

VII.—EPISCOPAL VISITATIONS IN THE DIOCESE OF DURHAM 1662-1671.

By REV. J. ROGAN, M.A.

With the appointment of seven divines to bishoprics during the autumn of 1660 and their consecration on 2 December of that year, the restoration of the Church of England began to take shape. When the new bishops reached their dioceses they would have to take stock of the situation left by the Commonwealth's religious policy, to which end the Upper House of Convocation appointed a committee to prepare a standard book of visitation articles. The task was later delegated to John Cosin, the Bishop of Durham, who presented his first draft on 8 March, 1662. They were then forwarded to the Archbishop of Canterbury (Juxon), revised and published in the form in which they were used. The articles were adopted for use by ten bishops, as well as by some archdeacons and other ordinaries in later years. Other bishops, like Henchman of Salisbury, preferred to issue articles of their own.

Cosin's articles are to be found with the rest of his published works in *The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology*, but what is, presumably, his first draft is to be found in an MS. in the library of Durham Cathedral.¹ There are a number of interesting variations between the two, which, though not great, do reveal the special interests of the Bishop. He inquires, in the MS. articles, about the survival of chancel screens, of which he much approved. He wishes to know whether the Ten Commandments and other Scripture sentences are to be found fastened up in the churches.

¹ Hunter MS. 11/80.

Furthermore, he asks whether the parish provides the incumbent with a tippet and hood, if a graduate, though the Canons of 1603 speak only of the parish providing a "decent and comely Surplice with sleeves" (Canon 58). Of more moment is the section in the MS. headed *Ecclesiastical Courts and Officers belonging to them*. Though this never appeared in the printed articles, and though no returns are made under this head in the Durham visitation reports, it is a clear indication of the Bishop's interest in the rights and interests of the Church, and of his determination to maintain her dignity and promote her efficient administration. It was, of course, of particular interest to the Bishop of the Palatine see to attend to the efficient working of his courts and officials, and one of Cosin's first concerns was to ensure that the Consistory Court should meet once more in the Galilee Chapel. Diocesan officials and cathedral canons no doubt found a bishop trying who, during the time he had been a canon residentiary there, had examined with great care the documents relating to the customs and administration of the cathedral and its property.

The Archdeaconry of Northumberland provides much of the information relating to the state of the parishes and the churches in the years following the restoration of Charles. The Archdeacon was Isaac Basire, who had spent his years of exile under the Commonwealth in Central and Eastern Europe. He was to be a useful, hard-working servant of the Bishop. During his tenure of office, having set himself the twin aims of the reformation of persons and the restoration of churches, he carried out visitations of his archdeaconry twice a year, until his age and health would no longer permit it. Yet even then his son was dispatched as his deputy.

The first two sections of the visitation articles are concerned with the building, fabric, vessels, ornaments and furniture of the church; the churchyard, houses, glebes and tithes belonging to the church. In 1662 the position was dismal, and it was not entirely bright so late as 1669. In the Rural Deanery of Newcastle three chapels stood ruinous,

and at South Gosforth only the walls remained. In the Rural Deanery of Corbridge, Corbridge church had been burnt by the Scots, and lay unrepaired, while the churches at Choller-ton, Nether Warden and Haltwhistle were either ruinous or in bad repair. In the Rural Deanery of Alnwick, Alnwick parish church stood ruinous with the chancel ready to fall down. Embleton church was out of order, while other churches and chapels at Edlingham, Alnham, Ingram, Iderton, Kirk Newton, Carron, Kelloe, Allingham and Warkworth were in a lamentable condition. Worst of all was Ford, which possessed no roof for the chancel and little for the nave; there were no doors, windows, plaster, font, desk, communion table, cloths or vessels, surplice, vestry or registers. Finally the parsonage had been totally demolished. Seven years later, on 8 November, 1669, Basire wrote to Cosin reporting that he found a number of churches in a ruinous condition and sequestrations difficult because men were loath to take them against such patrons as the Duke of Newcastle, one of whose churches, at Hepburn, was upheld by thirteen rough hewn props so that none could officiate there without danger. At Felton, by means of an injunction, he had arranged for the necessary repairs to be carried out. Whereas he had formerly found both nave and chancel down, now he saw them newly leaded and seated.²

A small number of people were presented during the visitations for being unable to exhibit their terriers of land, or for not possessing one. By 1665 stronger action was taken against those who failed to maintain the churches properly. Presentments were made at Mitford against five men, against three at Woodhorne. Lord Grey was presented at Belford for not repairing the church, it "being down to the ground". At Darlington a presentment was made against one who kept a "noysom sinke in the Churchyard". Basire noted the number of Recusants within his arch-deaconry who were also Impropropriators, which caused considerable difficulty, so that the Vicar of Mitford received but

² *Life of Isaace Basire*, Darnell, p. 300.

£16 p.a. from Sir Edward Ratcliff, when £40 p.a. was the desirable stipend. The Archdeacon also discovered that Mr. Thornton in the Morpeth deanery would let land to no one unless they turned to popery.

The returns say little about the ministers of the church which formed the third section of the visitation articles. Perhaps we may say that the silence augurs well for their diligence and morals. The deanery of Alnwick possessed one scandalous minister, who after an admonition promised amendment of life. In Humphrey Dacres, the incumbent of Haltwhistle, Basire had a renegade. He was, he noted, "sordid and scandalous", for on the first Sunday of 1663 he was so drunk that he was incapable of performing divine service. The Vicar of Felton, Mark Grieve, presents a more mysterious case. On Sunday, 20 September, 1668, in his sermon he declared that he was leaving both the parish and county and would never more officiate there; which, said the parishioners in their petition, he did not, but left them destitute. Later Basire examined one of the signatories, Robert Irwin, in Morpeth gaol, and noted that if the facts were true and there were two sufficient witnesses Grieve was to be suspended and referred to the bishop for deprivation.³ The next great section of the Visitation Returns concerns the spiritual state of the parishioners, and in particular they are much concerned with Recusants and Dissenters. Though Charles II and his chief minister, Clarendon, were inclined to moderation, the victorious spirit of the Cavalier Parliament triumphed in the persecuting legislation of the so-called Clarendon Code, aimed at the Dissenters; and the Roman Catholic penal laws were ordered to be enforced. The Visitation Returns tell of this policy of enforcement, and though they are imperfect, the decline of Dissent is perceptible, as it was throughout the whole country.

The connection between popery in a parish and the religious conservatism of the gentry is apparent. At Brancepeth, Cosin's old parish, Sir William Swinburne was

³ Hunter MS. 7/59; 7/61.

presented as a Papist, and with him 66 parishioners, in 1662, which had declined to 43 in 1665. At Kelloe, another stronghold, 62 were presented in 1662, as against 48 in 1665. The Papists' chief strength was in such families as the Trollops, Smyths, and Conyers. The figures for Dalton survive only for 1662, when 17 were presented, and where, clearly, the Dalton family were influential. Durham city contained a number of Recusants; 69 plus three families in 1662, and 130 altogether in 1665. Newcastle held but few Papists, being rather a hot-bed of dissent. The general picture over the first five years of the reign of Charles II is of the decline of popery. Besides the examples quoted above the numbers dropped at Ryton from 48 to 27, at Bishopton from 22 to 13, at Pitlington from 19 to 6, and at Sockburn from 16 to 8. At places where only the figures for one visitation survive, Berwick in 1662 had 39 Recusants, Hartlepool 21, Haltwhistle 22, and Rothbury 37; the rest were all under 12, with the exception of Long Horsley (18). The numbers from the 1665 visitations are smaller, on the whole, than those of the 1662 visitation. Netherwitton recorded 55, but 27 out of 32 parishes returned numbers of 11 or less. Darlington and Whorleton each had 17, with 18 at Sedgfield. At Ancroft the 3 persons presented were said to have been only "lately subverted"—a clear indication that proselytising continued. In *Information given to Doctor Basire Archdeacon of Northumberland by some of the clergie of that archdeaconrie*, before the primary visitation, it was recorded, "The papists of late have taken such boldness that in several places of that archdeaconry masses are openly and publicly said, and warning given to the people to come thereto. As was done on Easter's day last in the town of Duddoe with the parish of Norham, where there was a public mass and preaching and the people invited thereunto. Memorandum that at the chapel of Eslinton masse is publicly said every Sunday at Mr. George Collingwood's." Though it is likely that Mass continued to be said in the houses of some of the gentry after 1662, secrecy would, of

necessity, be more needed. The information given to Dr. Basire probably indicates the state of affairs that prevailed in the uncertain days following the Restoration. The general picture here, and, as we shall see, with the Dissenters is that of the Royal government taking an increasing hold of the situation.

The Quakers were stronger and more widespread in 1662 than in 1665, though it has to be remembered that they bore the brunt of the weight of the Clarendon Code during those early years. Where there was a sizeable group they tended to hold their own, or increase; as in the parish of St. Andrew, Auckland, where they rose from 10 in 1662 to 25 in 1665, and at Medomsley, where the rise was smaller (12 to 18). Darlington's numbers increased from 5 to 15, and though none were mentioned at Brancepeth in 1662, 11 were presented in 1665. Places like Elswick, the Hartlepoons, Kirkhaugh and Hylton, where the numbers were tiny in 1662, recorded no Quakers amongst themselves in 1665. Apart from the Quakers the picture is not one which gives the impression of Dissenting strength in the diocese. Independents are mentioned only in 7 places: Brancepeth (4 in '62), Bywell (1 in '62), Garrigill (19 in '62), Medomsley (12 in '62), Houghton le Spring (1 in '65), Wolsingham (2 in '65), and Witton le Wear (3 in '65). A number were presented as Anabaptists, mostly in 1662, when the diversity of Protestant sects was still felt from the period of the Commonwealth. 40 were presented in 1662 as opposed to 15 in 1665. Presbyterians were mentioned only once, at Hartlepool, where 5 were presented. Denominational nomenclature was not fixed then as it is now, so that a number were presented under such vague heads as Fanaticks, Schismaticks, and Non-conformists. The picture again is one of decline, amongst all kinds of Dissent, more rapid than that of Recusancy.

Despite the paucity of returns for Newcastle it is clear that the town was a great centre for those who did not conform, so that the silence of the returns is, probably, to be

construed as sympathy with the Dissenting cause on the part of the presenting officials. The city caused considerable trouble to both the Bishop and Archdeacon. The Mayor and Corporation were officially rebuked, and a great stir created when officials and their wives attended a conventicle. Assured of such sympathy the preachers were able to avoid for some time the snares of the government. The Trewhitt family were probably typical, "being Quakers and having frequent and public meetings in the house where resort a numerous company from Northumberland and this county". The report also noted that corpses were buried in their garth, contrary to the law, so seriously did they oppose the Established Church and all its works.

How reliable are these figures? It would be unwise to accept them in any absolute sense as showing the number of Quakers and other denominations at any given time. The returns survive only in part, and the number of presentments must have depended in large measure upon the sympathies of the churchwardens in particular and of the area in general. Where Nonconformity was strong, as in such a town as Newcastle, local officials seem to have been reluctant to prefer charges against Dissenters. Villages in Northumberland where Roman Catholicism was strong probably presented some difficulty, though all non-Catholics would be anxious to see the Papists restrained. Where the returns are headed Recusant, the folk mentioned cannot be taken to be Roman Catholics pure and simple. A Recusant was one who refused to attend Church of England services, and while it is true that Roman Catholics declined to attend the Parish Churches, Dissenters also come under the same head, besides those members of the Church of England who failed to perform their religious duties regularly. The Recusant habitually absented himself from Divine Service, the Non-Attender occasionally. There would be occasional Nonconformity, as well as occasional Conformity. In 1662 nearly three hundred, and in 1665 just over two hundred were presented for negligence of this sort. Where there is a

startling rise in the number presented for Non-Attendance or Recusancy the cause could often have been some dispute between Parish and Parson, say about tithes, now lost to history. We shall never know what it was that caused two people to absent themselves from Divine Service in South Shields but go over to Tynemouth, causing others to accompany them. The eleven people who were presented severally for attending an illegal meeting on a Sunday, had pretty clearly been worshipping in a conventicle. Others were presented for less conscientious offences: two for playing in time of the sermon, one for fighting on the Lord's Day, another for selling ale in time of Divine Service. Henry Hallyday, a Roman Catholic of Washington, more mischievously, called the young people out to dance in time of Divine Service. Without doubt a sore temptation! A number were simply-presented for Sabbath breaking without further amplification. In 1670 those presented for Sabbath breaking in the Hexham district were charged with such offences as playing football, nine-holes (golf?), driving sheep, travelling on a Sunday, with, of course, the inevitable crop of fighting and drinking. Here men were also presented for working on the holydays of 30th January (the execution of Charles I) and 5th November (Gunpowder Treason and Plot) for which the Established Church had special services.

Presentments also occur for misbehaviour in church. "Jane Bayles presented for unjustly molesting Jane Pinkney about her seat in the church at Hurworth." A man at Sedgfield refused to remove his hat in church; one abused the Book of Common Prayer at the burial of her son; at Whittingham six were presented for taking the Book of Common Prayer out of the Minister's hands and using "high contemptible words". Another was presented for refusing to kneel in time of Divine Service. There were 15 presentments for railing in time of Divine Service, besides charges of irreverent, violent disorder. A number appeared on charges of late coming to church; and one at Berwick for leaving before the service was over. There were a small number of

charges to do with damage to church fabric. At Brancepeth one was presented for breaking down the font, besides doing other mischief. At Alnmouth stones were removed from the church, together with church ornaments.

In 1662 there were a large number of presentments (83) on account of the failure of parents to have their children baptized, though this is probably accounted for by the effect of the religious policy of the Republic. The number had dropped by more than half in 1665. Only 11 "Anabaptist children" were noted, one schismatic baptism, and, significantly, only one was presented for having a child baptized by a "seminary priest". A small number of women were presented for failing to resort to church after child-birth to give thanks to God. There were no presentments in 1662 for failing to allow the children to be catechized, and only six in 1665. 125 were presented in 1665 for failing to communicate the number of times required by the Book of Common Prayer. Only a small number were charged with permitting illegal burials, not according to the rites of the Church of England. Presentments were made where corpses were buried in unconsecrated ground. Clandestine marriages were more numerous. Most likely they were Quakers. Only one was presented for being married by a "popish priest". Failure to pay dues brought a large number of charges, for example at Houghton le Spring, where the Easter dues had not been paid in 1665. There was also an assortment of miscellaneous offences; speaking ill of the minister, disturbing the Rector, working with an excommunicant, resisting rent for houses, making a fair in the churchyard, refusing to contribute to the Communion bread and wine, one for keeping a "Romish priest", and another for beating the Sexton in the churchyard, and four were presented in one parish for bringing "one who is neither priest nor deacon but who reads services without public authority".

Moral considerations were not forgotten. Presentments were made in cases of fornication and where adultery was

either reputed or suspected. Possession of bastards also led to charges. Drunkenness also appears as a charge, though it is also accompanied by some other offence. Common scolds, railers, sowers of sedition and discord, swearers, folk troublesome to their neighbours, abusers of churchwardens, including two who threw scalding water on them, all pass by in these returns. Churchwardens also suffered at the hands of the diocesan officers. Two appeared because they were inefficient in carrying out their duties, and in 1662 the wardens of 31 parishes were presented when their presentments were not ready at the time of visitation. And in 1670 a pair of wardens appeared for not having given their accounts to their successors. Finally a small number were presented on charges to do with the proving of wills. Three in 1662 and two in 1665 were presented as unlicensed physicians; unlicensed midwives and school teachers also figure under the same head in small numbers.

During the time that he had been a Prebendary of Durham Cathedral, Cosin had made a close study of the statutes of the Cathedral Chapter and other documents of the foundation, so that it was an extremely well-informed Ordinary that drew up the Articles for the primary visitation. Unfortunately, though we have those articles none of the returns seems to have survived. For the second visitation we have part of the answer of the Chapter, and it is clear from these and Cosin's *Comperts and Considerations* that the articles were the same. The articles to the Dean and Chapter at the third visitation still survive, and the articles addressed to Dr. Basire, with his replies. Thus it will be noted that the Bishop visited his cathedral church triennially.

The first Visitation was held on 19 July, 1662, and the second on 17 July, 1665; when the same questions were put to the Chapter. In the first section the Bishop wished to know if the cathedral foundation now had its full complement of dean, twelve prebendaries, twelve petty canons, ten singing clerks, an Epistler and Gospeller, an Organist, ten choristers, two vergers, two teachers of the grammar school,

eighteen scholars, eight almsmen, two "Bell-ringers and keepers of the clocke", two porters, two cooks, and he wanted to know, were they "serviceable and diligent"? Here the main defect was that seven minor canonries were not filled. Cosin noted that he had been trying to get the Chapter to fill them for five years but without result. Though the Chapter seemed to think that they had enough to carry on the services adequately, the Bishop noted that, nevertheless, this was against the cathedral statutes, and Durham alone of the cathedrals had not got its full number of minor canons. When the Bishop met the Dean and Chapter on 12 September, 1665, to discuss outstanding points, it was decided that the number of minor canonries would be made and kept up to the number of 6 within a year; and that within a year after that there should be 8, and twelve months after that 10, in order that the statutes might be made up.⁴

As to the bellringers the Chapter replied: "The clock keeper hath not kept time so truly as he should but now doth it better. To prevent (the) carrying of burthens and idle walkers in the church we have added an assistant with a good salary and still because of abuses are providing means of further prevention."

The schoolmaster, they wrote, was elected but not sworn. He was an able and apt man but was unwilling to be settled until he was certain that he would receive that full stipend that his predecessor received. The Bishop noted that they were in fact managing with a probationer, whose unfitness to teach and ability to manage the school had led most men to withdraw their children from it. Thus the September meeting produced the injunction that a schoolmaster should be settled in the grammar school within half a year. The Bishop was also dissatisfied because no survey had been made of the lands belonging to the church, probably fearing that during the early years after the Restoration property originally belonging to the church before the civil war might

⁴ Hunter MS. 11/92.

remain still in the hands of others. At any rate it was agreed that a survey of cathedral lands should be undertaken and placed on record in twelve months. As a result of the Bishop's observations it was decided as well, at the meeting, that the broken stones on the tops of the tombs should be taken away, and that the tops should be made plain.

The Bishop also observed that the prebendaries confessed that a third part of them were not always present and "that their mulcts appointed by statute are remitted to them at their own pleasure". In his *Injunctions to be made* Cosin wrote that the mulct for a prebendary who was absent was not to be remitted, as it defeated the statute. As the former librarian of the cathedral he saw that a catalogue had not been made, the Chapter having replied: "There is an old catalogue in the library (many books being bought by us of late) a better is intended and begun to be made. As to the books embezzled wee have or do enquire after them and have recovered some." The efficient Bishop noted for his *Injunctions* that a catalogue of books was to be made perfect within one month.

As for the divine offices the Chapter replied: "We who endeavour to be daily frequent (and more for a good example since these bad times) at all divine offices in public, cannot but wish them well and distinctly performed, leaving us convenient intervals for our studys and meditations. In these things we have not so much looked upon the practice of our predecessors (which might be various and not imitable) as to our rule and your Lordship's explanations of it. And for the better effecting of what is fit the Dean also takes these things into his care as the statutes require him. . . . And according as they have in the Chappell Royall and other cathedrals. Surplices are used by all; hoods by the petty canons that are graduates (though the canons dispense with them) and tippetts with hoods also by the Dean and Prebendaries. Some who are not graduates in Divinity seem to wear hoods belonging to such graduates as we conceive, but leave it to your Lordship's determination." Cosin somewhat

caustically wrote that the words "various and not imitable" were "words very obscure to the bishop".

In replying to questions concerning the fabric of the cathedral, the Chapter, after describing their labour disputes in some detail, conclude that "In effect we have done as much as we could in this time, keeping many workmen continually at work who are still employed by us daily to finish what remains to be done." But the Bishop was clearly impatient, and referred to the "patching of the church", as well as the fact that the floor of the cathedral was not yet repaired. He had asked in both visitations "What is become of the wood and lead of the two great broaches that stood on the square towers" at the West End of the cathedral? To which the Chapter had replied that Mr. Giles Marshall could give the best account of what had happened to the materials. The Bishop had further asked if they had found out the names of any persons who had damaged cathedral fabric? To this they returned the reply that the "fair, rich pulpit cloth with (the) college arms fairly embossed in gold and silver upon it and divers other ornaments and utensils of this church" had been "embezzled and taken away by Mr. Isaac Gilpin", who had also lent a book to Colonel Robert Lilburne who was now in the Tower. But the Bishop was not satisfied and wrote that "in all these five years" they have not taken proceedings against anybody for sacrilege.

The Chapter were asked whether they had the original statute book of the cathedral or whether they had tried to procure a copy. Basire, writing for the Chapter, declared that he had taken pains to have a search made in the Rolls, but that nothing was found; "What may be found in the Tower I know not having had neither time nor opportunity to search there, Mr. William Prynne (no great friend to cathedrals) being the keeper of these Records." The meeting in September 1665 decided that an exemplification of the statutes should be obtained either from the Rolls or the Tower "after it had pleased God to cease the present pestilence".

In reply to the Ordinary's question concerning the augmentation of livings, they replied that they had added about £400 to various livings, and had provided sufficient curates to the appropriate churches with the payment of an annual stipend.

The answers of the Minor Canons give some indication of the repairs that had been going on to the other cathedral buildings. The houses of the 2nd, 6th, 8th, 9th Prebendaries had been rebuilt in whole or great part "and made far better than in your Lordship's time". The house of the 11th Prebendary was about to be rebuilt. The deanery and other houses, they remarked, had had much spent upon them. "For the houses of the petty canons we certified in your Lordship's first visitation that they were all in these late bad times destroyed. That they were formerly but little houses or chambers made only for unmarried persons who had then their diet in common. That we had already made their places better than when they had their own old houses but old stipends, to which notwithstanding we have of our own accord and upon public cost added so much that we hope that within a little while to see three good houses built for them this year." And they went on to shew that they hoped to be able to build a fourth and a fifth shortly. The Guest Hall was partly unleaded and unrafted by the "pretended Provost and Fellows of this College in wicked Oliver's time" since which time it had fallen down and done great damage to Dr. Naylor's and Dr. Neile's houses. The petty canons' hall had suffered from the Provost and Fellows of the projected college, it being, as well, partly unleaded. The schoolmasters' house on Palace Green was in ruins, having been ruined by the Scots, and still not repaired. So the Bishop might well be anxious even in 1665 about the speed of repairs.

Having thus questioned the Dean and Chapter in detail about themselves, and the restoration of the church in all its aspects, and having examined their reply, and having found it inadequate, the Bishop must have noted his observations,

and then asked the Chapter to be more explicit. But we find that between 23rd and 25th August, 1665, all the prebendaries wrote individually to the Bishop declaring that they had nothing further to add.⁵ Thus it must have been after this that the meeting, between the Bishop and the Chapter, took place, which produced those injunctions that have been mentioned above. In addition to those points Cosin's has in his *Injunctions to be made*, already quoted, some additional points: that cooks not doing their duty ought to be suspended and their stipends withheld; that the Bishop's Episcopal seat in the Galilee chapel which had hitherto been set up by the Dean and Chapter should be repaired within three months. And that courts and synods should be kept in there decently as "heretofore hath been the use". Further, the lower desk in the choir should be "perfected and a decent bench set up along before it for the 18 scholars, 10 choristers, and the Almsmen, like the bench before the women's seats; and that they set (i.e. the Chapter) no doores to the new choir-quire work." Finally the Dean and the Prebendaries should put the mansion house belonging to their "severall corps" into good repair within twelve months.

The Articles of the third Visitation in 1668 follow much the same pattern. Has the Dean been diligent in his office and government over the canons and ministers of the church? Has he been regularly to the divine offices, and seen that they have been duly and religiously kept? Have he and the other prebendaries maintained that hospitality that was to be kept? Have the Major Prebendaries kept their turns of residence? Have they kept their houses in good repair? Have they preached their four sermons? If any have been defective what are their names? Have the officers (Sub-dean, Treasurer, Receivers) done their duty properly seeing that the church was kept in good repair, providing what was needful for the church, looking after the ornaments, and collecting the rents due? The Bishop then

⁵ Hunter MS. 11/85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91.

went on to enquire about the minor canons upon whom he thought so much in the previous visitation: Has the full number been made up and maintained? Have they, too, been diligent in attendance at divine service? And have they shewn themselves to be men capable of performing their duties efficiently? Passing on to the services of the church, the Chapter were asked whether the services of the Book of Common Prayer had been properly maintained? The Bishop then asked concerning the fabric of the church and its maintenance, together with the maintenance of records: "Have they not been suffered to be thrown about and eaten by worms, mice or other vermin?" He wished to know their manner of letting manors, etc.; how they kept their residences; whether they held a chapter every 15 days as ordered by their statutes?

The result was that Cosin called upon the Chapter to complete outstanding repairs, and to fill up the vacant minor canonries, even though Basire had informed him that he had made enquiries "at London, Southwell and elsewhere, and invited divers but could not prevail". In 1671 the Bishop returned to the same points, in his Articles to the Prebendary of the Seventh stall: "Is the Churchyard wall, adjoining to the Palace Green, finished in a comely manner, according to the order given for that purpose? And is the Churchyard made leuell, decently kept, and freed from beasts and all other annoyances and disorders? Is the north Isle of the Cathedrall Church freed from rain? And is the Consistory there freed from rain? and are the leads there in goode repairs? and is the Consistoriall seate made up as it ought to be?"

All were matters that the Bishop had had occasion to refer to on previous occasions. In his second visitation the Bishop had noted in his observations that the song books were torn, that the lectern and litany-desk were mean and uncomely; and that the altar was clothed with "course cuntry cloth". Now he wished to know whether the "uncomely forms and coarse matts lately used . . . at the

administration of the Holy Communion for such person as usually resort thither, without the railles, taken away and others more comely putt in their place and decently covered as heretofore hath been accustomed? And are the partitions on each side of the said forms under the two arches of the church next the said railles well framed . . . and there sett up for the better keeping out of the wind and cold which otherwise doe many times molest and annoy the Communicants." The beautifier of Brancepeth and the "young Apollo" of Smart's fury was not the man to overlook such things in his old age. The replies by Basire were not encouraging. The forms before the rails were not covered, there were no partitions, the churchyard wall was finished but the yard could not be levelled, and the yard was not wholly free from beasts, "the occupiers pretending their lease". There was some non-residence among the prebendaries still, either by Royal dispensation or their own will, and the cathedral sermons were often delivered by curates or others contrary to the statutes, and the Bishop's former injunctions.⁶

Thus even at the close of his episcopate there was a good deal still to be done, but there is no doubt that episcopal harring, with some of the Bishop's famous asperity, had produced results that might not have been brought about in so short a time. By the time that one reaches the fourth visitation it is clear that matters of smaller moment are being inquired into—the Consistory seats, and the quality of mats, rather than the procuration of a copy of the cathedral statutes and the thorough repair of the cathedral fabric. In many ways John, Bishop of Durham, is entitled to good repute, for his work as a liturgist, and for his theological writings; and among these good reports, the care and attention that he devoted to both cathedral and diocese must entitle him to be named as an efficient diocesan and a careful Father in God, at a time when the Church of England was busy with the reconstruction of her material and spiritual life.

⁶ Surtees Society vol. lv, pp. 288-290.

A NOTE ON SOURCES.

1. The Parishes.

Bishop Cosin's Primary Visitation Articles are in Durham Cathedral Library: Hunter MS. 11-80. Also p. 505, vol. 4, in Cosin's *Works* in *The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology*.

The answers to the Articles are in the Hunter MS. 80/2; 137; and also in Bishop Cosin's Visitation Book.

For what appears to have been the standard book of Articles as used by Seth Ward, as Bishop of Salisbury, and Denis Granville, as Archdeacon of Durham, see 1.7.20(4) in the Library of Durham Cathedral.

2. The Cathedral.

For Bishop Cosin's Primary Visitation Articles see p. 252, vol. 37, Surtees Society.

For the surviving part of the Chapter's reply to the Articles of the second visitation see Hunter MS. 11/81, 83.

For Cosin's *Comperts and Considerations upon the Answers of the Deane and Prebendaries of Durham to the Articles of my second visitation the 17th day of July 1665* see p. 262, vol. 37, Surtees Society.

For the articles agreed on at a meeting between the Bishop and the Dean and Chapter on 12th September, 1665, see Hunter MS. 11/92.

For the articles to the Minor Canons at the second visitation see Hunter MS. 11/94. For their replies Hunter MS. 11/95-101.

For the articles at the third visitation see p. 269, vol. 137, Surtees Society.

For the articles exhibited to the Minor Canons at the third visitation see p. 196, vol. 55, Surtees Society.

For the articles exhibited to the Seventh Prebendary at the fourth visitation see p. 288, vol. 55, Surtees Society.

For *Injunctions to be made*, drawn up by Cosin, see Hunter MS. 11/93.