

From the *Transactions* of the  
Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society

**The Visitation of the Diocese of Gloucester and the State of the  
Clergy, 1551**

by D. G. Newcombe  
1996, Vol. 114, 87-96

© The Society and the Author(s)

## The Visitation of the Diocese of Gloucester and the State of the Clergy, 1551

By D.G. NEWCOMBE

John Hooper, former Cistercian monk, religious exile and Protestant reformer, was consecrated bishop of Gloucester on 8 March 1551 at Lambeth. It had not been an easy passage. Hooper had taken some persuading to leave the comfortable surroundings of Zürich and the circle of the Swiss reformer Heinrich Bullinger and it was, no doubt, only the promise of actually putting his own reforming ideas into practice that convinced him to uproot his young family and return to England. Once there, Hooper had been useful to the government in providing crucial testimony against Edmund Bonner, bishop of London, which led to his deposition. Although this act would come back to haunt him once Bonner regained his bishopric under Queen Mary, in the meantime Hooper earned for himself the friendship of the mighty at court and the offer of the see of Gloucester. Hooper's reputation as an irascible and uncompromising reformer was only enhanced by his refusal of the bishopric and the prolonged and unpleasant controversy over the wearing of vestments which followed. It was only after a spell in prison, and an intercessory word from his mentor Heinrich Bullinger, that Hooper capitulated, wore the vestments required of a bishop and was consecrated.<sup>1</sup>

It was no secret that Hooper hoped to transform his diocese and create a church in the image of that he had left behind him in Zürich. He had enunciated many of his ideas for the reform of the Church of England in his *Sermons on Jonas* delivered before the king during Lent 1550.<sup>2</sup> In large part he brought these same ideas to his diocese in the form of articles and injunctions, and they reflected the profound influence of the theology of Zürich which earned him the sobriquet 'the future Zwingli of England'.<sup>3</sup> Despite the strength of his personality and the depth of his commitment, Hooper's effectiveness in implementing his reforms was hindered by a number of factors, not the least of which was the state of the diocese and its clergy.

Many Protestants, in particular William Tyndale, had considered Gloucester a particularly difficult diocese: its clergy were thought to be unusually ignorant. While historians have generally accepted this verdict without much question, a look at the evidence indicates that Gloucester was not as unusual as has been thought and gives us a clearer picture of the progress of the Reformation in mid 16th-century Gloucestershire.

When he finally arrived in his diocese John Hooper was appalled at conditions there. Inflation, a problem for most of the 16th century in England, had received a boost from the duke of Northumberland's further debasement of the currency in 1551. The hardship caused by this policy in Gloucestershire was reflected in Anna Hooper's anxious words to her friend Bullinger that 'we are very much disturbed by the apprehension of riots, for there is a very great danger of them shortly by reason of the dearness of provisions'.<sup>4</sup> There were, of course, areas of local prosperity in the diocese. The Cotswolds produced wool and market towns like Cirencester and Chipping Campden continued to thrive.<sup>5</sup> Gloucester itself, although an inland port from Roman times and one of the 'middle tier of urban society' in England, was not so well off.<sup>6</sup> What Hooper saw there was reflected in his own complaint to Cecil written soon after his arrival, begging that 'some order be taken upon the price of

things', for 'except God by sickness take (the people) out of the world, they must needs lack'.<sup>7</sup>

Terrible as the economic suffering in Gloucester was, it was typical that Hooper should perceive the problem as essentially spiritual. After all, the diocese was hardly on the cutting edge of the Reformation. True, there had been some small Lollard presence in the Cotswolds and the Forest of Dean, but this was never as important as has been thought.<sup>8</sup> As late as 1548 'in remote parts [of the diocese] men had barely heard of the [reform] movement so far as doctrine and ritual were concerned'.<sup>9</sup> Although some wills written in the 1540s may reflect Protestant ideas, these must be interpreted cautiously.<sup>10</sup> This is not to say that the diocese was without heterodox opinion; there were some very peculiar religious beliefs about.<sup>11</sup> Yet there was no groundswell of support for Protestantism in the diocese and there is no evidence of strong Protestant support there despite the fact that many of its deaneries had been under Hugh Latimer's episcopal guidance for about four years.<sup>12</sup>

The root of the problem was, as Hooper saw it, in leadership both at the diocesan and local levels. The diocese, founded in 1541, had been administered indifferently by its first bishop, John Wakeman until 1549.<sup>13</sup> The clergy, when not openly hostile, acquiesced in the changes brought about under Edward VI, and it is difficult to identify the sympathies of the majority. On the one hand, there were notoriously conservative elements in the diocese such as John Harpsfield, later archdeacon of London and known for his ruthless treatment of Protestants, as well as more humble papists such as Simon Southerne, who later confessed to having ministered to recusants under Elizabeth. On the other hand, clergy like John Parkhurst, later bishop of Norwich, and Guy Eton, chaplain to Hooper, had clearly Protestant sympathies and chose to leave the realm on the accession of Mary, living in exile during her reign. Yet among the mass of the clergy there are few clues to go on. The number of deprivations in 1554 (most presumably for marriage) tells us little.<sup>14</sup> Most of those who can be traced beyond the 1551 visitation appear to have adjusted admirably to the various changes in religious policy under the Tudors:<sup>15</sup> the clergy in Gloucester, as elsewhere, were survivors. But from Hooper's point of view, there were few clergy in the diocese who would be assets in instituting his programme of reform. Optimistic about the Protestant sympathies of the laity in Gloucester, he was not as hopeful about the clergy. Writing to Cecil in April 1551, he declared that 'as for the success and going forthward of God's word . . . every day the number doth increase and would do more and more, in case [there] were good teachers amongst them for the furtherance thereof'.<sup>16</sup>

Complaints about the ignorance of the clergy are a commonplace throughout the 16th century,<sup>17</sup> and it has been alleged that it was the clergy of Gloucester whose ignorance inspired William Tyndale to translate the scriptures into English.<sup>18</sup> In part, dissatisfaction with the intellectual quality of the clergy may be explained by the increase of literacy and education among the laity, yet the fact remains that the 'clergy of the 1540s and 1550s did not meet the new standards of learning required of them' by bishops such as Hooper.<sup>19</sup> If few of the clergy were illiterate,<sup>20</sup> there were worrying gaps in their education; in particular, their grasp of scripture was tenuous. Of course, prior to the Reformation, the bible had been a less essential text in many parishes than the service book and it is hardly surprising that men had difficulty reciting the Ten Commandments as 'it is more likely that [their] acquaintance with [their] faith was derived from the service book . . . than directly from the bible'.<sup>21</sup>

But the clergy in the diocese of Gloucester were no worse than elsewhere in England. Despite Tyndale's attacks in the 1520s, few were scandalously ignorant. While the number of graduates does not necessarily indicate the relative learning or ignorance of the clergy<sup>22</sup> it does provide a useful guide for comparison between dioceses.<sup>23</sup> Of the 311 clergy listed in the examination results of 1551, 63 (or 20.25%) appear to have been graduates or claim to have

been,<sup>24</sup> a percentage which is not out of line with the evidence from other dioceses around England in the early to mid 16th century.<sup>25</sup>

As suggested, the number of graduates is not the best indicator of the quality of the clergy. Forty-one of the graduate clergy in Gloucester took Hooper's examination in 1551 (of the others eighteen were non-resident, for three no result was recorded for unknown reasons, and one resigned before taking the examination) and of these fifteen (or 36%) failed. Some of these failures were spectacular, although they do not always ring true. Richard Bonde, a graduate of Oxford, failed to answer five of the nine questions, having particular difficulty with the Ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer (he *was* able to recite it). John Prynne, apparently holder of a doctorate and a non-resident, was examined by Hooper in London and was found unlearned (*indoctus*). The identification of John Lawrence, law dean at Oxford from 1525–6,<sup>26</sup> as one graduate failure is clearly a mistake: surely it was some other John Lawrence who was unable to identify the author of the Lord's Prayer or where it could be found in scripture.

However, in some respects Gloucester was better off than other dioceses. While 'graduates were always prone to be non-resident',<sup>27</sup> in Gloucester only eighteen graduate clergy (or 28.5% of all graduates) were non-resident as compared, for instance, to 63% of the graduates in Lancashire.<sup>28</sup> What is more, the graduate clergy tended to be spread fairly evenly throughout the deaneries, Campden with thirteen having the most.

The livings in Gloucester were not sufficiently poor to drive away graduates or to prevent them taking the cure of souls there.<sup>29</sup> In fact, poor though the see was, there were some very comfortable livings in it. Bishop's Cleeve was valued in the *Valor Ecclesiasticus* at £84 6s. 8d.; Cirencester at £59 3s. 10d.; Berkeley at £32 14s. 8d.; Tetbury at £35 1s. 3d.; and Standish at £44 2s. 8d. Although averages of the value of livings in Gloucester for this period must be based on the valuations in the *Valor*, already sixteen years old by 1551, it would appear that Gloucester's average of £12 4s. 8d. a year was well in line with other dioceses in England.<sup>30</sup>

The average, however, does not tell the whole story: the median value of the livings in Gloucester was closer to £9 a year. This inevitably led to pluralism and its attendant problem of neglect. At the time of the 1551 visitation, 57 parishes had non-resident clergy and were served by curates of often questionable capabilities.<sup>31</sup> Many of the non-resident clergy in Gloucester each held several benefices within the diocese. Some, like Anthony Alden, who held both Quenington (valued at £7 18s. 2d.) and Awre (£10 4s. 7d.), were graduates; others like John Dumbell, who held South Cerney (£6 16s. 7d.) and Driffield (£8 2s. 3d.), took advantage of geographical proximity to combine the ministry of two parishes. There were also notable pluralists in the diocese, among them William Dingley who held four benefices in four different dioceses from the mid 1520s until his death in 1557. The practice extended even into the ranks of the unbeneficed clergy: Thomas Dobbins, was curate of Stroud, curate of Forthampton and, later, vicar of Tirley, all in 1551.

Although we have no way of knowing what individual ministers were being paid (and this is especially true of the unbeneficed clergy), figures taken from the 1603 survey of Gloucester may be a useful indicator. The stipends of the unbeneficed clergy appear to have remained fairly constant during the latter half of the 16th century and, while beneficed clergy were better off in general,<sup>32</sup> even here stipends did not keep pace with inflation. The worth of livings had not been revalued since the *Valor Ecclesiasticus* and, as a result of impropriations, curates and vicars were being paid appallingly low salaries.<sup>33</sup> The situation was so bad that by 1603 six of the eleven city parishes of Gloucester were vacant 'by reason of the smaleness of the profittes'.<sup>34</sup>

At the time of the 1551 visitation, despite the decline in numbers seeking ordination in the middle of the century,<sup>35</sup> only one parish, Sudeley, was vacant in the whole of the diocese. Clearly this was because of the large pool of former religious available in the diocese. Although

it is difficult to know for sure, possibly as many as 66 clergy listed in the examination results were former religious;<sup>36</sup> these often took up the poorest paying of the parishes in the diocese and were often the least educated.<sup>37</sup>

Hooper began his visitation of the diocese on 4 May 1551. He took with him fifty articles of religion, thirty-one injunctions, twenty-seven interrogatories to be asked of the clergy and sixty-one interrogatories to be put to the laity. In addition to these he brought nine questions which comprised his examination of the clergy.<sup>38</sup> The articles were the chief instrument by which Hooper could hope to introduce change into his diocese. His articles go beyond anything seen previously, following Ridley's 1550 articles in part but anticipating the forthcoming Forty Two Articles of which Hooper had seen a draft.<sup>39</sup>

The fifty articles Hooper brought to Gloucester set out his theological vision and instructed all 'deans, parsons, prebends [sic], vicars, curates, and other ecclesiastical ministers within the diocese of Gloucester' not to 'teach or preach any manner of thing necessary for the salvation of man other than that which is contained in the book of God's holy word'.<sup>40</sup> To facilitate this, Hooper 'collected and gathered out of God's holy word a few articles, which I trust shall much profit and do ye good'.<sup>41</sup> The injunctions and interrogatories provided a more practical guide to the articles and how they were to be put into effect on the ground.

A few court cases, found in the Office books, appear to have resulted from Hooper's visitation. These are useful in understanding the problems Hooper faced, but perhaps the clearest picture of the clergy is to be found in the results of Hooper's examination. The results, however, must be treated with care for several reasons. The most important of these reasons is that the original document has been lost and of the copies available the earliest is an 18th-century transcription. Several copies of the transcript are available: a hand-copied folio, made for the Parker Society, in the British Library<sup>42</sup> and a typescript copy in the Hockaday Collections at the Gloucester Public Library.<sup>43</sup> We have no way of knowing whether these copies are correct or complete. Another reason for caution is that there have been three analyses (two published) of the results and none of them agree in all aspects, nor do any of them agree entirely with the analysis presented here.<sup>44</sup> As only one of the previous scholars to examine this work made any effort to describe the methods he used in interpreting the data (and even here his comments are not complete),<sup>45</sup> it is difficult to know why the various analyses disagree. Other reasons for caution will become apparent as the results are described.

The examination was divided into three sections of three questions each. The first section examined the clergy on the Ten Commandments. They were asked, first, how many commandments there were (*quot sunt Dei mandata*); second, where they were to be found in scripture; and third, to recite them from memory. The second section concerned the Apostles' Creed (*De Fide Christiana*) and the clergy were asked to identify the articles of the Christian faith, to recite them, and to support or prove them using scripture. Finally, they were asked to recite the Lord's Prayer, identify who its author was, and tell where it was to be found in scripture.<sup>46</sup> The examination was given at the time of the visitation and was oral. Whether Hooper gave the examination personally in all cases or delegated some of it to other examiners is not clear, though it is most likely that other examiners or deputies were appointed.

The organisation of the results sometimes makes it very difficult to determine whether a minister was thought to have passed the examination successfully; accuracy in any analysis of these results suffers from the irregularity with which the results were recorded. In some cases, a single comment was all that was recorded: John Parkhurst, for instance, was found to be a man of conspicuous learning (*vir insigniter doctus*).<sup>47</sup> On the other hand, hopeless cases such as Richard Sheffarde<sup>48</sup> were often reported to be *vir penitus ignorans* (a deeply or thoroughly ignorant man).<sup>49</sup> In the majority of cases the results of each minister were recorded by section

and it is not always clear which questions were considered to be satisfactorily answered and which were not.

The results were entered by parish, not by incumbent, and therefore, out of a total of 379 entries, a number of parishes had no recorded results. Thirty-seven parishes had clergy who lived outside the diocese, representing 35 clergy as two of them held two benefices apiece within the diocese of Gloucester in addition to other benefices elsewhere. Three parishes had clergy who were judged to be too infirm or decrepit to be examined and two clergy who had either resigned or retired to a benefice outside the diocese and were not examined. One minister simply did not appear and one parish was vacant. In addition, 23 parishes had clergy who held several benefices within the diocese and whose examination results were recorded under one of their other benefices. When all 'no result' entries are totalled, 311 results are left.

Of the 311 results, 79 were judged satisfactory without detailed comment and a further 12 apparently answered all areas satisfactorily. This represents 29.25% of the clergy who took the exam. Only a very few of the respondents failed completely: seven were found utterly ignorant without detailed comment and one was recorded as unsatisfactory in all areas (representing only 2.5% of all clergy examined). The remaining 213 results concern clergy who failed to answer one or more of the nine questions satisfactorily. As it is this large number which has given the impression that 'a truly astonishing state of affairs' existed among the clergy in Gloucester,<sup>50</sup> a careful and detailed look at what these results really show is long overdue.

There are a variety of ways to look at the results. All three of the previous analyses counted the number of unsatisfactory responses to each question and appear to have assumed that those who were failed without a breakdown of their answers were unsatisfactory in all areas. None of these earlier analyses gave totals for all the questions, preferring to highlight those areas which seemed most notable or shocking (e.g. the number of respondents who could not recite the Lord's Prayer). The following table gives the number of unsatisfactory results recorded for each question (the numbers in brackets are previous calculations: (a) represents Nevinson's count and (b) the count by Gairdner and Hockaday).

	Question	Number of unsatisfactory results
<i>Ten Commandments</i>	1	9
	2	34 (a - 31; b - 33)
	3	172 (a - 168; b - 171)
<i>Articles of Faith</i>	1	9
	2	14
	3	218
<i>Lord's Prayer</i>	1	10 (b - 10)
	2	38 (a - 31; b - 27)
	3	44 (a - 4; b - 30) <sup>51</sup>

Looked at in this manner, the results do present a very sorry picture indeed. Nine respondents were unable to give the number of Commandments and ten could not recite the Lord's Prayer — surely basic expectations of any minister. Gairdner is surely right when he notes that 'gross abuse of patronage and unaccountable laxity on the part of the bishops' may have been responsible for the results.<sup>52</sup> Yet this may paint too black a picture of the clergy in Gloucester. Looked at in another way, there were good reasons why so many failed the examination.

Of the unsatisfactory results, 43 clergy were judged to have failed having missed out one question,<sup>53</sup> while a further 123 clergy failed having missed out only two questions of the exam.<sup>54</sup> Two questions were major stumbling-blocks for the clergy in Gloucester (as the table above demonstrates): the recitation of the Ten Commandments and the proof of the Creed from scripture. Yet none of these results indicates that the vast majority of the clergy in Gloucester was ignorant or unfamiliar with scripture.

That so many should have had trouble reciting the Commandments is hardly surprising. The Commandments were not yet commonly used in services of worship and many of those who could not recite them still knew where they were found in scripture. Further, the examination is not clear whether the minister was expected to answer in English or Latin or both. Conceivably, some clergy might be able to recite the Commandments in one or the other but not both and therefore were judged ignorant.<sup>55</sup>

The second major problem for most of the clergy was proving the Creed from scripture. It is difficult to know just what was meant by this or what was expected in the way of an answer. It is quite conceivable that many who were confronted with this question had never faced such a question before and did not understand what was required. What can be said is that unfamiliarity with scripture is not proved by a failure to answer this question as most of the clergy were able to answer satisfactorily when asked for specific chapters of scripture in the other parts of the examination. As no model answer is provided, the passing or failing of this question must have been an entirely subjective decision on the part of the examiners. How strict the examiners were is open to question, but there is some evidence to suggest that they were somewhat lenient; more than one minister who passed was examined later and found ignorant.<sup>56</sup> Philip (or William) Horsam missed out three questions of the exam but was later found unable to answer anything,<sup>57</sup> while John Dumbell's illiteracy was not discovered until later even though he did poorly in the examination.<sup>58</sup>

The results reviewed with these factors in mind do not show necessarily a diocese made up of grossly ignorant clergy. In fact, the examiners themselves were only moved to single out seven of their colleagues as ignorant, although there are a number of cases very much on the borderline. Some of these, at least, made creative efforts to answer the questions. Thomas Taylor of North Cerney, for instance, was unable to prove the Creed from scripture but claimed that he was content to believe it because it was promulgated by the authority of the king.<sup>59</sup> William Pye of Leigh replied that the Lord's Prayer was given by Christ at the time of His Passion when he commanded his disciples to watch and pray.<sup>60</sup> The notorious John Dumbell, clearly unprepared for the examination, when asked where the Lord's Prayer was to be found, ventured that it was to be found in the Book of Common Prayer.<sup>61</sup>

Despite these responses sprinkled throughout the results, the number of 'absolute dunces' in the diocese, even when counted unsympathetically, is under one tenth of the total number.<sup>62</sup> While individuals within the diocese may have demonstrated appalling ignorance, this is hardly an accurate description of the diocese as a whole. By and large, the clergy in Gloucester adequately prepared for and adequately performed the tasks expected of vicars and curates, even if there were few Zwinglian Protestants among them. Clearly, there were few enough 'learned' men in the diocese but there were fewer still who could be condemned for their utter ignorance. In a diocese which was hardly at the centre of the Reformation and which had had neglectful leadership since its foundation in 1541,<sup>63</sup> that so many of the clergy should have answered so well as they did is probably more remarkable than the few who, like William Ayds,<sup>64</sup> 'could answer nothing correctly'.<sup>65</sup>

## Notes

1. There are several published accounts of Hooper's life. West, W.M.S., 'John Hooper and the Origins of Puritanism', *Baptist Quarterly* 15 (1953-4), 346-68; 16 (1955-6), 22-46, 67-88, provides much important information but from a rather partisan theological point of view. Hunt, M., *Life and Times of John Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester* (Lewiston, 1992), adds little to our knowledge of Hooper. For an unpublished review of Hooper's life and thought, Newcombe, D.G., 'Life and Theological Thought of John Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester and Worcester, 1551-3' (Camb. Univ. Ph.D. thesis, 1990).
2. *Early Writings of John Hooper*, ed. S. Carr (Cambridge, 1843), 431-558.
3. Pettegree, A., *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth Cent. England* (Oxford, 1986), 34. For more on the reformation and education of the clergy in Zürich on which Hooper based his model, Gordon, B., *Clerical Discipline and the Rural Reformation: The Synod in Zurich, 1532-80* (Zürcher Beiträge zur Reformationgeschichte 16, Berne/New York, 1992).
4. *Original Letters relative to the English Reformation*, ed. H. Robinson (Cambridge, 1846-7), 1, 108.
5. Cornwall, J.C.K., *Wealth and Society in Early Sixteenth Cent. England* (London, 1988), 41.
6. Clark, P., and Slack, P., *Crisis and Order in English Towns 1500-1700* (London, 1972), 5.
7. *Writings of John Bradford*, ed. A. Townsend (Cambridge, 1853), 11, 396. Given Hooper's sensitivity to the needs of the poor, it would be interesting to have an account of the debate of the 1551 Bill for 'taxes and assessment for the relief of poor and impotent persons': Slack, P., 'Social Policy and the Constraints of Government, 1547-8', in J. Loach and R. Tittler (eds.), *The Mid-Tudor Polity, 1540-60* (London, 1980), 103. Both Hooper and Coverdale were involved in the Bill's hurried passage: Guy, J., *Tudor England* (Oxford, 1988), 221. Hooper believed it the responsibility of the government to control inflation: Jones, W.R.D., *The Mid-Tudor Crisis 1539-63* (London, 1973), 131. Conditions in Gloucester were not as bad as they would be in 1586 when a crowd of artisans, poor and wealthy persons stopped a boat loaded with grain and looted it: Clark and Slack, *Crisis and Order*, 19.
8. Powell, K.G., 'Social Background to the Reformation in Glos.' *TBGAS* 92 (1973), 99.
9. Price, F.D., 'Gloucester Diocese under Bishop Hooper 1551-3', *ibid.* 60 (1938), 52. See Powell, K.G., 'Beginnings of Protestantism in Glos.' *ibid.* 90 (1971), 141-57; *idem*, *Marian Martyrs and the Reformation in Bristol* (Bristol, 1972), 1-8. Protestants were, it must be stressed, only a minority. Price's remarks are probably very close to the truth. It has been noted that in parts of England the Christian faith, let alone the Reformation and Protestantism, was scarcely heard of: Thomas, K., *Religion and the Decline of Magic* (Harmondsworth, 1978), 194-7. Cf. Palliser, D.M., 'Popular Reactions to the Reformation during the years of uncertainty, 1530-70', in C. Haigh (ed.), *The English Reformation Revised* (Cambridge, 1987), 94, for a justified caveat to Thomas's evidence.
10. For a full discussion of the problems in interpreting wills, Duffy, E., *Stripping of the Altars* (New Haven, 1992), 504-23; Burgess, C., 'Late Medieval Wills and Pious Convention: Testamentary Evidence Reconsidered', in M.A. Hicks (ed.), *Profit, Piety and the Professions in Later Medieval England* (Gloucester, 1990), 14-33. Litzenberger, C.J., 'Responses of the laity to changes in religious policy in Glos.' (Camb. Univ. Ph.D. thesis, 1993), 130, makes the point that, in Gloucester, the 'majority of lay people making wills opted for the safe middle ground of neutral will preambles'.
11. A man from Wotton-under-Edge offered the apparently sincere religious defence of his adulteries arguing that 'I knowe the law is for me to have children by adulterie; I wolde wysshe Moses lawe to be agayne': G.D.R. (Gloucester diocesan records at the Gloucestershire Record Office) vol. 6, p. 62. See Powell, 'Social Background', 100.
12. Latimer was bishop of Worcester, which included much of the later diocese of Gloucester, from 1535 until 1539. He had been especially concerned with combatting superstition, in particular the famous 'Blood of Hailes': Powell, 'Beginnings of Protestantism', 148-9. His outspoken sermons against the pope, bishops and ecclesiastics in general provoked one Gloucester priest, Dr. Sherwood of Dyrham, to accuse Latimer of uncharitableness when he asserted that all ecclesiastics were thieves and deserved hanging if enough rope could be found: *Sermons and Remains of Hugh Latimer*, ed. G.E. Corrie (Cambridge, 1845), 309-17.
13. Price, 'Gloucester Diocese', 51-2.



14. Marriage cannot be seen as proof of reformed ideas. There were 66 deprivations in Gloucester in 1554–5 but not all of them were of men with reforming tendencies. See Grieve, H.E.P., 'Deprived Married Clergy in Essex, 1553–61', *Trans. Royal Hist. Soc.* 4th ser. 22 (1940), 153; Oxley, J., *The Reformation in Essex to the Death of Mary* (Manchester, 1965), 179–85; O'Day, R., *The English Clergy: The Emergence and Consolidation of a Profession 1558–1642* (Leicester, 1979), 25–7.
15. See Palliser, 'Popular Reactions', 112.
16. *Writings of John Bradford* 11, 395.
17. Barrat, D.M., 'Conditions of the Parish Clergy from the Reformation to 1660 in the dioceses of Oxford, Worcester, and Gloucester' (Oxf. Univ. D. Phil. thesis, 1950), 39.
18. Mozley, J.F., *William Tyndale* (London, 1937), 10–11.
19. O'Day, *English Clergy*, 28.
20. Barrat, 'Conditions of Parish Clergy', 61. For levels of illiteracy in Tudor England, Cressy, D., *Literacy and Social Order* (Cambridge, 1980), esp. pp. 104–74; idem, 'Levels of Illiteracy in England, 1530–1730', *Hist. Jnl.* 20(1) (March 1977), 1–23.
21. Heath, P., *English Parish Clergy on Eve of the Reformation* (London, 1969), 6–7.
22. Even during Whitgift's time as archbishop, when the number of graduate clergy was increasing, a degree was no guarantee of learning. Whitgift complained that 'the University giveth degrees and honours to the unlearned and the Church is filled with ignorant ministers being for the most part poor scholars': Strype, J., *Life and Acts of Whitgift* (Oxford, 1822), 1, 610.
23. Barrat, 'Conditions of Parish Clergy', 42.
24. The figures for Gloucester were obtained by consulting Emden, A.B., *Biographical Register of Univ. of Oxford 1501–40* (Oxford, 1974); Venn, J. and J.A., *Alumni Cantabrigiensis* (1922–7); and the Gloucester diocesan records.
25. O'Day, *English Clergy*, 233. 20% of clergy in Canterbury and Durham dioceses were graduates in the 1520s and 1530s; 15.33% in Norwich in the years 1523–8; 33% in London in the years 1522–30. Surrey was unusual with 34.1% in the 1520s but there the percentage fell to 14.3 under Edward VI. See Heath, *English Parish Clergy*, 70–92.
26. Emden, *Biog. Register*, 344, expressed doubts that the John Lawrence examined was the law dean.
27. Bowker, M., *Henrician Reformation*, 119.
28. Haigh, C., *Reformation and Resistance in Tudor Lancashire* (Cambridge, 1975), 29.
29. As they were, for instance in York: Cross, C., 'Priests into Ministers: The Establishment of Protestant Practice in the City of York, 1530–1630', in P.N. Brooks (ed.), *Reformation Principle and Practice* (London, 1980), 203–25.
30. Heath, *English Parish Clergy*, 173; Bowker, *Henrician Reformation*, 134; Heal, F., 'Economic Problems of the Clergy', in R.O'Day and F. Heal (eds.), *Church and Society in England: Henry VIII to James I* (London, 1977), 99–117. See also Zell, M., 'Economic Problems of the Parochial Clergy in the Sixteenth Cent.', in R. O'Day and F. Heal (eds.), *Princes and Paupers in the English Church, 1500–1800* (Leicester, 1981), 19–43. For the view that the poverty of the clergy has been overstated, Brooks, F.W., 'Social Position of the Parson in the Sixteenth Cent.', *Jnl. Brit. Archaeol. Assoc.* 3rd ser. 10 (1945–7), 23–37.
31. For the problems of pluralism and neglect, Haigh, C., 'Puritan Evangelism in the reign of Elizabeth I', *Eng. Hist. Rev.* 92 (Jan. 1977), 36–9; Bowker, M., *Secular Clergy in the Diocese of Lincoln 1495–1520* (Cambridge, 1968), 85–109.
32. Zell, 'Economic Problems', 33.
33. The king was particularly guilty of paying his curates badly. Tewkesbury was valued at £160 a year but its curate was paid £10: Percival, A.C., and Sheils, W.J. (eds.), 'Survey of Diocese of Gloucester, 1603', in *Ecl. Miscellany* (BGAS Records Section 11, 1976), 76.
34. *Ibid.* 68–72. The evidence given in the survey tends to confirm contemporary reports. William Harrison (*Description of England*, ed. G. Edelen (Ithaca N.Y., 1968, 28), wrote 'And to say truth, one most commonly of these small livings is of so little value that it is not able to maintain a mean scholar, much less a learned man, as not being above £10, £12, £16, £17, £20 or £30 at the most towards their charges, which now (more than before time) do go out of the same'.

35. Bowker, M., 'The Henrician Reformation and the Parish Clergy', in Haigh (ed.), *English Reformation Revised*, 75–93.
36. This figure has been calculated by consulting Baskerville, G., 'Dispossessed Religious of Glos.' *TBGAS* 49 (1927), 63–97, and by checking names on the 1551 examination list against *The Faculty Office Registers 1534–49*, ed. D.S. Chambers (Oxford, 1966). It is extremely difficult to identify with precision all the religious in Gloucester for a number of reasons, which include the frequent use of aliases during the period.
37. This tends to bear out Zell's point ('Economic Problems', 32) that 'clerical poverty in the second half of the 16th century appears to have been less the consequence of an over-abundant supply of ministers, than of a relatively large number of under-endowed livings'.
38. *Later Writings of Bishop Hooper*, ed. C. Nevinson (Cambridge, 1852), 118–51.
39. *Visitation Articles and Injunctions*, ed. Frere and Kennedy (London, 1910), 1, 137 ('four-fifths of his articles consist of an anticipation of the coming Articles of Religion, the rest follow Ridley'). See Hardwick, C., *Hist. of the Articles of Religion* (London, 1876), 76–113.
40. *Later Writings of Hooper*, 120.
41. *Ibid.* 119.
42. Additional MS. 21,251.
43. Vol. 6, no. 2.
44. *Later Writings of Hooper*, 151: Nevinson's analysis is very brief and gives little detail of the variety of results in the document; Gairdner, J., 'Bishop Hooper's Visitation of Gloucester', *Eng. Hist. Rev.* 19 (Jan. 1904), 98–100: Frere and Kennedy seem to have relied on Gairdner's analysis; the third analysis, unpublished, was by F.S. Hockaday: Hockaday Abstracts, vol. 33 and Hockaday Collections, vol. 6, no. 2 (both at Gloucester Library). Both Price and Gairdner appear to have consulted Hockaday's work.
45. Gairdner, 'Hooper's Visit.' 98–100.
46. *Later Writings of Hooper*, 151.
47. Hockaday Collections, vol. 6, no. 2, p. 24. For the sake of simplicity, and where possible, I have used Gairdner's published abstract. Elsewhere I have used the Hockaday Collections because it is paginated.
48. Baskerville, G., 'Elections to Convocation in the Diocese of Gloucester under Bishop Hooper', *Eng. Hist. Rev.* 44 (1929), 29.
49. Hockaday Collections, vol. 6, no. 2, p. 93.
50. Price, 'Gloucester Diocese', 101.
51. Why there should be such a large discrepancy in the totals in some areas is mysterious, although respondents might in fairness be given the benefit of the doubt. That is undoubtedly what Nevinson did in his count. I have used the same documents and have checked my results against both Gairdner's published abstract and Nevinson's calculations (written in pencil on the British Library folio). In terms of individual results all agree. I can only assume that some results were excluded for unknown reasons or that the results were miscounted.
52. Gairdner, 'Hooper's Visit.' 99.
53. 41 were unable to prove the Creed from scripture and 2 to recite the Ten Commandments as written in *Exodus* 20.
54. 118 were unable to recite the Commandments or prove the Creed; 3 were unable to prove the Creed or cite the chapter in which the Lord's Prayer is found; 1 was unable to prove the Creed and, oddly, did not know who the author of the Lord's Prayer was; and 1 did not know who the author of the Lord's Prayer was and where it was to be found in scripture.
55. Gairdner, 'Hooper's Visit.' 99. J. Strype, *Memorials of Cranmer* (London, 1840), 1, 312, seems to have thought that the clergy were expected to recite the Lord's Prayer at least in *both* Latin and English: 'some could say the Pater Noster in Latin, but not in English'. He does not record where he found this information, which does not survive in the surviving documents of the examination.
56. Price, 'Gloucester Diocese', 101. For the case of Robert Sparrie, *ibid.* 108; G.D.R. vol. 6, p. 89.
57. G.D.R. vol. 6, p. 92.

58. Possibly he was found out at one of the quarterly meetings Hooper set up to keep an eye on the education of the clergy and was unable to recite the book required of him. Although only Dumbell was singled out as illiterate, this can be no indication of the level of literacy among the clergy.
59. 'Quia satis erit sibi credere propterea quod traditus [*sic.*] auctoritate Regia': Gairdner, 'Hooper's Visit.' 111.
60. 'Tempore Passionis suae mandavit discipulis suis dicens, "Vigilate et orate"': *ibid.* 120.
61. 'Scit esse Domini Orationem propterea quod tradita sit a Domino Rege, ac scripta in libro Regio de Communi Oratione': Hockaday Collections, vol. 6, no. 2, p. 64.
62. Gairdner, 'Hooper's Visit.' 99.
63. Price, 'Gloucester Diocese', 51-2.
64. See Baskerville, 'Elections to Convocation', 32.
65. Hockaday Collections, vol. 6, no. 2, p. 111; Heath, *English Parish Clergy*, 75.