, but little about Morley's – or his contemporaries' – selection procedures, which might have highlighted pastoral concerns, has survived.¹⁶

Institutions

Institution was the point when the bishop transferred the parish, and with it the spiritual care of the parishioners, to the new incumbent. Before this came the right by the patron – the owner of the advowson – to nominate a candidate or, in official terminology, to make a presentation. The bishop himself had the right to nominate and institute – known as a collation – to barely 50 of the 320 or so rectories and vicarages in the Winchester diocese; in the remainder – 85 per cent of the whole – other patrons, (lay and ecclesiastical), controlled nominations, leaving institution to the bishop.¹⁷

16 Whiteman, 'Seth Ward', pp. 209, 235; O'Day, *English Clergy*, pp. 142–3.

17 Calculations are confined to rectories and vicarages (c.320) because so much information about appointments to perpetual curacies is missing.

The bishop was central – no man could take charge of a parish without him – but for most appointments others were also involved. Whether a system of appointments, involving so many different types of patron, was good or bad for the Church is also difficult to say. The bishop controlled 15 per cent – large when compared with his counterpart at Salisbury but small when facing lay patronage of 50 or 60 per cent.¹⁸ In theory an array of patrons ought to have brought checks, balances, and variety and Margaret Stieg has found in the diocese of Wells one conscientious layman who listened to the preaching of two rivals before presenting.¹⁹ Their activity may be seen, on the other hand, as a threat to the theological integrity of the Church. Lay patronage could have been a gap in its defences, which ‘puritans’ of the 1630s were only too willing to exploit and which therefore lessened control by the bishop.²⁰ There were other patrons buying and selling advowsons, using posts to reward family, friends, and creditors, failing to check theological soundness or command of Latin, deterring clergy from speaking out when they ought to have been rebuking their benefactors.²¹

Examination of the qualifications of patrons’ nominees shows very little difference between episcopal and non-episcopal appointments under Morley; and the pattern did not differ much under Curl and Mews. There was a similar spread of degrees in both periods, mainly arts, with fewer theologians and even fewer lawyers, and a clear majority of MAs.

If doubts remain about the intrusion of lay patronage and if we can place trust in the bishops, there was one remedy to hand: bishops could always refuse to institute the nominees of others.²² Andrewes was apparently again a stickler, incurring suits from candidates and patrons alike.²³ One of Morley’s registers lists five rejections or postponements of nominees of lay patrons, two of which were the crown’s, between 1675 and 1684, although it has not been possible to establish whether this was exceptional.²⁴ A chance survival shows he delayed another

18 Whiteman, ‘Seth Ward’, pp. 351, 449.

19 M. Stieg, *Laud’s Laboratory: The Diocese of Bath and Wells in the Early Seventeenth Century* (Lewisburg, 1982), pp. 116–17.

20 C. Hill, *Economic Problems of the Church: from Archbishop Whitgift to the Long Parliament* (London, 1968), p. 252; O’Day, *English Clergy*, p. 92.

21 *Ibid.*, pp. 75, 105, 107, 109, 110; J. Spurr, *Restoration Church of England 1646–1689* (New Haven, 1991), p. 195.

22 P. Collinson, *The Religion of Protestants: the Church in English Society 1559–1625* (Oxford, 1982), p. 69; O’Day, *English Clergy*, pp. 79–82.

23 Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor*, p. 185.

24 HRO, A1/36, pp. 11, 12, 13, 65, 67, 75, 77.

Patrons and Degrees of Rectors and Vicars Instituted 1633-1637 (Curl)

	Other Collation	Eccl.*	Crown	Academic	Corporation	Private	Totals
BA	1	1	1				3
MA	6	5	17	1		25	54
BD	3		1	2		3	9
DD	1		1			1	3
LLB				1			1
LLD							
None†	4	1	3	1		3	12
Totals	15	7	23	5	0	32	82

Patrons and Degrees of Rectors and Vicars Instituted 1671-1675 (Morley)

	Other Collation	Eccl.*	Crown	Academic	Corporation	Private	Totals
BA		1	1	1		12	15
MA	10	1	5	9	1	22	48
BD		1		1		1	3
DD						1	1
LLB	1						1
LLD							
None†	2	2	2	2		7	15
Totals	13	5	8	13	1	43	83

Patrons and Degrees of Rectors and Vicars Instituted 1699 (Mews)

	Other Collation	Eccl.*	Crown	Academic	Corporation	Private	Totals
BA	1	1		1		2	5
MA	4		1			7	12
BD	1					1	2
DD	1						1
LLB						1	1
LLD							
None†							
Totals	7	1	1	1		11	21

* Patron other than the bishop (e.g. cathedral chapters).

† No degree or none recorded.

Sources: episcopal registers.

from the Provost of the Queen's College Oxford for further scrutiny.²⁵ Institutions, it would seem, were not automatic under Andrewes or Morley. A survey of the social class of private patrons in the early 1630s and 1670s suggests theirs would have been the weaker position, as individuals, if the bishop chose to resist them.²⁶ Peers were relatively few and, while only one private patron confessed to yeoman status, patrons were mostly gentry or esquires whose standing and influence must have been considerably less than the bishop's. A challenge to a nomination, on the other hand, ran the risk of uniting large sectors of influential opposition so discretion was probably the wiser course.

Morley's register shows that appointments of rectors and vicars, whether his collations or institutions of nominees, averaged seventeen or so a year and, while there were inevitable fluctuations, this was much in line with Curl and Mews. Morley seems to have filled the posts promptly, neither better nor worse than his predecessors or his successor, although it is difficult to be certain because his registers do not include departure dates. The quality of appointments can be gauged, in academic terms, more easily from the registers which show that, under Morley, graduate appointments rose from between two thirds and three quarters in 1666 to 100 per cent in 1683, though this

**Appointment of Rectors and Vicars by Curl, Morley, and Mews:
Numbers and Degrees***

		BA	MA	BD	DD	LLB	LLD	None/?	Total
Curl	1633	1	12	2	1			1	17
Morley	1666		11	2				5	18
	1667	2	15	1				1	19
	1674	1	8					4	13
	1675	2	11	1				3	17
	1682	3	12	1	1	1		2	20
	1683	6	9	1	1				17
Mews	1699	5	12	2	1	1			21

Source: HRO, episcopal registers.

* The table excludes curates, perpetual or assistant, as there are no relevant registers, and the clergy of the Channel Islands.

25 B.C. Barker Benfield, 'Scraps from Thomas Barlow's Waste Paper Basket', *Bodleian Library of Record* 13 (1988-90), 85.

26 In 1630-35 there were 39 private patrons (4 peers, 6 knight/baronet, 20 gentry/armiger); 1671-75, 53 private patrons (3 peers, 14 knight/baronet, 32 gentry/armiger).

only brought him into line with his 'wintonian' counterparts; and the majority held masters degrees.

There is no surviving evidence to indicate the pressures that Morley must have inevitably come under in making his appointments. Something can be surmised, however, about his use of collations from six sample years (1666, 1667, 1674, 1675, 1682, 1683) of his episcopate. Most of the 21 men had MAs but, at the extremes, one was a Doctor of Divinity (three others became so) and three were mere 'clerks'. Morley appears to have managed his collations to attract or reward his chaplains and canons. Thomas Ken, one of his chaplains, first served at Brighstone (Isle of Wight) and then, on becoming a canon in 1669, East Woodhey (mainland), both of them collations.²⁷ Morley appears also to have seen the value of several 'degreeless' clergymen: moving John Hearsey, a lay clerk at the cathedral, to three problematic parishes under sequestration in the city of Winchester before appointing him rector of one of them; and, likewise, apparently setting more store by family connexions with East Meon than academic qualifications when he preferred Richard Downes to East Meon in 1674.²⁸

Although documentation for the perpetual curates, who were in charge of chapels (in effect, separate parishes), is far less satisfactory than for the rectors and vicars, enough can be gleaned principally from visitation and subscription books, to highlight two features of Morley's episcopate. Firstly, the number of these curates was significant. There were 120 or so chapelries in the diocese, served – allowing for some pluralism and inevitable vacancies – by about 100 curates. These had fallen to 84 in 1663–64, the time of Morley's arrival, reflecting the upheavals of the 1640s and 1650s and the expulsions of 1662. By 1675–77 there were 114 perpetual curates in post, some admittedly supplying more than one chapelry but, in other cases, two (and in one case three) curates were serving a single chapelry. Whether this should be seen as desperate improvisation or as a surplus of curates, reflecting successful recruiting by Morley, must be left to speculation. The other feature concerns qualifications. There are more gaps in degree records but it would seem that in the early 1660s, somewhere between a third and a quarter of perpetual curates in the diocese were graduate; by the late 1670s, at least half; and the most usual degree was an MA.

27 Wood, *Athenae*, II, col. 189; J. Foster (ed.), *Alumni Oxonienses: the members of the University of Oxford, 1500–1714*, 4 vols (London, 1889); *Fasti*, p. 90; HRO, A1/33.

28 WCL, CAB3, p. 149; HRO, VB; HRO, A1/33, TNA, *Liber Institutionum*.

Comparison of Degrees of Rectors and Vicars in Post

	BA	MA	BD	DD	LLB	LLD	Null	?
Curl	23	165	33	40	6	1	3	18
1637	(8.0%)	(57.1%)	(11.4%)	(13.8%)	(2.1%)	(0.3%)	(1.0%)	(6.2%)
Morley	24	123	14	44	9	5	1	68
1663	(8.3%)	(42.7%)	(4.9%)	(15.3%)	(3.1%)	(1.7%)	(0.3%)	(23.6%)
Morley	35	131	7	42	7	4	0	57
1675	(12.4%)	(46.3%)	(2.5%)	(14.8%)	(2.5%)	(1.4%)	(0.0%)	(20.1%)
Mews	54	145	9	26	7	2	0	42
1697	(18.9%)	(50.9%)	(3.2%)	(9.1%)	(2.5%)	(0.7%)	(0.0%)	(14.7%)

Sources: Mainly episcopal registers of Curl, Morley, and Mews (HRO, A1/31, A1/33, E4/1)

Morley took one further step to raise academic standards. He ordered the establishment of a library, fixing its hours and the stipend of the librarian, in the cathedral. He left all his books to it and declared that they were specifically for the use not only of the cathedral dignitaries but also for the diocesan 'Clergymen and Country Parsons vicars and Curates of my Diocese'.²⁹

Comparison of Morley's 'gathered' body of clergy, as distinct from his individual appointments, helps to set his achievement in context, though different research methods render comparisons inexact. Graduates rose, among Morley's rectors and vicars, from three quarters in the early 1660s to four fifths by the mid-1670s, a little lower than under Curl (1632-47) and Mews (1684-1707).³⁰ Eighty per cent was lower than contemporaneous Leicestershire but higher than Oxford and Hereford and much like Warwickshire and Wiltshire.³¹ Morley's record may not have been exceptional but it came after a time of great upheaval and the parish clergy of Winchester formed an impressive body of men when university attendance was so limited.³² Academic qualifications did not guarantee pastoral commitment, of course, but they showed learning in the priesthood and drew respect from the community.

29 Lambeth Palace Library [hereafter LPL], Laudian Papers, 943/805; TNA, 1684 Prob11/377.

30 HRO, A1/31, E4/1.

31 Pruett, *Parish Clergy*, p. 43; W.M. Marshall, 'Administration of the Dioceses of Hereford and Oxford 1660-1760', unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Bristol, 1978, p. 101; J.L. Salter, 'Warwickshire Clergy 1660-1714', unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Birmingham, 1975, p. 49; D.A. Spaeth, *Church in an Age of Danger: Parsons and Parishioners 1660-1740* (Cambridge, 2000), p. 51.

32 L. Stone (ed.), *University in Society: Vol. 1 Oxford and Cambridge from the 14th to the early 19th Century*, 2 vols (Princeton, NJ, 1975), I, pp. 94, 103.

Visitations

Visitations were opportunities for the bishop to acquire knowledge about his diocese – clergy, people, and buildings – and to instruct, or even inspire, in matters of behaviour and theology.³³ They could also be sources of irritation with clerking procedures, boredom over lengthy sermons, cynicism at the ‘inconsistency’ of bishops requiring attendance while themselves failing to attend, and anger at the exactions to finance the bishop’s hospitality.³⁴ Much would turn on the personality and simply the attendance of the bishop.

Visitations of the diocese of Winchester in the name of the bishop and by the two archdeacons took place every year, the bishop’s usually in May for the Surrey archdeaconry, September for Winchester. To concentrate on the triennial visitations, which, if any, the bishop was probably expected to attend, Morley began well in 1662, visiting at least two deaneries on the mainland and crossing to the Isle of Wight.³⁵ 1668 and 1677 were his best years on the surviving evidence: though he never again seems to have reached the Isle of Wight, he was present at the visitations of all the other deaneries of the Winchester archdeaconry and all three Surrey deaneries.³⁶ He had, meanwhile, been present at the visitations of the Surrey deaneries in 1674 and he appears, finally, to have managed to visit Basingstoke, though no other deanery, in 1680 and 1683. There were gaps – he was apparently entirely absent from Surrey in 1662, 1680, and 1683 – but he was present at all three of those deaneries in three other years; present also at many of the ten deaneries of the Winchester Archdeaconry in the 1660s and 1670s for which records survive; but declining, presumably with old age, by the 1680s when he was recorded as only being present once at each visitation.

Morley’s attendance at visitations was far better than any of his immediate predecessors’ or his successor’s. There is no evidence from surviving visitation books that Bilson, Montagu, or Curl ever appeared

33 Collinson, *Religion of Protestants*, p. 67; Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor*, pp. 116–17; I.M. Green, *Re-establishment of the Church of England, 1660–1663* (Oxford, 1978), p. 138; A. Whiteman, ‘Re-establishment of the Church of England 1660–1663’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th series, 5 (1955), 122–3; BodL, Clarendon 77, f. 307.

34 Collinson, *Religion of Protestants*, p. 68; Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor*, pp. 114, 121; Foster, ‘Neile Revisited’, p. 170.

35 BodL, Clarendon 73, f. 217.

36 HRO, B1/38, B1/43; BodL. Tanner 40, f. 104 (there is a slight discrepancy concerning 1677).

Morley's Attendance at Visitations

Year	P/T	Winchester Archdeaconry	Surrey Archdeaconry
1662	P	Present at 3?	Absent
1665	T	Nil info	Nil info
1668	T	Present except I of W	Present all three
1671	T	Nil info	Nil Info
1674	T	Nil info	Present all three
1677	T	Present except I of W	Present all three
1680	T	Present 1: Absent 9	Absent
1683	T	Present 1: Absent 9	Absent

P = Primary; T = Triennial.

Surviving 'Annual' books do not show attendance by Morley.

in person at their primary or triennial visitations. The saintly Lancelot Andrewes who appeared at a visitation once – Chichester in 1609 – was in fact 'the most persistent absentee' and Richard Neile, who 'rode at the head' of his visitations in Durham, seems to have caught the Winchester disease – neglect – after his translation to the diocese.³⁷ Mews followed Morley and, in the only tenure longer than Morley's, visited every deanery in the Winchester Archdeaconry in his Primary. Although he managed all the mainland deaneries once more in 1691, the Isle of Wight again proved too much. Anthony Wood's bold assertion that Morley went 'where had not been a bishop before in the memory of man' must therefore carry considerable justification.³⁸ Morley's personal scrutiny of the diocese was far closer than any of his fellow Bishops of Winchester or other contemporaries.³⁹ Whatever their shortcomings, visitations were effective in increasing contact with the clergy and people of the diocese.

Bishops produced an array of questions – Articles of Inquiry – for their visitations. While their content on issues such as the condition of the church, performance of the incumbent, and attendance of the parishioners often tended to be similar, there was inevitable variation

37 Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor*, pp. 113–14, 322.

38 Wood, *Athenae*, II, col. 768.

39 W.M. Marshall, 'Episcopal Activity in Hereford and Oxford Dioceses', *Midland History* 8 (1983), 116; Whiteman, 'Seth Ward', pp. 240, 592; *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Charles II*, 28 vols (London, 1860–1947) [hereafter CSPD], 1672, p. 427; Carpenter, *Protestant Bishop*, pp. 208–12; J. Gregory, *Reformation, Restoration, and Reform 1660–1828: Archbishops of Canterbury and their Diocese* (Oxford, 2000), p. 277.

in detail and emphasis. They reflected the religious concerns of their time, for example, the 'Laudianism' of the 1630s, Uniformity in the 1660s, the Treaty of Dover and the Declaration of Indulgence in the 1670s. A comparison of Morley's articles with those of his predecessors reflects these changing concerns.⁴⁰ One such difference is length: Neile's list of 1631 ran to 97 articles, Curl's of 1639 to 87, but Morley's of 1662 and 1674 were compressed to 57. This was achieved largely by combining some of the subdivisions, avoiding some of the repetitions, and by removing such marginal matters as sorcery, all of which characterised Neile's articles. It could therefore be said that Morley's inquiries were more manageable and more focused – on the morals of parishioners and their financial support for their church – and thus more effective than Neile's.

Of fundamental importance, surely, would have been questions about the authority of kings and bishops. These appear among the questions of Neile and Curl – perhaps obsessively so in Neile's case – but, rather surprisingly, are raised only obliquely in Morley's articles and this may reflect the caution with which people were moving at the Restoration.⁴¹ Another difference between the articles of the 1630s and Morley's of the Restoration is the shift of emphasis over Catholics and dissenters. Neile, Laudian though he was, mentions popery no less than six times and seems determined to distance himself from it.⁴² There is reference to sects in Neile's articles of 1631 but they appear twice

40 [Richard Neile], *Articles to be Inquired of within the Diocesse of Winchester In the Triennial Visitation of the Reuerend Father in God, Richard, by the Prouidence of God, Lord Bishop of Winton, in the yeere of our lord God, 1631* (London, 1631); [Walter Curl], *Articles to be Enquired of by Chvrchwardens and Sworn-men in the Trienniall Visitation of the Right Reverend Father in God, Walter Lord Bishop of Winton within the Diocesse of Winchester, Anno. 1639* (London, 1639); [George Morley], *Articles of Visitation and Enquiry Concerning Matters Ecclesiastical Exhibited to the Ministers, Church-Wardens, and Sides-men of every Parish within the Diocese of Winchester, In the Primary Episcopal Visitation of the Right Reverend Father in God George by Divine Providence Lord Bishop of Winchester* (London, 1662); [George Morley], *Articles of Visitation and Enquiry Concerning Matters Ecclesiastical Exhibited to the Ministers, Church-wardens, and Sidesmen, of every Parish within the Diocess of Winchester In the Visitation of the Right Reverend Father in God George By Divine Providence Lord Bishop of Winchester* (London, 1674).

41 [Neile], *Articles to be Inquired*, II, 8, 12, 18, 32, VI, 3, 4; [Curl], *Articles to be Enquired*, II, 16, 27, V, 2, 3; [Morley], *Articles of Visitation and Enquiry* (1662), III, 12; [Morley], *Articles of Visitation and Enquiry* (1674), III, 12.

42 [Neile], *Articles to be Inquired*, II, 5, 11, 12, 24, VI, 2, 15; [Curl], *Articles to be Enquired*, II 20, V, 14; [Morley], *Articles of Visitation and Enquiry* (1662), III, 10, IV, 1; [Morley], *Articles of Visitation and Enquiry* (1674), III, 10, IV, 1.

in Morley's questions and there is specific reference to the Quakers.⁴³ This must reflect a growing concern about such developments just before the Civil Wars and in the aftermath of the Commonwealth and Protectorate.

There remains one of the most interesting differences of all: the credentials of incumbents. In his articles of 1662, Morley enquires about episcopal ordination and institution. There is no mention of these subjects in the articles of the 1630s and Morley's articles of 1674 confine themselves to a relatively innocuous inquiry about induction.⁴⁴ Clearly, in the immediate wake of the Act of Uniformity, questions of proper 'orders' of priesthood and of procedures for their appointment were an urgent problem.⁴⁵ Substantial numbers of incumbents had gained their posts in the 1650s and the king and bishops appeared to be willing to accept them at the Restoration.⁴⁶ Morley even proposed a possible stratagem: while ordination by 'Presbyters without Bishops' was an obstacle, 'no notice [would] be taken'.⁴⁷ By 1662, however, there was to be no compromise on their provenance and loyalty to Church and Crown.

A fuller picture of the state of the diocese would be provided by the replies of the churchwardens and clergy, but unfortunately they do not survive. It can be inferred from the visitation articles that Morley's concerns were somewhat different from his predecessors', reflecting the time of his episcopate, and that he was probably less intrusive, more focused, and probably more effective.

Confirmations

Confirmation was, like ordinations, the duty solely of a bishop and was usually performed during visitations. It was one of the 'rites of passage', allowing parishioners to communicate, and essential for the Church of England in its efforts to retain membership and combat dissent. Patrick Collinson writes of confirmations 'en masse' before

43 [Neile], *Articles to be Inquired*, II, 32; [Curl], *Articles to be Enquired*, II, 27, V, 3; [Morley], *Articles of Visitation and Enquiry* (1662), III, 15, IV, 1; [Morley], *Articles of Visitation and Enquiry* (1674), III, 15, IV, 1.

44 [Morley], *Articles of Visitation and Enquiry* (1662), III, 1, 2, 3; [Morley], *Articles of Visitation and Enquiry* (1674), III, 2, 3; Whiteman, 'Seth Ward', p. 241.

45 14 Charles II c.4 section IX.

46 A. Thomson, 'Continuity and Change: A Comparison of the Parish Clergy in the Diocese of Winchester 1642–1663', *Southern History* 30 (2008), 6–9.

47 R. Scrope and T. Monkhouse, *Clarendon State Papers*, 3 vols (Oxford, 1767–86), III, p. 738.

the Interregnum; and after it, Fuller of Lincoln, Lloyd of Peterborough, and Ward of Exeter, among others, claimed ceremonies on a similar scale but there are hardly any details about their – or Morley's – confirmations.⁴⁸

Morley does offer, quite exceptionally, an insight into one round of confirmations in a letter written probably to Lord Chancellor Clarendon in September 1662.⁴⁹ He was entertained in some style at Southampton where the mayor and corporation threw a 'very generous ... banquet'; he was welcomed to the Isle of Wight with a three gun salute, a gift of '2 dozen of partridges', and 'a great supper' of 'meat both flesh and fish'. The crowds swelled, 'half the people of the Town' (Southampton) waving him off to the Isle of Wight where 'the people flock with great devotion'. Earlier at Romsey, Morley claimed to have confirmed two to three hundred and, amid all the celebrations, five to six hundred at Southampton and 'more than a 1000' on the Isle of Wight.

There is no more detail of this kind for Morley or any other seventeenth century bishop of Winchester and whether the numbers of 1662 were usual or exceptional, reflecting the absence of bishops and confirmation in the Interregnum, is not possible to say. What can be said with some confidence is that Morley did tour the diocese during visitations and he would almost certainly have seized such opportunities to conduct confirmation ceremonies.

III Morley and Diocesan Reform

Morley's tenure should have been the optimum moment for reform within the diocese. The immediate problems at the Restoration had been largely resolved and the change from an ageing Duppa to the more dynamic but experienced Morley ought to have raised the possibility of wide-scale reform. While there was no 'Reform Movement' with acknowledged leaders and a comprehensive manifesto – only something more disparate – there was widespread recognition of the need for reform.

48 Collinson, *Religion of Protestants*, p. 51; CSPD, 1671, p. 427; BodL, Rawlinson, D1163, f. 21, Clarendon c.305, f. 156; Whiteman, 'Seth Ward', pp. 250, 268. See also J. Miller, *After the Civil Wars: English Politics and Government in the Reign of Charles II* (London, 2000), p. 138.

49 BodL, Clarendon 73, f. 217.

The Consistory Court

The need for reform was certainly true of the consistory courts. These had, in effect, been overthrown in 1641 because of their intrusion into daily life, their dubious ways of settling cases, their humiliating penances, their overuse of excommunications, and their costs.⁵⁰ After the courts were restored, the papers of Leoline Jenkins and reports of debates in parliament by John Milward and John Nicholas, show that these earlier concerns persisted into the 1660s, just as Morley was assuming control.⁵¹

The Church had rules – canons and rubrics – and, to enforce them, episcopal consistory courts. Bishops' articles of inquiry, already referred to, covered a range of issues: for incumbents, wearing the surplice and using the prayer book; for churchwardens, supplying communion wine, maintaining the fabric of the buildings, and the fittings within them; for the laity, attending services, receiving communion, and observing moral standards of behaviour. Churchwardens drew up presentments, answering the questions and, where necessary, laying blame and naming names; these were delivered at the visitations. If not dealt with less formally there, they formed the basis of subsequent 'office' – or disciplinary – proceedings in the consistory court.⁵²

The consistory court sat in the cathedral to deal with cases within the archdeaconry of Winchester and there was parallel machinery for Surrey. Morley, like others of Winchester and elsewhere, appears never to have sat in his courts.⁵³ He left the conduct of affairs to his Official Principal, Mondeford Bramston during the 1660s and 70s and Charles Morley in the 1680s, and their deputies.⁵⁴ The bishop was ultimately responsible, and his influence probably accounts for changes in the types of cases pursued by the courts. The court was busiest in Michaelmas term, following the latest round of visitations. To judge by numbers of charges against individuals, the most frequent problems during Michaelmas 1663 concerned religion – church attendance, sectaries, and baptism irregularity – followed by issues to do with morality, fabric, presentments and church rate and the pattern was much the same,

50 16 Charles I c. 11.

51 BodL, Tanner 315, e.g. f. 66; British Library, London [hereafter BL], Egerton 2539, f. 168; *The Diary of John Milward, esq Member of Parliament for Derbyshire, September 1666–May 1668*, edited by C. Robbins (Cambridge, 1938), p. 213.

52 HRO, B1/43.

53 HRO, e.g. C1/35; Whiteman, 'Seth Ward', pp. 170, 181, 591; and, an exception, Worcester Record Office, e.g. 794.011 2722 4a+b.

54 HRO, A1/32, f. 37; WCL, L11/R17, f. 60v.

Offences (charges) Considered by the Consistory Court					
	Religion	Morality	Fabric/Fittings	Presentments	Church Rate
1623	141	59	42	0	71
1663	33	14	10	0	1
1674	7	2	2	2	1
1681	16	0	0	0	0

with lower numbers, in the corresponding term of 1674. Attendance and communion cases seem to dominate proceedings by the early 1680s so either there had been improvements in other respects or greater concentration in the 1680s on problems of religious conformity.

The court of Michaelmas term 1663 appears the busiest for forty years, reflecting loyalist enthusiasm in the early years of the Restoration, no doubt; but, if so, it was not to last and the most striking feature of the courts at this time is their decline. Attendance was poor – 27 October 1663 was one of three days in the term when no one arrived – and, if the accused did not appear, business was delayed and progress paralysed. By the 1670s the court was hardly functioning; 1674 saw one of the most ‘active’ Michaelmas terms. By the 1680s, sittings were fewer, with just one during Michaelmas 1681, and none of the accused arrived at court. Sessions and whole terms are missing and the court stuttered to a halt with a final sitting in May 1683.

It is possible that court books, telling a different story, have been lost but surviving documents strongly imply it was in terminal decline by the end of Morley’s episcopate. Evan Davies and W.M. Jacob insist on the continuing vitality of the courts they have examined but both suffer from serious limitations.⁵⁵ Davies concentrates on proceedings from the Restoration to the Revolution and so cannot set performance in a

Numbers of Sessions Cases and People				
	1623	1663	1674	1681
Sessions	6	10	4	1
Cases	354	558	84	5
People	352	647	84	16

55 C.E. Davies, ‘Enforcement of Religious Conformity in England 1668–1700’, unpublished D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford, 1982, Abstract I, p. 1; W.M. Jacob, *Lay People and Religion in the Early Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 135–36.

wider context; while Jacob's account must leave historians wondering why, if the courts were so popular, their role was to be diminished by statute so shortly after their golden age.⁵⁶ Ralph Houlbrooke, Martin Jones, W.M. Marshall, Barry Till, and Donald Spaeth all believe the church courts were eclipsed during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.⁵⁷ Morley appears to have presided over decline at Winchester and the attempts at reform elsewhere under Sancroft in the 1680s and Atterbury in the 1700s also highlight general concerns.⁵⁸ It is unclear how far the situation at Winchester was due to Morley's dubious appointment of his great nephew as Official Principal in 1679 who seldom sat in person. This was not unusual in itself but a young and inexperienced law graduate was probably not best qualified to ensure the effectiveness of subordinates. The situation may, on the other hand, just simply reflect chronic problems with the court.⁵⁹

Parochial Restructuring

Parochial boundaries were a similarly pressing matter. Some parishes were too large which led to churches becoming overcrowded, such as St Saviour's Southwark where in the 1630s communion had to be arranged in relays.⁶⁰ For these larger parishes subdivision was the answer but more commonly many were so small that union was the only viable course of action. This was an issue in Southampton and Winchester where there had been one or two amalgamations well before the Civil

56 6+7, William IV c.71; 18+19, Victoria c.41; 20+21 Victoria c.77, c.85.

57 R. Houlbrooke, *Church Courts and the People during the Reformation 1520-1570*, (Oxford, 1979), pp. 262, 263, 266, 267, 269, 270; M.D.W. Jones, 'Ecclesiastical Courts before and after the English Civil War', unpublished B.Litt. thesis, University of Oxford, 1977, pp. 65, 83, 91-8, 234-6; Marshall, 'Hereford and Oxford', pp. 74-7; Spaeth, *Church in Danger*, pp. 59-64; B.D. Till, *The Church Courts 1660-1720: The Revival of Procedure* (York, 2006), p. 30.

58 BodL, Tanner 300, f. 143; LPL, Gibson Papers, MS 929; see also N. Sykes, *From Sheldon to Secker: Aspects of English Church History, 1660-1768* (Cambridge, 1959), p. 191; G.V. Bennett, 'The Convocation of 1710: an Anglican Attempt at Counter-Revolution' in G.J. Cumming and D. Baker (eds), *Councils and Assemblies*, *Studies in Church History* 7 (Cambridge, 1971), p. 316.

59 Foster, *Alumni Oxonienses*; WCL, L11/R17, f. 60v; BodL, Tanner 39, f. 180; 40, ff. 34, 41, 74, 199; 43, ff. 27, 29; BL, Harleian 7377, f. 40v; CSPD, 1677-1678, p. 288; A. Thomson, 'Church Discipline: The Operation of the Winchester Consistory Court in the Seventeenth Century', *History* 91 (2006), 358-9.

60 J.P. Boulton, 'The Limits of Formal Religion: the Administration of Holy Communion in Later Elizabethan and Early Stuart England', *London Journal* 10 (1984), 136.

Wars (St Lawrence and St John in the former and St John and Peter Soke in the latter).⁶¹ The number of prolonged sequestrations – the process by which a parish in financial difficulties was placed under a ‘caretaker’ incumbent – signalled continuing problems of diminished resources to maintain fabric, fittings, and clergyman.⁶² The ordinances in the Interregnum, empowering commissioners to examine and recommend change, together with the orders from Cromwell’s Council of State requiring unions and division (e.g. collapsing five Winchester parishes into two), underscored the problem and pointed the direction reform should take, though little was achieved.⁶³ Following the Restoration, an Act of Parliament in 1665, encouraged by Sheldon, referred to ‘the great ruine of many churches and parishes ...’, the low pay, and the attendant risk of preachers ‘complying and suiting their ... teaching to the humour rather than the good of their Auditors’. It empowered, but did not compel, bishops to unite parishes to achieve ‘a competent settled maintenance’ for the new incumbent, while taking care to protect royal receipt of first fruits and tenths.⁶⁴

Following this Act, Morley petitioned the crown in May 1670, claiming to have united ‘some’ smaller ‘much decayed’ and ‘out of repair’ churches in the city of Winchester and asking for exemption of these parishes from arrears of tenths as the new incumbencies could more easily be filled if released from this impost. A royal warrant for ‘pardon and release’ from these arrears in July 1670 was applied to nine churches.⁶⁵ Two of the churches never appear in contemporaneous visitation books and must have long since been redundant; two others, St Thomas and St Clement, had merged by the 1660s and another (St Peter Colebrook) disappears from the books from the 1680s.⁶⁶

Other minor adjustments, not mentioned in the warrant, can also be inferred from the visitation books: Nutley combined with Preston Candover, Yarmouth (Isle of Wight) its church demolished (1636), its incumbent a curate after 1663. Whether these were part of an overall restructuring scheme and on whose initiative is, again, in the absence

61 See, for Southampton, e.g. HRO, A1/29, ff. 42v; HRO, B1/31; J.S. Davies, *History of Southampton* (Southampton, 1883), p. 371; for Winchester, e.g. HRO A1/29, f. 34r.

62 D.M. Owen, *Records of the Established Church of England* (London, 1970), p. 22.

63 *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum 1642–1660*, edited by C.H. Firth and R.S. Rait, 3 vols (London, 1911), II, pp. 142, 1000, 1132; *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series [of the Commonwealth]* [hereafter CSPD *Commonwealth*] 13 vols (London, 1875–86), 1657–1658, p. 376.

64 17 Charles II c.3; Hutton, *Restoration*, p. 213.

65 CSPD, 1670, pp. 194, 347.

66 HRO, A1/33; B1/15; B1/38.

of any written record, too difficult to say.⁶⁷ One definite change was the new parish of Christchurch Southwark, established by Act of Parliament in 1670, because St Saviour's could not accommodate a quarter of its parishioners. The new church was consecrated in October 1671, the first rector instituted in March 1672.⁶⁸

There cannot be much doubt that parochial restructuring in the diocese of Winchester was on far too small a scale and Morley, like his episcopal predecessors and the 'puritan' reformers, was thwarted by lay advowson holders fearful of losing valuable rights of patronage. By the 1680s one or two of Southampton's five churches and seven or eight of Winchester's eleven were usually in sequestration.⁶⁹ Parochial boundaries in the diocese stayed much the same throughout the century. It was a common problem and contemporaries recognised the limitations of the 1665 Act; 'it signifies nothing' was the comment of Seth Ward of Exeter.⁷⁰ Attempts to achieve a better correlation between boundaries and parishioners, together with improved incomes for their clergy thereby, remained largely unaddressed. The reformers had shown the way but their efforts – their warnings – were ignored. The opportunities for reform offered by the Restoration were deferred, and the benefits lost until reforms in subsequent centuries.⁷¹

Clergy Incomes

Bearing more directly on parish clergy incomes than parochial boundaries were augmentations and impropriations. Clergy incomes were of critical importance for the welfare of the Church and could determine whether a parish had a good pastor or even a pastor at all. Low incomes made it difficult to attract able and learned men and those who did join the ministry were likely to be less effective, their standing in the eyes of their parishioners damaged, their ability to admonish the 'good and the great' compromised. Pluralism and working into old age became all too common – because of lack of money – resulting inevitably in much absence, neglect, and senility. Higher rewards

67 HRO, B1/35 (1663); A1/31, f. 24v.

68 P. Norman, 'Accounts of the Overseers of the Poor 1608–1671', *Surrey Archaeological Collections* 16 (1901), 60; HRO, A1/33, p. 42.

69 HRO, Visitation Books.

70 BodL, Clarendon c.305, f. 175; J. Miller, *Cities Divided: Politics and Religion in English Provincial Towns 1660–1722* (Oxford, 2007), pp. 140–2.

71 Bennett, 'Convocation of 1710', p. 317; E.L. Woodward, *Age of Reform 1815–1870* (Oxford, 1939), p. 510.

would, conversely, boost the morale and quality of the clergy, enabling them to command respect, to concentrate on the work of the Church, to speak out on public and personal issues and, at a suitable age, to leave office.

Surviving Parliamentary Surveys show that incomes of rectors and vicars averaged £74 per annum, curates (perpetual and assistant) £20, in the 1650s. This was more than 300 per cent higher than incomes of the 1530s but still had barely kept pace with inflation.⁷² As with parochial boundaries, there had been earlier concern about clerical incomes: Charles I had urged a clerical minimum of £80 per annum and during the Commonwealth and Protectorate, the authorities preferred £100 per annum.⁷³ Even if the parliamentary surveys are not entirely representative, many clergy incomes must have fallen well short of those targets.

The simpler method of reform was augmentation and, in line with Charles I's request, Winchester Cathedral was raising incomes – or requiring lessees to do so – before the Civil Wars for parishes within its gift.⁷⁴ During the Commonwealth and Protectorate commissions of inquiry into stipends, overlapping with those reviewing parish boundaries, were set in train, assets of bishops and cathedrals were 'nationalised' to provide funds, and augmentations begun.⁷⁵ This process came to an end following the Restoration but, the problem having been highlighted, there were some spasmodic efforts to address the issue. Twenty-three years after his father, Charles II was writing, in almost identical terms, about achieving a minimum income of £80 per annum.⁷⁶ Securing a 'competent maintenance' and, thus, the quality of the parish clergy was the professed concern of the Acts of 1665 and 1677.⁷⁷

In response to these pressures there appears to have been some increase in augmentations after the Restoration. Morley himself augmented a

72 See e.g. E.H. Phelps and S.V. Hopkins, 'Seven Centuries of Prices of Consumables', *Economica* 23 (1956), 305, 306; A. Thomson 'The Diocese of Winchester Before and After the English Civil Wars: A Study of the Character and Performance of its Clergy', unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 2004, p. 234.

73 WCL, T43/7/3; *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum*, II, p. 142.

74 WCL, L7/R12, L10/15.

75 LPL, Commonwealth Surveys, XII/A/7, 14, 15, 16, 21; TNA, C94/4; WCL, W52/76, W52/82; *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum*, I, p. 879, II, p. 81; CSPD Commonwealth, II–XIII; W.A. Shaw, *History of the English Church*, 2 vols (London, 1900), II, p. 496.

76 CSPD, 1660–1661, p. 183.

77 17 Charles II c.3; 29 Charles II c.8.

number of parishes. He purchased a manor in 1674 for £816, producing income of £51 per annum, some of which was assigned to Whitchurch. A larger purchase, costing £1065, generated £56 per annum which was to be shared between the parishes of Binstead (Isle of Wight), Holy Rood (Southampton) and St Maurice (Winchester).⁷⁸ Finally, in his will, the income of Farnham was augmented by £20 per annum, Horsell by £10 per annum; the Guildford parishes, St Mary and Holy Trinity, were to be united and to receive an extra £20 per annum.⁷⁹

Further augmentations were made by Winchester Cathedral which gave an extra £8 per annum to its parish of Christchurch before the Interregnum, and £54 per annum after the Restoration, the largest amounts so far discovered.⁸⁰ They claimed to be spending between £470 and £537 per annum on augmentations in the 1660s and 1670s.⁸¹ Evidence also exists of a few other modest augmentations: at Andover and Comb from the patron and Bisley where the rector obliged.⁸² It is not possible to establish how widespread this policy was and whether it had been inspired by Morley's efforts, but other bishops and ecclesiastical institutions were making similar efforts.⁸³ Morley was also mindful that many parish clergy were married and recognised the hardship experienced by some clergy widows and their families. He therefore founded a 'college' (almshouses) for them in the Outer Cathedral Close.⁸⁴

If the attempts to increase clergy incomes – less than fifteen rectories and vicarages (out of some 320) and one or two chapelries (out of some 120) – bear any resemblance to the total, however, they were miniscule. The bishopric of Winchester was one of the richest in the kingdom with a substantial portfolio of 60 properties and its revenues came therefore in the form of fines – an initial 'lump sum' paid by the lessee on assuming or renewing a lease – and rents.⁸⁵ The rent incomes of the bishop remained remarkably static, some rents never rising in

78 LPL, Laudian Papers 943/805.

79 TNA, Prob 11/377.

80 WCL, L7/R12, f. 80, L12/R18, f. 22v.

81 WCL, W41/9, W52/76; BodL, Tanner 140, ff. 117, 123.

82 HRO, E15/3, E15/26; LMA, DW/PC/5/1712/15.

83 BodL, Tanner 128, f. 57; 130, f. 66; 141, f. 101; 144, ff. 8, 9; Whiteman, 'Seth Ward', pp. 589, 592; Green, *Re-establishment*, pp. 109, 110.

84 LPL, Laudian Papers 943/805.

85 HRO, 11M59/B1/315, B1/323. For a fuller discussion of bishop's income and comparisons, see Thomson, 'Diocese of Winchester', p. 211; A. Thomson, 'Estate Management in the Winchester Diocese Before and After the Interregnum: A Missed Opportunity', *Hampshire Studies* 61 (2006), 193.

the 160 or 170 or so years from the Reformation to the beginning of the eighteenth century – itself a sign of neglect.⁸⁶ Fines, though concealed under a smoke screen of words and lacking proper records, probably rose; but the practice of abating – discounting – fines for their lessees, especially at the Restoration, markedly diminished the potential from this source.⁸⁷ It was left to the bishop's discretion, moreover, to decide how much of his revenues to keep for himself, how much to spend on 'public' concerns such as augmentation. All this was true also of the other wealthy diocesan institution, the cathedral, and Morley, though visitor, seems never to have contemplated control over its property policy.⁸⁸ None of this was unique to Winchester which would have made it more difficult to break ranks.⁸⁹ Lax management, surrender to gentry and noble clients, and a certain amount of selfishness therefore prevailed in Winchester and elsewhere.⁹⁰

More complex was the question of impropriation – the diversion of the endowments of a parish from the incumbent to 'outsiders' who enjoyed the revenues and either paid the vicar a small sum from the profits or allowed him to receive the lesser tithes.

The cathedral, as well as numerous individual laymen, took possession of parishes from their monastic predecessors and were the 'outsiders' who creamed off parochial revenues. Winchester Cathedral owned nine rectories in the diocese which it leased out. Its rectory at Christchurch, for example, could produce an income of £800 per annum and was frequently re-leased for rent of £58 per annum and an entry fine, payable at renewals, of £450, while the lessee presumably enjoyed the annual £800. The critical questions are the numbers and the values of impropriations. Too much information is missing to estimate the value of all impropriations in the diocese but, from surviving documents,

86 HRO, 11M59, E2, 1556-42, 43, 44.

87 E.g. HRO, 11M59/E2/1556-42; C. Clay, 'Greed of Whig Bishops? Church Landlords and their Lessees, 1660-1760', *Past and Present* 87 (1980), 157; F. Heal, *Of Prelates and Princes. A Study of the Economic and Social Position of the Tudor Episcopate* (Cambridge, 1980), p. 58; Whiteman, 'Seth Ward', p. 451; BodL, Tanner 141, f. 101.

88 Thomson, 'Diocese of Winchester', p. 224; WCL, L7/R12, L12/R15, T4/1/5, T4/3/3, W56-2/6; BodL, Tanner 140, f. 123.

89 P. Hembry, *Bishops of Bath and Wells 1540-1640* (London, 1967), pp. 134, 243; I. Atherton and B.A. Holderness, 'Dean and Chapter Estates', in I. Atherton (ed.), *Norwich Cathedral: Church, City, and Diocese 1096-1996* (London, 1996), p. 668; M. Bowker, 'Historical Survey 1450-1750', in D. Owen (ed.), *History of Lincoln Minster* (Cambridge, 1994), p. 187; D. Johnson, 'Estates and Income 1540-1714', in D. Keene (ed.), *St Paul's: Cathedral Church of London 604-2004* (London, 2004), pp. 309-10.

90 See Clay, 'Greed of Whig Bishops?', 129, 136-7.

Winchester Cathedral Impropriations Mid 17th Century

	Profit	Fine	Rent	Income
Alton	£200		£25	£40
Barton Stacey	£240	£100	£23	£ 7
Christchurch	£800	£450	£58	£ 8
Hursley	£180	£330	£35	
Preston Candover	£ 66	£ 60	£ 6	£20
Romsey	£200		£26	£26
Titchfield	£550		£31	£30
Winchester St Laurence	£100			£19

Explanations: *Profit* = the gross annual profit; *Fine* = the entry fine; *Rent* = the annual rent payable to the cathedral; *Income* = the amount payable by the lessee to the incumbent, not necessarily his total, e.g. the vicar of Candover was to receive in addition the smaller tithes; while at Christchurch he received, over the £8, income from the cathedral of £26, augmentation from the cathedral of £54, and other amounts, e.g. Easter Offerings (WCL, W41/9; W52/7; T4 3/7/4) – the £26 was still £26 in 1770 (HRO, E15/23).

Sources: WCL, L6/R10-L17/R24, W52/76+82; *Diary of John Young*, ed. F.R. Goodman (London, 1928), pp. 96, 121, 122, 121, 148.

Providers of Income: clear at e.g. Christchurch – the lessee paid – others, not clear, e.g. Alton.

numbers totalled about a third of rectories and vicarages and a quarter of the chapels, proportions similar to the Elizabethan diocese of London and to Restoration Salisbury.⁹¹ There are examples of generosity, as at Whitsbury, where the impropiator gave all his profit to the vicar, but staggering disparities between the huge sums siphoned in impropriations and the meagre incomes of the clergy were all too common. Amounts, ranging from £50 to £500, if transferred to the local clergy, would have improved parochial salaries out of all recognition and would have done much to raise their standing and independence. The issue had been 'on the agenda' of William Laud in the 1630s and the parliamentary revolutionaries in the 1640s, but nothing had been done – certainly not at Winchester – when Morley assumed control of the diocese.⁹²

91 E.g. BL, Harleian 595, ff. 213-250 (1603) is one of the best survivals and numbers do not seem to have changed much over the century; H.G. Owen, 'London Parish Clergy in the Reign of Elizabeth I', unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1957, p. 359; Whiteman, 'Seth Ward', p. 287.

92 *The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God William Laud*, edited by W. Scott and J. Bliss, 7 vols. (Oxford, 1847-60), III, p. 255; H. Trevor Roper, *Archbishop Laud* (London, 1962), pp. 107-9; Shaw, *English Church*, II, p. 477.

With augmentations, at least, there was progress; not so with impropriations which appear to have continued, cathedral and lay, intact. To give two examples in addition to Winchester Cathedral, at Nether Wallop the vicars choral of York took £300 per annum, while the vicar had to make do with £40 per annum; at Okewood Chapel the impropiator received £200, leaving John Evelyn's brother to pay the curate.⁹³ This meant that large numbers of impropriations – about a third of rectories and vicarages and a quarter of the chapels – persisted and significant amounts of money eluded rectors, vicars, and curates. The bishops of Winchester had no impropriations of their own to manipulate and their guilt, including Morley's, lay in failing to tackle those who did. Instead all was thwarted, by discreet pressure, if not howls of anguish, from the impropiators; buying them out or simply abolishing them was not an option in Laudian, Cromwellian, or Morleyian times.

The outcome was that by the end of the century, clergy stipends were still too low. Evidence assembled for 127 rectories and vicarages suggests the average of £74 per annum for the 1650s had hardly changed, although it must be noted that Ecton's *Liber Valorum* and the *Notitia Parochialis* were compiled in the early eighteenth century to demonstrate the existence of poorer parishes. Some 66 incumbents – over 20 per cent of all rectors and vicars in the diocese and over 50 per cent of this sample – received less than £50 per annum. Furthermore, perpetual curates faced the ultimate challenge of living on some £30 per annum.⁹⁴ Winchester's lower stipends were, however, not unique.⁹⁵ The consequent problems of parochial pluralism – a quarter of incumbents had two parishes in 1675 – and of old age, with 21 incumbents over 80 in 1675, continued to weaken the church's mission.⁹⁶ Inflation appears, fortunately, to have stabilised at this time and purchasing power to have improved. On Gregory King's general scale of incomes, however, £70 or £80 would have placed the clergy of Winchester between greater and lesser freeholders, £50 into the realms of farmers and tradesmen, £20 on the level of servants, and labourers.⁹⁷ All would have come well below merchants, gentry, and lawyers, let alone knights and peers – the people with power and influence in

93 HRO, E15/89; J. Aubrey, *Natural History and Antiquities of the County of Surrey*, 4 vols (Dorking, 1975), IV, p. 82.

94 HRO, B1/55.

95 Whiteman, 'Seth Ward', p. 321; Pruett, *Parish Clergy*, p. 82; Gregory, *Restoration*, pp. 161–2; Spaeth, *Church in Danger*, pp. 34–8.

96 Thomson, 'Diocese of Winchester', pp. 101, 104.

97 C. Davenant, *Political and Commercial Works*, 5 vols (London, 1771), II, p. 184.

Survey of the Incomes of Rectors and Vicars

	Commonwealth	Late 17 th /early 18 th century
£300 +	1 (1.3%)	5 (3.9%)
£200 – £200-19s	2 (2.6%)	10 (7.9%)
£100 – £199-19s	21 (26.9%)	24 (18.9%)
£50 – £99-19s	26 (33.4%)	22 (17.3%)
£20 – £49-19s	20 (25.6%)	53 (41.7%)
Below £19-19s	8 (10.3%)	13 (10.2%)
Total Number of Parishes	78	127

Sources: LPL, XII/A/7, 14, 15, 16, 21; TNA, C94/4; WCL, W52/76, W52/82; HRO, 35M48 16/160; LMA, DW/S-73, 57; Aubrey, *Natural History*, passim; J. Ecton, *Liber Valorum et Decimarum* (London, 1711); LPL, *Notitia Parochialis*, MS 960 (1705); HRO, B1/55.

the community. Small wonder that Archbishops Burnet and Sharp continued their campaign for augmentation which culminated in Queen Anne's Bounty; small wonder that impropriations continued to provoke the outrage of Aubrey, Evelyn, and Ecton.⁹⁸

IV Conclusion

George Morley brought fresh drive to the pastoral oversight of the diocese of Winchester. He combined moderation and firmness in his enforcement of religious uniformity. Building on the work of Duppa, he revived and strengthened episcopal administration – certainly ordinations, institutions, confirmations, visitations – at Winchester after fourteen years of abolition. Some areas – confirmation and visitations in particular – received far closer scrutiny during his tenure than under his predecessors, his contemporaries, or his successors. Reinvisitation was the distinctive feature of the diocese under Morley, in his early years, at least; purpose and resolve the watchwords of his administration. In these he was challenged perhaps by Ward of Salisbury, rivalled by Croft of Hereford and Fuller of Lincoln, and possibly outshone only by Compton of London.

Supervision began to suffer in his later years. Ordinations and institutions continued, the former at one of his palaces, the latter with the help of his officials, and neither involving extensive travel. He

98 A. Savidge, *Foundations of Queen Anne's Bounty* (London, 1955), pp. 12, 16; G.F.A. Best, *Temporal Pillars. Queen Anne's Bounty, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and the Church of England* (Cambridge, 1964), p. 30; Aubrey, *Natural History*, III, p. 126, IV, p. 82; J. Ecton, *Thesaurum Rerum Ecclesiasticarum* (London, 1742), p. iv.

appears to have been absent from his last visitations and confirmations were probably abandoned in consequence. Much of this was inevitable and 'systemic'. Bishops, particularly Winchester's, had political responsibilities. Morley combined his diocesan commitments with membership of the House of Lords where he was heavily involved, for example, in the Conventicle and Test Acts.⁹⁹ He served for four years on the Privy Council which, to take one particular period, required attendance more than once a week over six months in 1675–76.¹⁰⁰ Nor did bishops retire in the seventeenth century: instead they 'soldiered on', or languished, as the case may be, to the inevitable cost of effective governance. In 1684 Morley entered his 87th year, plagued by such illness that he could hardly see or walk.¹⁰¹

Reform was destined, not surprisingly, to remain a mirage. The consistory court declined to near extinction by the 1680s and 90s – a far from unique development – its problems too great for even a Sancroft or an Atterbury to resolve. If Morley had a reform programme it was timid and minute – a few augmentations and closure of a handful of long since redundant churches – while rents remained static, impropiators sacrosanct. In these he was blocked, by the vested interests of innately conservative incumbents and parishioners, together with selfishness of patrons, lessees, and impropiators and, thus, all hope of reform was thwarted. All this – and worse – was equally true of his fellow bishops. They too were stalled by implacable opposition, they too were old and ill.¹⁰² Reform was postponed first until Queen Anne's Bounty and then the reforms of the nineteenth century.¹⁰³

None of this should be allowed to overshadow Morley's positive achievements. He surpassed most of his contemporaries – Ward, Croft, and Fuller among them – and he at least broached reform issues. He was, above all, a conscientious and humane bishop and if, lacking major reform, not truly great, his was, nonetheless, an impressive episcopate and one which compares favourably with those of his contemporary diocesans.

99 Simon, *Restoration Episcopate*, pp. 72, 78, 79, 84, 131.

100 TNA, PC2/64, p. 468, PC2/68, p. 1, PC2/65, PC2/66; Thomson 'Diocese of Winchester', Chapter 2.

101 BodL, Tanner 39, f. 180; 40, ff. 34, 41, 74, 199; 43, ff. 27, 29; BL, Harleian 7377, f. 40v; CSPD, 1677–1678, p. 288.

102 Marshall, 'Administration of Hereford and Oxford', p. 234; Simon, *Restoration Episcopate*, p. 16; BL, Harleian 7377, ff. 47v, 55r, 56r, 58r, 62v; 3784, f. 77, 3785, f. 262; BodL, Additional MS c.308, ff. 14r, 109r; Whiteman, 'Seth Ward', p. 193.

103 I.M. Green, 'The First Years of Queen Anne's Bounty', in F. Heal and R. O'Day (eds), *Princes and Paupers in the English church 1500–1800* (Leicester, 1981), p. 232; Woodward, *Age of Reform*, p. 510.