

## CHICHESTER DIOCESE IN THE EARLY 17TH CENTURY

*by Andrew Foster*

This article originated in a short paper given at the Sussex Archaeological Society's conference held in March 1983 on the theme 'Sussex in the 17th Century'.<sup>1</sup> It is very difficult to form an impression of what a diocese was like in the early 17th century and most descriptions tend to rely upon a few isolated quotations from contemporaries, regional analyses of parishes, and discussion of the location and strength of Puritanism and Catholicism within the diocese in question. This article represents another way of looking at the diocese of Chichester designed to complement the more traditional perspectives well sketched already by historians like Roger Manning and Anthony Fletcher.<sup>2</sup>

What follows is an overtly subjective and elitist approach to this topic which makes no concessions to the perfectly valid claims of those who might say that we really ought to consider the reality of 'popular religion' at the time, be it that of the laity or the ordinary clergy. That approach offers scope for many articles to follow.<sup>3</sup> This article has more limited objectives and revolves around the idea of trying to imagine what it would be like to be a fairly senior cleric in the church seeking to become a bishop in the 17th century. How would one see Chichester diocese? What would be its attractions and shortcomings? What were the clergy like? Was it a very large and prestigious see? Did it provide a good income? Were the palaces comfortable and in good repair? Did the see provide a London residence? How might one expect to get on with the Dean and Chapter at the Cathedral? In other words, would it be a very congenial diocese in which to settle? This rather irreverent line of questioning should

prove thought-provoking, even if it does not afford a complete picture of the diocese in the 17th century.

Seven bishops were posted to Chichester diocese between 1596 and 1669. They were in order: Anthony Watson (1596-1605), Lancelot Andrewes (1605-9), Samuel Harsnett (1609-19), George Carleton (1619-28), Richard Mountague (1628-38), Brian Duppa (1638-41) and Henry King (1642-69). Despite this apparent popularity, which had of course little to do with any freedom of choice of the clerics themselves, it is my contention that, comparatively speaking, the diocese of Chichester did not have much to recommend it in the early 17th century.

If one starts with the very briefest description, the diocese was roughly coterminous with the straggling county of Sussex, immensely difficult to traverse and administer, as the Sussex Archaeological Society and other organizations which attempt to cross the now divided county find to this day. Worse still, from the bishop's point of view, it contained within it peculiars belonging to the Archbishop of Canterbury—namely the deaneries of Pagham, Tarring and South Malling—and also the partially exempt jurisdiction of the Dean of Chichester, comprising the city itself.<sup>4</sup> Many dioceses encompassed peculiar jurisdictions, which simply posed irritating problems of authority and administration from time to time, the Savoy in London being a notorious haunt of troublemakers for this reason. But it must have been doubly disconcerting for the bishops of Chichester that if they had problems they could involve the Dean or their ultimate superior, the

Archbishop of Canterbury, and the city of Chichester itself was a maze of jurisdictions. Moreover, the diocese was split into two archdeaconries, Lewes to the east and Chichester to the west, which were virtually autonomous and very different in character. Anthony Fletcher has ably demonstrated how Puritanism was rampant in the east, while Catholicism survived amongst gentry families close to the Hampshire border. Two caveats to this argument ought to be noted. First, the problem of the Archbishop's peculiars would have been lessened during Harsnett's episcopate because he served as Dean of Archbishop Abbot's peculiars between 1611 and 1618. Secondly, although the two archdeaconries did pose very different problems for the Bishop, the actual powers of the archdeacons in the diocese had long since been severely curtailed and they were much more under the control of the Bishop than in other dioceses, something Harsnett appreciated ruefully when he moved to Norwich.<sup>5</sup>

Chichester was one of the smaller of the 26 dioceses of England and Wales.<sup>6</sup> According to one calculation by Roger Manning for the Elizabethan period, it came about nineteenth out of the 26 in terms of population.<sup>7</sup> The diocese was made up of between 250 and 300 parishes, with Lewes slightly the larger of the two archdeaconries. Such different figures are noteworthy in themselves, for it is possible that the bishops of the 17th century may have been no clearer about the precise number of parishes over which they presided. Boundary changes, the counting of chapels, amalgamation of livings, and the possible inclusion or exclusion of peculiars all help to explain why we have varying estimates for the number of parishes between Bishop Barlow's survey of 1563 and the Compton Census of 1676.<sup>8</sup>

There is, however, possibly a little more to say about the celebrated survey of 1603, and here we have an indication of the kind of problems faced by the bishops of Chichester. In response to a request for information in that year by Archbishop Whitgift, Bishop Watson

delivered details of 250 parishes in his diocese.<sup>9</sup> Worried by the forthcoming Hampton Court Conference, Whitgift and Watson were anxious to refute Puritan claims that the diocese was served by insufficient or inadequate ministers. Hence, Watson supplied the further figure of 211 preachers who apparently served the above number of parishes, of whom 152 were graduates, an amazingly high 72 per cent. At first sight this seems like corroboration for Rosemary O'Day's thesis that this period witnessed a fundamental change in the educational training and background of clergy.<sup>10</sup> Moreover, this fits the picture so recently presented in this journal by Peter Jenkins, confirming that Chichester was in the forefront of this graduate take-over of the church. Where some dioceses to the north, like Lichfield and Coventry, could barely muster 25 per cent graduate clergy in the early 1600s, the Chichester figure more than doubled that and was rising rapidly.<sup>11</sup>

Unfortunately, there are good reasons to doubt this extremely rosy picture of Chichester diocese, at least in 1603. Puritans in the diocese presented two major petitions to the King in that year and one of them maintained:

the number of churches in their country is about 300, of which the impropriations are 108. The insufficient maintenances are many, and of them 23 not above £16 by the year, and some of £4 or £5. Double beneficed men about 50. Single and yet non-resident 6. Non preaching 100. Negligent in preaching about 60. Of all these many are scandalous for corrupt life or doctrine.<sup>12</sup>

Thanks to the work of Ken Fincham, it now looks likely that Whitgift and Watson conflated the list of licensed and unlicensed preachers which had the happy effect of exaggerating the number of preachers available in the diocese. Examination of the *libri cleri* for this period suggests that only 115 ministers were strictly eligible to preach.<sup>13</sup> Another way of creating a

favourable impression of the ratio of preachers to parishes was simply to provide a low figure for the number of parishes, hence perhaps the difference between the two estimates of 250 and 300 in 1603.

The situation did improve rapidly, for while most attention has been focused on the deprivation of Puritan ministers, including ten from Sussex, in the aftermath of the Hampton Court Conference, Ken Fincham has recently highlighted Watson's speed in examining candidates for preaching licences and in setting up vocational training for the less able clergy of the diocese.<sup>14</sup>

Just as there are problems in calculating how many parishes there were in the 17th century, so there are difficulties in describing the financial position of the see. Technically, the diocese was worth approximately £677 per annum, which placed it twelfth out of the 26 English and Welsh sees.<sup>15</sup> Yet that position is flattering, for Winchester, at the top of the tree, was worth four times that amount and Bristol was closer at hand at the bottom of the ladder, worth £294. In a very uneven pyramid of sees, Chichester was firmly in the lower category of those worth below £1,000, and indeed shrinking in value. When Anthony Watson was appointed Bishop in 1596, the Queen instructed officers of the Exchequer:

As the revenues of the Bishop are but small and during the payment of first fruits, etc. to us, he has not had a competent living to maintain the dignity of his place, and chargeable attendance upon us as our Almoner . . . we are content to give him six years for payment thereof . . .<sup>16</sup>

Not only was Watson given six years over which to pay his first fruits and tenths, but the see was now valued at just over £609, a drop of £68, and that after a frantic period of inflation in the late 16th century.

It was the same story when Lancelot Andrewes gained the see in 1605. He was

granted a licence to retain his prebend of St. Paul's Cathedral for two years 'on account of the poverty of his bishopric, with dispensation of all statutes of non-residence, etc.'<sup>17</sup> George Carleton became bishop in 1619, but he seems to have overestimated his good fortune on moving from poverty-stricken Llandaff, for within one year he too was having to plead with the Privy Council for more time to pay first fruits and tenths, having given too much, he claimed, towards the war fund for the Palatinate.<sup>18</sup>

There were other ways in which the fortunes of the see had slipped since the 16th century. No longer was a magnificent London residence available to the bishop in Chancery Lane; this was in the process of being swallowed completely by Lincoln's Inn in the 17th century. Bishop Sherburne had been forced to hand it over on a 99-year lease to one of Henry VIII's courtiers in 1535; a court case a century later failed to regain it for the see.<sup>19</sup>

The use of Amberley Castle had been lost in similar fashion in 1588.<sup>20</sup> The key residences which thus remained for the bishops in the 17th century were those of Chichester Palace and Aldingbourne, but both required some expenditure to make them really habitable. Andrewes spent over £420 on these two places between 1606 and 1609, but he is not known as a bishop who actually stayed here more than he needed.<sup>21</sup> Although Richard Mountague spent a lot of time at Petworth, he too carried out extensive repairs at Chichester and Aldingbourne, particularly the latter, which, he informed Secretary Windebank, was quite transformed in 1632.<sup>22</sup> No sooner had poor Henry King spent money on making Chichester Palace more to his liking than the siege of Chichester during the Civil War ruined his handiwork in 1642.<sup>23</sup>

Why was the see in such a parlous financial state? The answer lies in the reign of Elizabeth, that great 'asset-stripper' of the Church of England. Whatever attempts are now being made to show that the loss was not as dramatic as we were once told by Christopher Hill, there is no denying that the Church was weakened

during her reign.<sup>24</sup> And Chichester serves as a classic example of that process. In a forced exchange of property for impropriations in 1561, the see lost eight estates out of approximately 13 ancient episcopal manors. These included the manors of Heathfield, Bishopstone, Ticehurst, Bexhill, Sidlesham and Selsey. Worth a nominal figure of £228 in 1561, Bishop Barlow was granted impropriations in exchange worth roughly the same figure, but while the value of the latter barely altered, inflation saw the value of the property rise dramatically and Bishop Mountague calculated ruefully that the lost manors were probably worth £2,500 in 1634.<sup>25</sup>

The loss of the manors affected the bishops of Chichester in more ways than one. With them went the last episcopal foothold in the archdeaconry of Lewes. This reduction in the Bishop's potential influence in the east was not helped by the geographical location of those livings to which he had the direct power to appoint clergy. The 17th-century bishops of Chichester held the advowsons of some 30 livings, apart that is from the prebendaries of the Cathedral, but of those 30 livings only 11 were in the archdeaconry of Lewes. Moreover, the majority of those, like Henfield, Cowfold, Cuckfield and Brighton were far closer to Chichester than places like Bexhill and Icklesham, the farthest point of the Bishop's influence to the east.<sup>26</sup>

It is hardly surprising that a recurrent theme of reports on this diocese should involve a distinction between east and west. In people like John Drury, Clement Corbett and William Nevile, the bishops of Chichester could call upon the services of extremely well qualified lawyers to serve as chancellors of the diocese. They were far better qualified than the lawyers who served most dioceses, probably because of the proximity of London, where these people also held responsible posts in the central administration of the Church. Drury was appointed directly by the Privy Council to assist Watson in the hunt for Puritans in 1603.

Clement Corbett was Master of Trinity Hall, Cambridge between 1611 and 1626 and Professor of Law at Gresham College, London before taking up his appointment at Chichester in 1614.<sup>27</sup> Yet even these high-fliers could achieve little in a legal system which was heavily dependent upon the co-operation of parish churchwardens. This simply echoes Anthony Fletcher's well-told story of regular visitations at episcopal and archidiaconal level, visitations which met with increasing resistance and dwindling presentments as the country edged closer to civil war.<sup>28</sup> A survey of churches in 1602 revealed that a large number stood in need of repair, with problems ranging from simple lack of books and ornaments to more significant structural matters.<sup>29</sup> A similar survey in 1636 revealed at least 202 items amiss in only 21 churches, yet only one of these problems had been picked up in an earlier visitation. Twelve fonts were found to be unusable; the steeples at Chidham and Stoughton were about to fall down, and pews everywhere were in disarray.<sup>30</sup>

In a recent dissertation based on the published churchwardens' presentments for the 1620s, Sharon Hannaford has provided further evidence that the system was breaking down during that period.<sup>31</sup> Boxgrove deanery appears to have been particularly neglected, and nearly three quarters of its churches were reported to have problems at least once in the 1620s. A need for chancel repairs was noted eight times at Compton; the parsonage at North Marden 13 times.<sup>32</sup> Certain lay impropiators became notorious, such as Roger Barwicke, who was responsible for the chancels at Compton, Racton and Upmarden. He was reported on no less than six occasions in the 1620s, for at Upmarden the chancel was 'far gone to ruin' and 'so full of pigeons dung and other filth . . . the people are not able to endure the ill and noisome smell'.<sup>33</sup> Boxgrove deanery was probably no worse than any other in the diocese, but it was significantly closer to Chichester.

Bishops like Harsnett and Mountague were particularly energetic in their efforts to root out

clerical and lay non-conformists in the diocese, but it was one thing to draw up impressive articles of visitation and quite another to achieve results. Sanguine reports became the order of the day. In an annual report of 1634, Archbishop Laud informed the King:

My lord of Chichester certified all very well in his diocese, save only in the east part, which is far from him; he finds that some puritan justices of the peace have awed some of the clergy into like opinions with themselves, which yet of late have not broken into any public inconformity.<sup>34</sup>

A similar papering-over of the cracks took place when Duppa was bishop. All was reported to be well in 1639, 'saving that of late there hath happened some little disorder in the east parts of the diocese about Lewes, which we are taking care to settle as well as we can'.<sup>35</sup>

The feeling that the bishops were not really in control of the diocese is compounded by the evidence of Laud's metropolitanical visitation of 1635. Nathaniel Brent's reports indicate how exceptional the circumstances had to be before Puritan ministers were brought to book. After a salutary conversation with Brent, we are informed that 'Mr. Speed of St. Pancras in Chichester, confessed his error in being too popular in the pulpit, and is very willing the gallery in his parish church should be pulled down, which was built to receive strangers'.<sup>36</sup> Three ministers at Arundel (Messrs. Nye, Salisbury and Hill) were 'so vehemently suspected to be non-conformists, that although nothing was confessed or proved against them, I thought fit to inhibit them to preach until I could be better satisfied of them'.<sup>37</sup>

The story was much the same at Lewes where four ministers (Messrs. Bunyard, Maynard, Russell and Giles) 'refused in open court to bow at the blessed name of Jesus, being by me questioned for it. After long conference, and late at night, they all submitted, confessing that they were convinced in their opinions, and

hereafter they would observe that law of the church'.<sup>38</sup> There seem some shades of the Spanish Inquisition about this case! It is highly doubtful whether these ministers really conformed, and this report, far from showing how effective the authorities were, simply serves to underline the problems faced by the bishops of Chichester in extracting obedience from their clergy.

If the situation would have looked gloomy in the diocese at large, what of nearer home with Chichester Cathedral and its Dean and Chapter? It is doubtful whether the bishops would have derived much comfort here. William Camden may have thought the Cathedral 'very fair and neat' in the 1580s,<sup>39</sup> but its steeple was always a topic of concern, even before its celebrated collapse in 1861, and by 1635 the building was reported to be 'somewhat out of repair, especially one tower'.<sup>40</sup> This was the north-west tower and in 1636 a large part of it came crashing down. A contemporary estimate for the cost of repairs was nearly £3,500, quite a sum by 17th-century standards and put in perspective by a glance at what has already been said of the Bishop's income.<sup>41</sup> Christopher Wren submitted designs to remodel the entire west end of the Cathedral, but nothing substantial was undertaken until as late as 1901.<sup>42</sup>

Nor was all always well within the Close. In a series of orders in 1611 Bishop Harsnett had to chastise the vicars for 'unreverend gestures and unseemly talking' during times of divine service.<sup>43</sup> Several of the cathedral's officers appear to have had a drink problem! Harsnett had to discipline the verger, sexton and others for scandalous behaviour in alehouses.<sup>44</sup> For all that he was one of the finest musicians of his day, Thomas Weelkes, the cathedral organist, was found guilty in court on several occasions 'noted and famed for a common drunkard and a notorious swearer and blasphemer'.<sup>45</sup> Even the canons of the cathedral could sometimes misbehave. Bishop Mountague found occasion to complain about William Hickes in 1632, because he refused to attend to his teaching

duties as West Wittering prebendary personally, and sent as substitutes 'whom he can get, sometimes good, sometimes bad, any riff-raff, whom he can light upon, shifters, unconfirmitants, curates, young boys, puritans, as the whole city hath often spoken against it'.<sup>46</sup>

A running feud between the Corporation of Chichester and the Dean and Chapter over rights in the Close and Cathedral, and also the city charters, could not have made the atmosphere a pleasant one for the Bishop when he resided in his city palace. This seems to have affected Harsnett in particular, for in an exasperated letter to the Earl of Arundel in December 1617 he wrote:

If your lordship had but the least taste of the unsavoury government of Chichester, you would do like Almighty God,—spew both it and them out of your mouth.<sup>47</sup>

Harsnett was thought by contemporaries to be 'such a furious Hildebrand, that like Davus in the Comedie, he perturbed all things where ever he came', so perhaps we should not take this outspoken comment too seriously.<sup>48</sup> Yet Brent too, found cause to complain in 1635:

The mayor and his brethren came not to visit me, because I lodged in the close, there being some difference between them and the dean and prebendaries. They are puritanically addicted, which caused me to convent publicly, and canonically admonish one of the aldermen for putting his hat on in time of divine service.<sup>49</sup>

An order that the Bishop and his chancellor should serve on the commission of peace for the town in 1636 only served to prolong disputes.<sup>50</sup>

So what were the advantages, if any, of coming to this see? It seems to have been small, but difficult to manage. The basic assets—churches, Cathedral, and palaces—appear to have been in great need of repair. While the see possessed a high number of educated clergy,

that does not seem to have made them particularly obedient. Finally, it does not appear to have been very pleasant, for Harsnett at least, living in Chichester. Indeed, if one goes by the records, few of the bishops, apart from Carleton who was politically in the wilderness, and the Laudians later acting under instructions, seem to have spent more than the summers in the diocese if they could help it. Harsnett may have done, but then he was escaping from his responsibilities as Master of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, from which post he was eventually removed in 1616.

What, then, did the see have to commend it? Clearly, it did give one a bishopric and thus a step up the clerical ladder and that may have been very significant in the 17th century when so many bishops came from humble backgrounds. It did provide a seat in the House of Lords, albeit as a rather inferior peer. Chichester possessed the big advantage of being near to centres of influence such as Whitehall and Lambeth Palace and the routes north-south across the county were much better than those east-west. And, indeed, its convenient location seems to have influenced the selection of the bishops in the early 17th century. For all of the seven bishops, if one counts Carleton's service at the court of Prince Charles, were royal chaplains; Watson and Andrewes served as Royal Almoner and Duppa was tutor to the future Charles II. These were essentially court bishops and Andrewes in particular was always in demand with James I as a preacher.

Given the relative poverty and size of the see, it is also not really surprising that it was used to give people a start in their episcopal careers. This is suggested both by the relatively high turnover of seven bishops during this period, and also by the fact that for all but Carleton, who came from lowly Llandaff in Wales, this was their first see. In spite of his good family connections, Carleton was always an outsider and owed his selection for Chichester purely to the fact that he was one of the English representatives sent to the Synod of

Dort in 1617–18.<sup>51</sup> Carleton saw out his days in Chichester, Watson died unexpectedly early, but all the rest except King, who was caught by the Civil War and died here after the Restoration, moved on to enjoy fairly distinguished careers in the Church. Andrewes moved on to Ely and Winchester; Harsnett to Norwich and York; Mountague to Norwich; and Duppa to Salisbury and later Winchester after the Restoration.

Of all the bishops of this period, Richard Mountague probably made the most determined effort to come to grips with the problems of the see. He is the hero or villain of Anthony Fletcher's chapter on Arminianism—depending on which way one looks at it. Yet all he really succeeded in doing was in making himself very unpopular in his attempts to transform the interiors of churches and to rid the see of Puritans. Likewise, his assault on tenants of episcopal properties, where he deliberately set out 'to pick holes in the leases to void them', was scarcely honourable.<sup>52</sup> Even his influence with King Charles I and Archbishop Laud could not ensure the return of the London residence or the lost manor of Selsey in 1634.

It is very difficult to assess the work of the bishops of Chichester during this period. Some were here longer than others and have left more records. Some were greater self-publicists, and indeed there is a need to be cautious in our assessment of Mountague, for on his arrival in the diocese he had no hesitation in writing to Secretary Dorchester that he found it 'miserably depopulated, especially by his last two predecessors'.<sup>53</sup> A contemporary observed that 'he was a sharp wit, would be barking at everybody', but there could be much noise and little action.<sup>54</sup> Certainly, Anthony Fletcher's final

assessment was that Mountague 'preferred to cosset himself in the remoteness of his palace at Aldingbourne than to live in the rough and tumble of Chichester's factional politics'.<sup>55</sup> There is evidence that Carleton sat regularly in his consistory court and may well have attended conscientiously to his pastoral duties. Even Harsnett, ever a controversial figure, seems to have conducted a fairly thorough campaign to improve the condition of Sussex churches in 1610. Much work remains to be done before we are in a position to comment more fully.<sup>56</sup>

I hope that this short article has fulfilled a number of objectives. First, that it has illustrated some difficulties involved in looking at dioceses in the past, suggested several perspectives worthy of consideration, while also revealing, albeit mostly by implication, that much more comparative material should be used when attempting this kind of task. Secondly, that the article has increased awareness of problems of diocesan administration in days of poor communications. Finally, that it has highlighted some practical and economic constraints ever-present in 17th-century diocesan affairs.

Unlike several other sees, the offer of Chichester was not refused by aspiring clerics in the early 17th century, and perhaps when all is said and done, a mundane yet good reason for coming here would be the climate, which was certainly the envy of many a cleric in the north. Archbishop Laud's chaplain and biographer, Peter Heylyn, records the story that Richard Neile initially resisted a move to prestigious York in 1632 because 'he was warm at Winchester'.<sup>57</sup> This attitude becomes quite understandable in the light of suggestions that Europe underwent a 'Little Ice Age' in the 17th century!<sup>58</sup>

*Author:* Andrew Foster, West Sussex Institute of Higher Education, Bognor, Sussex.

#### Notes

<sup>1</sup>I am grateful to Tim Hudson, Ken Fincham and my wife Liz for helpful comments on this paper, and to my

students, particularly Peter Jenkins and Sharon Hannaford, who have allowed me to exploit the fruits of their research.

- <sup>2</sup>R. Manning, *Religion and Society in Elizabethan Sussex* (Leicester, 1969); A. Fletcher, *A County Community in Peace and War: Sussex 1600-1660* (1975).
- <sup>3</sup>One of my students, Mrs. Lynn Shaw, has shown what can be done in this direction in 'The Reality of Religious Experience in Two West Sussex Parishes: Walberton and Yapton in the Seventeenth Century' (West Sussex Inst. of Higher Education C.N.A.A. B.A. dissertation, 1984). A classic in this field is K. Wrightson & D. Levine, *Poverty and Piety in an English Village: Terling, 1525-1700* (1979).
- <sup>4</sup>*Diocese of Chichester: A Catalogue of the Records of the Bishop, Archdeacons and Former Exempt Jurisdictions*, ed. F. Steer & I. Kirby (Chichester, 1966), pp. xxii-xxiii.
- <sup>5</sup>I am grateful to Ken Fincham for reminding me of these points; for more on the powers of the archdeacons see S. Lander, 'Church Courts and the Reformation in the Diocese of Chichester, 1500-58', in *Continuity & Change*, ed. R. O'Day & F. Heal (Leicester, 1976), 215-37; Fletcher, *County Community*, chs. 3-5.
- <sup>6</sup>This figure includes Canterbury and York themselves, and the four Welsh sees, but excludes the small offshore diocese of Sodor and Man.
- <sup>7</sup>Manning, *Religion and Society*, 15.
- <sup>8</sup>The 1563 survey yielded a total of 272 parishes, 145 in Lewes archdeaconry and 127 in Chichester: Manning, *Religion and Society*, 55; V. Torr, 'An Elizabethan Return of the State of the Diocese of Chichester', *Suss. Arch. Coll.* 61 (1920), 92-125. The 1603 survey suggests 250 parishes: B(ritish) L(ibrary), Harl. MS. 280, f. 158. The Compton Census of 1676 suggests 304 parishes, counting 31 from the peculiars: J. Cooper, 'A Religious Census in Sussex in 1676', *Suss. Arch. Coll.* 45 (1902), 142-8.
- <sup>9</sup>B. L., Harl. MS. 280, f. 158; see also the more detailed returns which have survived for 81 East Sussex parishes printed in *Suss. Rec. Soc.* 4 (1905), 3-17.
- <sup>10</sup>R. O'Day, *The English Clergy: The Emergence and Consolidation of a Profession 1558-1642* (Leicester, 1979).
- <sup>11</sup>P. Jenkins, 'The Rise of a Graduate Clergy in Sussex, 1570-1640', *Suss. Arch. Coll.* 120 (1982), 161-9; P. Jenkins, 'The Condition of the Clergy in the Diocese of Chichester, 1601-40, with Particular Reference to Education' (West Sussex Inst. of Higher Education C.N.A.A. B.A. dissertation, 1981).
- <sup>12</sup>Hist. MSS. Com. 9, *Salisbury (Cecil)*, 15, p. 390, as quoted in S. Babbage, *Puritanism and Richard Bancroft* (1962), 191.
- <sup>13</sup>I am grateful to Ken Fincham for this information soon to become more widely available in an article entitled 'Ramifications of the Hampton Court Conference 1603-9', *Jnl. of Ecclesiastical Hist.* (forthcoming).
- <sup>14</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>15</sup>This figure is based on analysis of J. Bacon, *Liber Regis* (1786).
- <sup>16</sup>*Callendar of S(tate) P(apers) Dom(estic)*, *Addenda 1580-1625*, 382-3.
- <sup>17</sup>Ibid. 488.
- <sup>18</sup>*Cal.S.P.Dom. 1619-23*, 200.
- <sup>19</sup>*Cal.S.P.Dom. 1634-5*, 206-7; F. Heal, *Of Prelates and Princes* (1980), 112-13; R. Rait, *English Episcopal Palaces: Province of Canterbury* (1910), 16-24.
- <sup>20</sup>Heal, *Prelates and Princes*, 340.
- <sup>21</sup>P. Welsby, *Lancelot Andrewes 1555-1626* (1958), 100; J. Bishop, *Lancelot Andrewes Bishop of Chichester 1605-1609* (Chichester, 1963), 12.
- <sup>22</sup>*Cal.S.P.Dom. 1631-3*, 363.
- <sup>23</sup>The classic account of the siege is given in W. Stephens, *Memorials of the South Saxon See and Cathedral Church of Chichester* (1876), 281-91.
- <sup>24</sup>C. Hill, *Economic Problems of the Church* (1956).
- <sup>25</sup>Stephens, *Memorials*, 250-1.
- <sup>26</sup>Bodleian Library, Oxford, Tanner MS. 148, f. 63. Needless to say, there are problems with these figures for this manuscript relates to the late 17th century and does not tally very well with W(est) S(ussex) R(ecord) O(ffice), Ep. 1/44/3, a complex document said to date from 1625; the basic point stands that the bishop held very few advowsons in the east.
- <sup>27</sup>For details of these people see the biographical appendix to B. Levack, *The Civil Lawyers in England 1603-1641* (1973), 220-1, 225, 258.
- <sup>28</sup>Fletcher, *County Community*, ch. 4.
- <sup>29</sup>W.S.R.O., Ep. 1/26/1.
- <sup>30</sup>Fletcher, *County Community*, 85.
- <sup>31</sup>*Suss. Rec. Soc.* 49 (1949); Sharon Hannaford, 'A Study of the Visitation Process in the Archdeaconry of Chichester between 1621 and 1626' (West Sussex Inst. of Higher Education C.N.A.A. B.A. dissertation, 1982).
- <sup>32</sup>Hannaford, 'Study of the Visitation Process', 29.
- <sup>33</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>34</sup>*The Works of William Laud*, ed. W. Scott & J. Bliss, 5 (2) (1853), 330.
- <sup>35</sup>Ibid. 369.
- <sup>36</sup>*Cal.S.P.Dom. 1635*, pp. xlii-xliii.
- <sup>37</sup>Ibid. p. xliii.
- <sup>38</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>39</sup>*Restricted Grandeur*, ed. T. McCann (Chichester, 1974), 1; ibid. 6 contains an extract from Lieut. Hammond's tour of the western counties in 1635 during which he visited Chichester and thought the cathedral 'not very large, but reasonable fair'; he made no mention of the tower.
- <sup>40</sup>*Cal.S.P.Dom. 1635*, p. xlii.
- <sup>41</sup>*Cal.S.P.Dom. 1636-7*, 325, printed in *Suss. Arch. Coll.* 86 (1947), 185-6.
- <sup>42</sup>*V(ictoria) C(ounty) H(istory)*, *Sussex*, 3 (1935), 112.
- <sup>43</sup>W.S.R.O., Cap. 1/1/2, f. 24.
- <sup>44</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>45</sup>W.S.R.O., Ep. 1/18/33, f. 16; for more on Weelkes see W. Ford, 'Chichester Cathedral and Thomas Weelkes', *Suss. Arch. Coll.* 100 (1962), 156-72.
- <sup>46</sup>*Cal.S.P.Dom. 1631-3*, 254.
- <sup>47</sup>B.L., Add. MS. 39948, f. 185.
- <sup>48</sup>W. Prynne, *The Antipathie of the English Lordly Prelacie* (1641), 221.
- <sup>49</sup>*Cal.S.P.Dom. 1635*, p. xliii.
- <sup>50</sup>*Cal.S.P.Dom. 1640*, 503-4.
- <sup>51</sup>*Cal.S.P.Dom. 1619-23*, 64.
- <sup>52</sup>*Cal.S.P.Dom. 1629-31*, 122.
- <sup>53</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>54</sup>A. Clark, 'Dr. Plume's Notebook', *The Essex Review*, 57 (Jan. 1906), 23; I owe this reference to Ken Fincham.
- <sup>55</sup>Fletcher, *County Community*, 79.
- <sup>56</sup>I owe these points about Carleton and Harsnett to Ken Fincham whose work on the Jacobean bishops of Chichester should soon shed so much more light on this subject.
- <sup>57</sup>P. Heylyn, *Cyprianus Anglicus* (1668), 227.
- <sup>58</sup>J. Eddy, 'The "Maunder Minimum": Sunspots and Climate in the Reign of Louis XIV', in *The General Crisis of the Seventeenth Century*, ed. G. Parker & L. Smith (1978), 226-68.