

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

**The Bishop of Gloucester's Letter about Nonconformist
Conventicles, August 1669**

by D. L. Wykes
1996, Vol. 114, 97-104

© The Society and the Author(s)

The Bishop of Gloucester's Letter about Nonconformist Conventicles, August 1669

By DAVID L. WYKES

Modern religious dissent dates from the Restoration of Charles II and the insistence of Parliament upon a strict conformity to a re-established Anglican Church of England. Many ministers were unable to accept the terms required by the 1662 Act of Uniformity and suffered ejection as a result of their refusal to conform. In addition to the existing Elizabethan and early Stuart statutes requiring attendance at church on Sundays, further legislation was passed to suppress nonconformist meetings and to make it difficult for ejected ministers to gather new congregations. The 1664 Conventicle Act made it unlawful for more than five people aged 16 and over, besides the household, to 'be present at any Assembly, Conventicle, or Meeting' for religious worship other than that of the Church of England. The statute expired on 1 March 1669, and it was in connection with the passing of a new Act that in June of that year the archbishop of Canterbury, Gilbert Sheldon, ordered an enquiry into the number of conventicles, their size and principal supporters. This survey of nonconformist conventicles, completed during the summer of 1669, is the most important source available to historians studying the earliest period of religious dissent in the decade following the Restoration. The returns prepared by the parish clergy are particularly valuable because they cover a large part of the country during a crucial period in the early development and organisation of religious dissent.¹ In addition, except for the Society of Friends, only a handful of records belonging to dissenters survive for the period. Unfortunately, the Returns are not available for the diocese of Gloucester, and overall they are missing for about a quarter of all the dioceses in England and Wales. The poor survival of the Gloucestershire quarter sessions records² and the absence of any archdeaconry act books for the period also limits the amount of evidence available on the early development of dissent in the county. Thus the surviving details on the nonconformist conventicles and preachers in the two southern deaneries of Dursley and Hawkesbury, contained in a letter written in August 1669 by the bishop of Gloucester, William Nicholson, to the lord lieutenant of the county and seven justices of the peace, is particularly welcome. A copy of the letter survives amongst the papers of one of the justices, the Gloucestershire gentleman and antiquarian John Smyth of Nibley.³

The main source of evidence on the Conventicle Returns for the country as a whole is the abstract volume preserved in Lambeth Palace Library and published 'verbatim et literatum' by Professor Lyon Turner over 80 years ago.⁴ Additional evidence on the survey has in a few cases been found locally. A transcript of the original certificates for the archdeaconries of Leicester and Buckingham prepared by the parish clergy survive amongst the records of the bishop of Lincoln and include much valuable additional detail.⁵ A summary for at least one of the archdeaconries not included in the Lambeth volume, the archdeaconry of Northampton, also exists and it is possible that others may yet be found in local archives.⁶ The surviving records, therefore, represent three distinct phases in the making of the Returns. The returns for the archdeaconries of Leicester and Buckingham are copies of the original parish certificates and therefore contain the most detail. The summary for the archdeaconry of Northampton, which

was made by the archdeacon from the original parish certificates, may represent an intermediate stage before the returns were forwarded to the bishop of Peterborough for transmission to Archbishop Sheldon. The Lambeth volume is an abstract of the returns sent in by the bishops drawn up for the use of the archbishop. The Gloucestershire evidence provided by Nicholson in his letter was clearly derived from the original returns which are now missing, and represents the next stage, the use of the information to suppress illegal nonconformist meetings. The letter provides the clearest evidence which has come to light of the authorities using the information derived from the Conventicle Returns to suppress dissent. It is not clear why the Gloucestershire returns do not survive at Lambeth. One explanation may be that Nicholson failed to forward the details provided by his clergy to Lambeth though he made use of the information himself. A similar case can be found for another diocese. The bishop of Peterborough used the information on conventicles provided by his clergy to prosecute dissenters though the answers are not now at Lambeth.⁷ It is possible that some of the abstract diocesan returns were lost before the volume was bound up in the late eighteenth century.⁸

The letter Nicholson wrote as bishop to the justices in 1669 is an important source of evidence on the state of dissent, and in particular for the details on nonconformist preachers and their meetings. The information on conventicles contained in the letter is not as full or consistent as that provided by the Lambeth abstract, and, indeed, it only covers two of the ten deaneries in the diocese. It does, however, include evidence on nonconformist activity for parishes without conventicles, in particular a record of the numbers not attending church, details of which are omitted from the Lambeth volume. Unfortunately, the clerk responsible for copying the bishop's letter was careless or had little understanding of what he was transcribing. His orthography was unusual and inconsistent and there are a number of omissions where he apparently failed to copy a word or phrase. The most serious omission was his failure to include the name of the first parish on the list and it is now impossible to identify that parish with certainty.

Conventicles were reported in 11 of the 55 parishes in the two deaneries, including Rangeworthy, which was not recorded separately but mentioned under the entry for Iron Acton. For another four parishes it was reported that the inhabitants went to conventicles in neighbouring places, and details are recorded on the presence of Quakers and Baptists and the number of individuals who failed to attend church for a further six parishes. For most of the conventicles the bishop's letter provides the names of the preachers and hosts, and in some cases the size of the meeting. Where the denomination is not recorded it is generally possible to make the identification from knowledge of the preacher's affiliations. Archbishop Sheldon had required information on the condition and status of those who attended the meetings and also on the individuals who provided the places in which the conventicles met. Unfortunately, Nicholson did not include such details when writing to the justices. The only direct reference in the bishop's letter is to 'Stampton a butcher', who provided a meeting-place in the parish which the clerk failed to identify, though Mrs. Mary Gossett, who with others encouraged the conventicle at Marshfield, was clearly of gentry status. John Goslett and Thomas Goslett, both styled esquire, and perhaps her sons, licensed their houses in Marshfield in 1672 for nonconformist worship under Charles II's Declaration of Indulgence.⁹ Some of the clearest evidence on the status of those who attended Presbyterian conventicles is provided by the depositions and recognizances drawn up as a result of a conventicle held at Wotton-under-Edge in January 1670. Eleven individuals were named. Not surprisingly for Gloucestershire at this date, a significant number were involved in the cloth trade and the rest were craftsmen. They included a clothier, a clothworker, four broadweavers, a cardmaker, two 'tilers', a tailor and a staymaker. Twelve individuals in the parish of Cromhall, where a Baptist conventicle was

recorded in 1669, were indicted at the quarter sessions in 1665 for not attending church. They consisted of five spinsters, four husbandmen and three yeomen.¹⁰ Evidence from other parts of the country suggests that the Presbyterians and Independents still had some gentry supporters, but that the principal supporters in the countryside were yeomen and husbandmen and in the towns tradesmen and manufacturers. Those attending Quakers conventicles were mainly craftsmen and husbandmen, with a few yeomen. Baptist conventicles, though similar in social background, seemed to have lacked any of the more substantial figures usually found in Quaker meetings.¹¹

Most studies using the evidence from the 1669 Returns analyse the number and size of the conventicles, but the information is far from easy to interpret. It is clear from detailed work for other parts of the country that the returns are not a census, but a record of the incidence of conventicles, not all of which were active at the same time. Some were clearly regular meetings, held every week, or in some cases held in turn in neighbouring parishes on successive Sundays. Others were occasional meetings which depended upon the appearance of a preacher, or even a single meeting which was never repeated.¹² Since the purpose of the letter was to urge the local magistrates to suppress nonconformity, it seems likely that the conventicles listed were still being held. Nevertheless, there are serious difficulties in using the Gloucester evidence because the information is both incomplete and inconsistent. For most of the conventicles details are only given on the number attending from the parish itself and not the total number at the meeting including those who came from outside the parish. Whereas the compilers of the Lambeth volume were anxious to establish the number and size of the meetings as part of the campaign justifying the new legislation against conventicles, the bishop's concern was the practical issue of suppressing nonconformity. He was therefore more anxious in identifying the location of the conventicle and the parish of those who attended in order to provide the local justices with the necessary information to put the law into action. The overall size of individual meetings was only occasionally included by Nicholson since it was not directly relevant to his attempts to suppress nonconformist meetings, other than perhaps to identify where dissenters were particularly bold.

The largest conventicle recorded in the two deaneries was at Marshfield, adjoining the county boundary with Somerset and Wiltshire, where it was reported that '200 people usually met at a conventicle at this towne'. A conventicle of this size was a substantial meeting by contemporary standards. Over 100 people were said to attend from Marshfield itself. Other evidence confirms this was one of the most important conventicles in the area, and the size and strength of its meetings had been a major source of alarm in adjoining counties since at least 1667.¹³ A hundred persons were said to meet at Hawkesbury, the next largest conventicle recorded, and 40 at a conventicle in another parish for which the name was unfortunately omitted in error from the bishop's letter, but which was possible Wotton-under-Edge. All these conventicles can be identified as Presbyterian meetings, though Independents also generally met with Presbyterians at this date. At John Taylor's house in Frampton Cotterell, it was said that '50 persons meete there of this Parish and more', and 53 were said to attend the Quaker meetings in Pucklechurch. Despite the limitations in the evidence, it is clear that the Presbyterians were the strongest denomination. They held the largest meetings in the two deaneries, though there was a Baptist conventicle at Horton with seven speakers, which suggests a substantial meeting, though unfortunately the number present is not recorded. The Presbyterians also held a majority of the meetings in the two deaneries. In all, six conventicles can be identified as Presbyterian, including the largest reported, three as Baptist, and two which were probably Quaker meetings.

The pattern of support found in the two deaneries is similar to that found for the rest of the

country, where the Presbyterians were easily the largest denomination in terms of the number of conventicles and total attendance reported. The Congregationalists, or Independents, had the second largest number of adherents returned, though only a third of the total given for the Presbyterians. They had in fact fewer conventicles reported than the Baptists, who, with only 7,000 attenders, were clearly the weakest denomination.¹⁴ Though the Presbyterians were the largest and most influential body of dissenters, the apparent contrast with the Congregationalists can be exaggerated. In many parts of the country before the early eighteenth century the two denominations met together in one meeting, and conventicles described as either Presbyterian or Independent usually contained supporters of both groups. Denominational labels in this period were often very fluid, and where dissenters were few a meeting would include individuals of differing religious opinions who might not belong to the same denomination as the minister.¹⁵ Only where dissent was strong was it likely that separate congregations would be formed. In contrast, a history of conflict between Baptists and Quakers, particularly over attempts to recruit each other's members, had led to a stricter division between the groups.

Unfortunately, there is no indication of the overall size of the Baptist meetings in the Gloucester list, only of the numbers attending from the parish itself. The Baptist meeting at Horton, judging from the number of preachers reported, was probably substantial, and it had certainly been kept up for some years. James Nobbs the younger and William Pike of Cromhall had both been presented for keeping conventicles there in the mid 1660s. Only 18 persons were said to attend the conventicle from the parish itself, which suggests that many meetings attracted audiences from much of the surrounding area. In the case of Rangeworthy, for which there is no separate return, it was said in the entry for the neighbouring parish of Iron Acton that 'the greatest p[ar]t of the p[ar]ish' went to a conventicle in Rangeworthy. Three speakers and the hosts of two meetings were named for Wickwar, but only ten individuals in the parish were said to attend, and at Cromhall there were two speakers but only '7 Auditors' from the parish. The bishop's letter also records the numbers who did not attend church or who were reputedly either Baptists or Quakers. At Didmarton three were said not to come to church, in Yate 14 persons were recorded as either Baptists or Quakers. At Doynton and Cold Ashton the numbers who 'come not to church' and went instead to conventicles were recorded. A distinction was made by the bishop between lewd and profane persons who failed to attend church through neglect, and those who refused to conform for conscientious reasons and attended meetings elsewhere. At Oldbury on the Hill there were six Quakers and '2 profane p[er]sons more'. At Coaley 22 persons were said 'goe not to any place on pretence of worship', and 30 that 'goe to other conventicks in other places'.

The greatest value of the bishop's letter is the information it contains about the preachers, and the details on the pattern of dissent in this early period. At least seven ejected ministers can be identified as preaching at Presbyterian and Independent conventicles in the two deaneries in 1669, though there are difficulties in identifying some of the ministers, particularly in those cases where only the surname is recorded. 'Mr. Smith of Stincham', who was reported as preaching at Berkeley and Hawkesbury, is clearly Jonathan Smith the elder, who died on 10 December 1670 and was buried at Stinchcombe. He had been displaced from his living at Ross on Wye on the return of the sequestered rector in 1660. Mr. Flower, reported as preaching at Marshfield, can probably be identified with Benjamin Flower, who had been educated at the grammar school in Wotton-under-Edge. Far less certain is the identification of Mr. Green of 'Greetham', presumably Gretton in the parish of Winchcombe, reported as preaching at Horton, who was possibly William Green ejected from the vicarage at Bath. The other preachers at the meeting in Horton were, however, Baptists.¹⁶

Most of the ministers were reported as preaching at more than one conventicle, and in many cases in adjoining counties. Henry Stubbes was clearly the most distinguished and active minister recorded in the two deaneries. He was reported by the bishop as preaching at Berkeley, Dursley, Hawkesbury, Marshfield and one unnamed parish, perhaps Wotton-under-Edge. According to the Lambeth volume he had also preached at five conventicles in Wiltshire, seven in Somerset and one in Berkshire. In October 1670, it was claimed that he was one of a group of nonconformist ministers who had preached in the parish church at Ubley near Bath, allegedly with the consent of its vicar, James Whiting.¹⁷ Stubbes had been a minister at Wells in Somerset, and according to Edmund Calamy, the biographer of the ejected ministers, on the restoration of the sequestered vicar Stubbes moved to Dursley, where he preached until August 1662 when the Act of Uniformity came into force. An informer in 1665 reported that Stubbes of Wells was an 'intelligencer' or correspondent in those parts for dissenters in London, and was often in London himself preaching at conventicles there. In March 1666, however, he subscribed to a declaration confirming his earlier oath of allegiance and his abhorrence of sedition, probably in connection with the Five Mile Act.¹⁸ In 1672 he was licensed to preach under Charles II's Declaration of Indulgence in London at his own house in Jewin Street and at another meeting in the parish of All Hallows in the Wall. Nicholson's successor as bishop in 1672, John Pritchett, connived at Stubbes officiating in the parish church at Horsley, 'which Living being but 8*l. per An[nuum]*, had been without a Minister for several Years. There he us'd some part of the Liturgy, not regarding the Censure of the Rigid'. Stubbes was to die in 1678 still in possession of the vicarage.¹⁹

Three other ejected ministers in the two deaneries were particularly active preaching at conventicles in the south-west. Edward Hancock, who had been ejected from Bristol, was also preaching with Stubbes at the conventicle in the unnamed parish which was probably Wotton-under-Edge. John Fox had been ejected from Pucklechurch in the deanery of Hawkesbury, and after his ejection removed to Marshfield where he was reported as preaching by the bishop in 1669. Benjamin Flower, who was also preaching with Stubbes and Fox at Marshfield, had been ejected from a post at Cardiff in 1660 and retired to Castle Combe in Wiltshire where he assisted his father who was rector there. When his father was ejected in 1662, he set up a school. Both Flower and Hancock were reported as preaching with Stubbes at Charlton in Wiltshire 'by turnes'. Hancock was also preaching at Batheaston with Stubbes and at Beckington, Dunkerton and Weston by Bath with Fox, and with another group of ejected ministers at Monkton Combe. In addition to the three parishes in Somerset, Fox was also preaching at two conventicles in Wiltshire, including Hornington, where Flower and Stubbes were preaching as well, to a meeting of '4 or 500' held at the barn of Mr. Alexander Cray. The evidence for Charlton, where Flower, Hancock and Stubbes were reported as preaching 'by turnes', together with that for other parishes where they were reported to be preaching together, offers evidence on the structure and organisation of dissent in this crucial early period. Although many of the meetings were held regularly, they depended upon the readiness of lay patrons to offer a place to meet, and upon the efforts of a relatively small number of ejected ministers who were willing to travel large distances in order to serve these meetings. The institutional forms and structures characteristic of modern dissent, involving the formation of congregations who called and supported their own minister, only came after toleration was granted in 1689.

Among the speakers at the Baptist meeting in Horton was Thomas Collier, the leading Baptist preacher in the south and west of England. He had been active preaching and proselytising since the early 1640s and had helped establish the Baptist Western Association in 1653. The other preachers at Horton included James Nobbs, who had also been a member of the Western Association, and who in 1656 signed the Somerset Confession. He had been

presented during the mid 1660s with William Pike of Cromhall for keeping conventicles in Horton. Nobbs was also reported in 1669 as preaching at Berkeley and Wickwar.²⁰ Mr. Harrison was probably Richard Harrison, displaced as curate at Charlton Kings, Cheltenham, in 1660, who was a Baptist, and Mr. Skinner can be identified as John Skinner, a Congregationalist who was ejected from a joint living in Herefordshire, and who became a Baptist. He licensed his house at 'Clonwell', perhaps Cromhall, in 1672.²¹ The Quaker meeting at Pucklechurch was served by two Friends from Bristol, John Story, presumably the Quaker leader, and 'one Moore', who was perhaps Joseph Moore 'an Antient Friend', who suffered much for his religious witness.²²

It is difficult on the basis of the incomplete evidence for only two deaneries to draw broad conclusions about the state of dissent in the diocese of Gloucester in 1669. Nevertheless the information is valuable for the evidence it provides on dissent in the deaneries of Dursley and Hawkesbury during the first decade after the Restoration, and for the specific details it gives on individual ejected ministers. In the absence of comprehensive archdeaconry and quarter sessions records, the bishop's letter, despite its limitations, is the main source of evidence for the activities of nonconformists in the diocese during the late 1660s. It not only discloses the extent and significance of dissent in the two deaneries, but the bishop's efforts to enforce conformity.²³ The evidence is, however, of wider significance, since it provides additional information on the strength of dissent in the West Country, particularly for the area around Bath and Bristol. It also adds to the knowledge that historians have of the organisation and structure of dissent in this early period.

The bishop's letter reveals a significant level of nonconformity in the two deaneries. Conventicles were reported in 11 parishes and other evidence of nonconformist activity in another ten parishes, nearly two fifths of the 55 parishes in the two deaneries. It is also clear that the Presbyterians were the strongest denomination both in terms of the number of conventicles and the total attendance reported. The pattern of support is similar to that found for the rest of the country. The returns provide evidence of varying response of ejected ministers. Some ministers made extraordinary efforts to keep alive the ideal of a preaching ministry. Henry Stubbes was reported in 1669 as preaching in five parishes in the two deaneries, and at another 13 in three other counties. He was undoubtedly one of the most active of the early nonconformist ministers, but the number of places and the distances involved mean that it is impossible he was preaching in all these parishes at the same time. One of the weaknesses of the Conventicle Returns is that they record not only the places where ministers were still actively preaching, but also those places where they had preached sometime in the past, perhaps only on a single occasion. The efforts of Stubbes and other ministers does, however, provide an insight into the organisation of dissent in this period. In some areas, principally in the larger towns, dissenters were able to establish regular meetings often served by their own minister. The evidence for ministers preaching 'by turns' suggests that in many areas, however, dissenters depended upon visiting ministers to keep up a meeting through the regular supply of sermons. Other meetings were clearly less regular or organised, and some were probably no more than an improvised meeting occasioned by the appearance of a visiting preacher. During this early period much religious dissent, particularly in the countryside, often only consisted of small, fluctuating pockets of nonconformity. Although the authorities found it impossible to suppress dissent, the bishop's letter helps to confirm the difficulties ejected ministers experienced in gathering meetings. None of the ejected ministers reported in the two deaneries were still preaching in the parishes from which they had been ejected.²⁴

Notes

1. For an introduction in the Conventicle Returns, D.L. Wykes, *Short Guides for Historians: The 1669 Return of Nonconformist Conventicles* (Hist. Assoc., London, 1994).
2. Glos. R.O., Q/S1b 1 (indictment book 1660–8); Q/S0 1 (order book 1672–81).
3. British Library [hereafter B.L.] Add. MS. 33,589, ff. 75r.–76v.
4. Lambeth Palace MSS. 639, ff. 139–294; 951/1, ff. 111–13; published in *Original Records of Early Nonconformity Under Persecution and Indulgence*, ed. G.L. Turner (London, 1911), 1, 3–176; 3, 823–8.
5. Lincolnshire Archives, Diss 1A/6 (Return of Conventicles for the Archdeaconry of Buckingham, 1669); Diss 1A/7 (Return of Conventicles for the Archdeaconry of Leicester, 1669). Transcripts of the parish certificates for the two archdeaconries have been published in *Buckinghamshire Dissent and Parish Life, 1669–1712*, ed. J. Broad (Bucks. Rec. Soc. 28, 1993), 1–72; R.H. Evans, ‘Nonconformists in Leicestershire in 1669’, *Trans. Leics. Arch. Soc.* 25 (1949), 98–143.
6. The returns for the archdeaconry of Northampton are missing from the Lambeth volume with the rest of the returns for the diocese of Peterborough, but a summary made from the original parish certificates by the archdeacon has survived: Northants. R.O., Fermor Hesketh (Baker) MS. 708, pp. 73–6. For a discussion of the survey, D.L. Wykes, ‘The Church and Early Dissent: The 1669 Return of Nonconformist Conventicles for the Archdeaconry of Northampton’, *Northants. Past and Present* 8 (1991–2), 197–209.
7. Wykes, ‘Church and Early Dissent’, 199.
8. The returns for the diocese of Oxford have become detached from the main series in Lambeth Palace MS. 639 and form part of *ibid.* MS. 951/1.
9. *Original Records*, ed. Turner, 2, 817.
10. *Ibid.*; B.L. Add. MS. 33,589, ff. 77r.–78v. (examination and recognizance of Wallington); Glos. R.O., Q/S1b 1, ff. 94r.–96v.
11. Wykes, ‘Church and Early Dissent’, 208–9.
12. Wykes, *Short Guides*, 2–3.
13. J[oseph] G[lanville] to Dr. [J.] Beale, 10 Sept. 1667; Beale, Yeovil, to Williamson, 31 Aug. 1667: *Calendar of State Papers Domestic 1667*, 454–5, 428.
14. *Original Records*, ed. Turner, 3, 119.
15. G.F. Nuttall, ‘Dissenting Churches in Kent before 1700’, *Jnl. Eccl. Hist.* 14 (1963), 177.
16. *Calamy Revised: Being a Revision of Edmund Calamy’s Account of the Ministers and Others Ejected and Silenced, 1660–2*, ed. A.G. Matthews (Oxford, 1934), 447, 233; E. Calamy, *An Account of the Ministers, Lecturers, Masters and Fellows of Colleges and Schoolmasters, who were Ejected or Silenced* (London, 1713), 731, 763; *Freedom After Ejection: A Review (1690–2) of Presbyterian and Congregational Nonconformity in England and Wales*, ed. A. Gordon (Manchester, 1917), 265–6.
17. Somerset R.O., D/D/Cd/93 (Diocese of Bath and Wells, depositions 1668–71).
18. B.L. Add. MS. 33,589, f. 37r. (Oath of Allegiance, 15 March 1665/6, subscribed by Stubbes). Thompson Cooper in his account of Stubbes’s son, also Henry, suggests that the declaration was signed by the son, who conformed at the Restoration and was confirmed by Bishop Morley of Worcester. As the declaration is among the papers of John Smyth of Nibley, who presumably administered the oath, it seems much more likely that the subscriber was the father, who had not conformed and who was resident in Gloucestershire at this date: *Dictionary of National Biography*.
19. *Calamy Revised*, ed. Matthews, 468–9; Calamy, *Account of the Ministers*, 319; *Original Records*, ed. Turner, 1, 7, 10–12, 105–6, 108, 113, 121; 2, 971–2, 979; *Dictionary of National Biography*, s.v. Stubbes.
20. G.F. Nuttall, ‘The Baptist Western Association, 1653–8’, *Jnl. Eccl. Hist.* 11 (1960), 213–18; *Association Records of the Particular Baptists of England, Wales and Ireland to 1660: Part 2. The West Country and Ireland*, ed. B.R. White (Baptist Hist. Soc. 1973), 105 n. 4; *Biographical Dictionary of British Radicals in the Seventeenth Cent.: Volume 1*, ed. R.L. Greaves and R. Zaller (Brighton, 1982), 162–3; ‘Baptist Churches till 1660’, *Trans. Baptist Hist. Soc.* 2 (1910–11), 240; *The Records of a Church of Christ in Bristol, 1640–87*, ed. R. Hayden (Bristol Rec. Soc. 27, 1974), 286, 300.

21. *Calamy Revised*, ed. Matthews, 250, 444, 566; *Original Records*, ed. Turner, 1, 507; 2, 820. Turner identified 'Clonwell' as Clearwell, west of the Severn.
22. *Minute Book of the Men's Meeting of the Society of Friends in Bristol, 1667-86*, ed. R.S. Mortimer (Bristol Rec. Soc. 26, 1971), 210, 217.
23. For a detailed consideration of the attempts by Nicholson to suppress open nonconformity in his diocese, D.L. Wykes, 'They "assemble in greater numbers and [with] more dareing then formerly": the Bishop of Gloucester and nonconformity in the late 1660s', *Southern Hist.* 17 (1995), 24-39.
24. Stubbes, however, was reported as preaching at Dursley, where he had preached since his ejection from Wells, though according to the returns for Chippenham and Grittenham in Wiltshire he was living in Bristol in 1669. Hancock when returned as preaching at a conventicle in Yatton, Wiltshire, was also said to be residing in Bristol, but Fox preaching at Bradford-on-Avon was reported as living in Marshfield and Flower at Castle Combe: see *Original Records*, ed. Turner, 1, 107, 117.