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FOREWORD

This Volume is the second in a series of Bristol and Gloucestershire records issued in accordance with the terms of a legacy left to the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society by the late Mr Alfred Bruce Robinson. Responsibility for publication was entrusted by the Society to a Records Section, and the first volume in the series—Marriage Bonds for the Diocese of Bristol 1637-1700—was issued two years ago. The Records Section wishes to express its thanks to Mr Wilfrid Leighton who undertook the work of Honorary General Editor from 1950 to 1952.

The present volume contains a calendar of marriage allegations in the diocese of Gloucester from 1637-1680, together with surrogate allegations up to 1694. In his Introduction, the editor, Mr Brian Frith, furnishes much new information on the procedure relating to marriage licences and marriage bonds, and indicates some of the ways in which records of this type can be of use not only to the genealogist, but also to the social historian.

The next volume in the series will be the parish registers of St. Augustine the Less, Bristol, edited by Mr Arthur Sabin. The MS. is now in the hands of the printer, and the book will be published in 1955. In addition, Mr Irvine Gray and the Rev. J. E. Gethyn Jones have nearly completed their work on the parish registers of Dymock.

The Records Section also has in hand a guide to the Parish Records of Gloucestershire. The surviving records of all Gloucestershire parishes have already been examined, and the material is now being arranged and classified.

Other projects under consideration include the publication of churchwardens' accounts, overseers' accounts, poor law records, and Bristol wills.

Volumes in this series are available at a reduced price to members of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society, and the Records Section appeals to all of them to support its work. It hopes too that these Gloucestershire records will be of interest to all who are concerned with the history of the county and its relations with national history.

Patrick McGrath.

Hon. General Editor,
To the Memory
of
My Mother
(1877-1954)
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INTRODUCTION

The eight Marriage Allegation Books from which the following transcription has been made are in the custody of the Gloucester Diocesan Registrar, and are kept at the Diocesan Registry, Pitt Street, Gloucester. They are printed with permission of the Registrar, Mr Percy C. Lloyd.

The volumes in which the entries were made are mostly bound in vellum, measure about 12 by 8 inches, and vary in size from some fifty to about four hundred pages. Described on some of the covers as being 'Liber Actorum Licentiarum Matrimonialium,' they are in fact the record of the allegations made before the Chancellor of the Diocese, or his deputy, for permission to obtain marriage licences. The actual licences were presumably issued on the basis of the facts stated in the allegations, but no licences are to be found in the Gloucester Diocesan Registry, and there are no marriage bonds before 1729.¹

The volumes are arranged in chronological order and are in quite good condition, and they are readily accessible to the searcher. The later volumes are bound in cardboard, some of them being indexed. The earliest volume in the Registry begins on 18 April 1637² and goes up to 18 October 1638. Then there is a gap until 12 February 1660/1, when the next volume begins. There are, however, four allegations for 1640/1 found on a loose sheet of paper at the end of Volume 1,³ and it is possible that other allegations after 1638 were entered in a volume which had not survived; but the gap between 1638 and 1660/1 was in the main due to the disturbances in connection with the Civil War and the abolition of episcopacy. The transcription now printed, includes all the allegations to be found from 1637 to 1680, together with the surrogate allegations up to 1694.⁴

The usual procedure when two people wished to be married without the calling of banns was for one of them to go to the Diocesan Chancellor and make the necessary allegation or sworn statement, the purpose of which was to ensure that there was no impediment to the marriage and that the requirements of the canon law had been complied with.⁵ An example of what was involved when an allegation was made may be seen from a typical entry in the Marriage Allegation Books on which the present volume is based. The full version of the first entry, which is calendared on page 1, runs as follows:

Decimo octavo die Aprilis 1637

On wch day appeared personally John Barra of Newnton in the County of Wilts husbandman aged 30th yeares or thereabouts

¹ See p. xiv.
² There must once have been records of allegations before this date, but they do not seem to have survived.
³ See p. 18.
⁴ For surrogate allegations, see p. xv.
⁵ These requirements have been noted infra, p. xx ff.
before the right Worll ffrrancis Baber doctor of the Civill Lawes and Chancellor of the dioces of Glouc'r and allledged that he intenden to marry with one Mary Wight of Kingcott in the said dioces of Gloucr singlewoman aged 22th yeares or thereabouts And sayeth that the consent of parents is had and obtayned on either side to be lawfully married together And further sayeth that there is noe lett or impediment by reason of any precontract consanguinity affinity or any other lawfull meanes whatsoever that may barr or hinder the said intended marriage flr the trueth of all wch premises he the said John Barra maketh faith

Jurat die pred'
coram me
ffran : Baber

The following letter preserved in the Lincolnshire diocesan archives provides an interesting illustration of an applicant for a licence who armed himself with a letter of introduction from the parson before going off to make his allegation:

(Endorsed : To hys very good and lovinge friend Mr John Prigeon Register at Mr Bullingham his house in Lincoln give these)

Mr John Prigeon my most hartie commendacions premysed etc. these may be to request your favourable furderance toward the bearer heareof William Brigges my neighbour and good frend who desyreth to have a lyence to be married to the obtaining whereof I do earnestly desyer your helpe and ready dispatch whearin you shall furder bynd me unto yow and fynd me ready to the uttermost of my abilitie to requyte this and the rest of your good favours and friendly good turns and this in hast I do hartely commit you to thallmighty.

Whickenby this xvth of May

Yours assuredly
Roberte Boothe

Fiat licencia magistro Roberto Boothe clerico rectori de Wickenby ad solemnizandum matrimonium inter Willelum Brigges de Houlton in Beckeringe in comitatu Lincoln' husbandman ex una et jaman Welles de Wickenby solutam etc tempore de (sic) matr' (torn) prohibito etc.

Obligetur dictus Brigges in C marcis
Tho. Randes1

It will be noted that in the surviving records of the diocese of Gloucester the allegations are entered in special volumes and are given in full. This does not always seem to have been the practice in other dioceses. The earliest records of allegations for marriage licences issued by the Dean and Chapter of Westminster are found in a series of Act Books of the Dean and Chapter, and, according to the editor of

1 Lincolnshire Diocesan Records: M.B. 1601/14. M.B. 1601/15 is the bond of Brigges, dated 15 May 1601. I am indebted to Mrs J. Varley and Miss Dorothy Williamson for this illustration.
the volume, were 'mere records of licences issued, the original allegations, which had long been in the custody of the Solicitors of the Dean and Chapter, having been only a few years earlier sold to a paper-maker and converted into pulp'. The earliest Allegation Book in the Lincolnshire Diocesan Records, covering the years 1508–1601, makes no mention of an appearance and an allegation by the person concerned, and is a record of licences issued to schoolmasters and curates as well as a record of marriage licences. At Ely there are five volumes containing registrations of administrations, sequestrations, curates' licences and other licences, intermingled with the records of marriage licences. At Bristol, there are no surviving records of marriage allegations before 1746, and then the allegations are recorded, not in volumes, but on separate printed forms. The procedure for recording allegations no doubt varied from diocese to diocese, and from one period to another, and it is likely that the variations now appear even greater because many records have not survived.

Although the allegation was frequently made by the prospective bridegroom, there were many occasions when it was inconvenient for him to appear personally, and he called on the services of a friend or relation. A full transcription of the second entry in the first Marriage Allegation Book will serve to illustrate the form of entry used in such cases:

```
die pred'
Att which daie and place appeared p'sonally Richard Cooke of ye parrishe of Cirencester Innholder before the right wr'p'
franc Baber D'tor of lawes and Chancellor of the dioces of Gloucr and alleadged that there is a marridge intended betweene one Robert Heath of the same parish singlman and Margaret Cooke of the Siddington in the dioces of Gloucr singwoman aged 25 yeares or thereabouts. And sayth further that there is no lawfull let or impediment by reason of any precontracte consanguinitie affinitie or the like to hinder this intended marridge they havinge the consent of their parents thereto of the truth of which premisses hee maketh faith
franc. Baber

Rich. Cook
```

For the purpose of the present transcription, it is convenient, when the allegation is made by a person other than the bride or bridegroom, to describe that person as a bondsman or bondswoman, although

2 The second Lincolnshire Allegation Book begins in 1612, and, unlike the first, contains nothing but allegations. It gives full details of appearance and allegation, as at Gloucester. I am indebted to Mrs J. Varley and Miss D. M. Williamson for this information and for help on a number of other points.
3 A. Gibbons, Ely Episcopal Records, Lincoln, 1896, p. 154 ff. These cover the period 1562–1693. The later volumes contain only marriage licences.
4 For an example of the prospective bride making the allegation, see 17 Sept. 1663 when Susanna Selman made the necessary statement.
5 Calendared, p. 1 infra.

xiii
it cannot necessarily be assumed that such persons did in fact enter into a bond. As will be seen, there is considerable uncertainty about the question of marriage bonds in the diocese of Gloucester in this period.

In general, the practice of requiring marriage bonds seems to have been insisted on from at least as early as 1579. The licence was not to be issued unless the party was bound with sureties under the following conditions: that consent of parents or guardians had been obtained; that there was no impediment to the marriage; and that no suit was depending touching any impediment. The Canons of 1604 required also security that the marriage would take place in the parish church or chapel where one of the parties dwelt and between the canonical hours. Two sufficient witnesses, one of them known to the judge or to some person of good reputation then present, had to swear that the consent of parents or guardians had been obtained (except in the case of widows and widowers), and one of the parties had also to swear that there was no impediment to the marriage.

It is reasonable to assume that a bond would have been required in the diocese of Gloucester, and that it may have been signed by the person making the allegation, who might be either the prospective bridegroom or the person he deputed to make the allegation. That some bonds certainly did exist can be shown from the note made by the Rev. Henry Kirkham, one of the surrogates and incumbent of Stanton, who included the following note in his surrogate allegations: 'Memorandum June 12th–93 when my 2 Cosens Anne and Jane Parsons came to Stanton then sent 38 bonds back to the Chancellor by the Coach. All the bonds that were sealed to that time.' Yet no bonds appear in the Gloucestershire Diocesan Registry before 1729, and it seems that for some reason they have failed to survive.

From 1729 there are bonds for some, but by no means all, of the marriages for which licences were issued, and it is a curious and interesting fact that the procedure used in the Gloucester Registry differed in the case of an allegation accompanied by a bond from what it was when there was an allegation without a bond. The latter was entered in the Marriage Allegation Book as before; the former were not so entered. Instead, details of the allegation were entered, not in an Allegation Book, but on a special form which was attached to the bond, and these were collected together in bundles. A much fuller investigation of procedure than is possible here would be required to explain why this was so. One would almost be tempted to suggest that Gloucester did not require the completion of a bond until 1729 and until then regarded the sworn allegation as sufficient, but this would have been clearly contrary to the canon law, and, in any case, it is known that at least some bonds did exist in the seventeenth century.

When all the formalities had been completed, a marriage licence was issued. This was taken to the clergyman performing the ceremony and he presumably retained it as his authority for dispensing with the

1 See p. 181.
2 Compare with Bristol where the bonds survive but where there are no Allegation Books. Bristol Marriage Licence Bonds up to 1700 have been printed as vol. 1 of the present series.
banns required by the rubrics. A number of marriage licences survive among the parish records. The licence was not necessarily in the lengthy form suggested in the Canons of 1597. A licence for the early seventeenth century which has been preserved, attached to a bond, in the Lincolnshire Diocesan Archives, runs as follows:

Fiat licentia curato de Alvingham arch' Lincoln' ad solemnizandum matrimonium inter William Mansert de Alvingham predicto generosum et Annam Goge de eadem ancellam.

Obligetur Humfridus Ashton de eadem in centum marcis
Thomas Rands commissarius Archdiaconus hinc.

Although the procedure outlined above was the one normally adopted, there were variations, for it was not always possible or convenient for the parties or their representatives to appear personally before the Diocesan Registrar in Gloucester, and a licence might be obtained through a surrogate. A surrogate was usually a clergymen in some part of the diocese who acted for the Chancellor, took down details of the allegations, and sent them in to the Chancellor at a later date. Often he would wait some considerable time before sending the information to the Registry, and thus a group of surrogate allegations ranging over a period of time might be entered in the Allegation Book on a particular date. These entries are often disappointing, for the surrogate frequently obtained only the briefest information, sometimes recording only the names of the parties without their parishes. The surrogate allegations are here transcribed in the order in which they appear in the original volumes, and when some of the parish names are omitted, it is of help to know that the parties probably came from the district in which the surrogate had jurisdiction.

There is a further variation from the normal procedure in the case of a few parishes which were peculiar where it seems licences were issued from time to time either by the incumbent or by some official of the peculiar. The parish registers of Bishop's Cleeve contain a number of references to these practices. On 23 June 1674, for example reference is made to a marriage performed 'by vertue of a licence granted by ye Rectour of Bishops Cleeve,' and on 10 October 1677 to a marriage 'by vertue of a licence granted by ye official of ye Peculiar of Bps Cleeve.' There is naturally no record of allegations for such marriages in the Diocesan Registry. Bibury and Withington were also peculiar, and the records of marriage allegations made in these parishes were presumably recorded elsewhere than in the Gloucester Diocesan Registry.

The value of marriage allegations to the genealogist cannot be overstressed, for these records act as an index to many of the families

1 See p. 211.
2 Lincolnshire Diocesan Records: M.B. 1601/3-4. The licence is undated, but the accompanying bond is dated 6 April 1601.
3 For a reference to a licence granted to a couple in Bibury Peculiar, see infra., p. 111, 12 July 1672. The fact that a note was entered in the Allegation Book suggests that it was an unusual case.
4 In the middle ages, these three parishes were episcopal manors of the bishop of Worcester.
of the diocese, and give the searcher a reasonable idea of the whereabouts of particular families in which he is interested. They often provide the clue to a marriage which has taken place in a parish other than that from which one of the parties came. The status of the couple, the occupation of the prospective bridegroom, and the ages of the parties (except usually in the case of widows and widowers) are often given, and these details are not easily found elsewhere.

A systematic study of marriage allegations has, it may be suggested, a good deal to offer to the social historian, for the records raise a number of questions which cannot be adequately answered except in terms of the social background of the time, and they provide the historian with a great volume of statistical material on marriage habits in earlier centuries.

One interesting problem is the relationship of the number of marriages by licence to marriages by banns at different periods of history. The number of allegations in Gloucestershire in the time covered by the present volume was about two hundred a year. The number of parishes in the diocese was in the neighbourhood of three hundred. It is impossible to say how many marriages took place, but it is interesting to note that in 1670, in 86 parishes there appear to have been only 166 marriages. This gives an average of 1.93 marriages per parish, and although this average is almost certainly too low if we consider the diocese as a whole, yet it is clear that marriages by licence formed a considerable proportion of the total marriages, and that the licence system was very popular, even though it must have been more expensive than marriage by banns.

Anyone who wished to obtain a licence had to pay certain fees. In 1597 after there had been many complaints of exactions in ecclesiastical courts, Archbishop Whitgift issued a table of fees which was supposed to be displayed in every ecclesiastical court. There is in Lambeth Palace Library a list drawn up by the bishop of Gloucester presumably in accordance with the Archbishop's instructions. It runs as follows:

A table of such fees as have bine usuallie payed to the Lord Bishoppes Chauncellor and Register of Glouc' and the Archdeacon and to the Proctors and Apparitors and other Officers of the Consistorie there ever since the installacon' of me Godfrey Bishop

1 Applicants describing themselves as gentlemen were, on the whole considerably younger than those in other occupations.

2 Based on an examination of Phillimore's Gloucestershire Marriages. In 41 of these 86 parishes no marriage was recorded for this year. The 86 parishes did not include some of the larger ones such as Berkeley, Tewkesbury, Stroud, Chipping Campden, Bisley and the Gloucester city parishes.

3 I am indebted to Miss Doreen Slatter, Archivist, Lambeth Palace Library, for this information. Miss Slatter also informs me that in Process Book of the Court of Arches, Corney v. Shuttlewood, 1667, there is a copy made on 20 Nov. 1627 of an undated table of fees in the Registry of the Archbishop of Canterbury referring to the Archdeaconry Court of Leicester. By this, the fee payable to the Commissary or officials was 5s. and to the Registrar 5s. The Rev. J. S. Purvis gives a reference to a list of fees in 1530 at York.

4 Item pro litera ad solemnizandum matrimonium Capitulo ijs. Registrario viijd. (Register of the Dean and Chapter).
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of Glouc' to that See, and so have bine for many yeares before, as I am crediblie informed.

Chancellor
For Licence of mariage and in time prohibited double fee . . . . . . . . . . . . vis. viiid.
Register
For dispensacons' or Licences of mariage or any other Licence . . . . . . . . . . . . iis. iiiid.

These were the official fees, but one may well doubt whether in the seventeenth century applicants in practice found their costs limited to what was officially required. Nevertheless they may well have found in many cases that a quiet wedding by licence saved expense.

Some of the reasons why people in the sixteenth century chose to use, and not infrequently abuse, the practice of marriage by licence are noted elsewhere¹, and a study of these records will help to illustrate and illuminate the explanations given by contemporaries. Sometimes, no doubt, the marriage was one of real urgency, and in one case we find the reluctant bridegroom-to-be taken to make his allegation by the constable². The calling of banns would not lead to great delay, but marriage by licence could certainly be a little quicker. Perhaps some of the sailors mentioned in these pages married in haste before their ships sailed. Again, a surprisingly large number of the prospective bridegrooms were widowers, and may have preferred a quiet second marriage. Some of the bridegrooms ventured on matrimony surprisingly late in life. That one applicant for a licence was stated in the records to be 226³ was no doubt the result of a clerical error, but in one case the age was 88⁴ and in another 76⁵, and there were other examples of the same kind to be found in these pages. We can easily understand why such people might wish to avoid the publicity of banns, and we may be tempted to enquire whether the proposed unions resembled those described in the late sixteenth century attack on the abuses connected with the issue of marriage licences⁶. With regard to the ages given in the allegations, a word of warning is necessary. Little reliance can be placed on some of the early figures, for although the age is often given correctly, it is sometimes only an approximation, due no doubt to the ignorance of the parties of their real ages. Ages are frequently given as 'so many years and upwards,' and although it has been suggested that the upwards refers only to the odd months, this does not seem to be the case. The genealogist is here helped by that remarkable work, Bigland's Gloucestershire Collections⁷, with its lists of monumental inscriptions both for churches and churchyards. When the inscriptions give age at death, this can often be

¹ See pp. xxivff.
³ See p. 56.
⁴ See p. 55.
⁵ See p. 54.
⁷ Historical, Monumental and Genealogical Collections, relating to the County of Gloucester, printed from the original papers of Ralph Bigland, vol. 1 (1791); vol. 2 (1792); vol. 3 (1838–89).
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compared with the age shown in the marriage allegations and in the parish registers. For example, in an allegation of 20 September 1670, Richard Freeman's age is given as 33, i.e. born about 1637. His baptism, however, took place at Buckland in 1635, while on his monumental inscription, as given by Bigland, his age at death in 1701 was 66, i.e. born about 1635. Many other examples might be given of this understatement of age in the allegations, but the following, selected at random, will suffice. In an allegation dated 29 April 1671, Giles Sanders gave his age as 30, i.e. born about 1641. From the parish register, however, we find that he was baptised on 30 June 1633, while his bride, whose age is given in the allegation as 25, i.e. born about 1646, was in fact baptised on 4 August 1639, and her age was 31. Perhaps the lady forgot her real age.

It will be seen from the following pages that the practice of marriage by licence was not limited to any particular social class, and that people of many occupations, from labourers upwards, are found making allegations. The idea that licences were issued mainly to the better-class families may have arisen from the direction in the Canons of 1604, that they should be granted 'unto such persons only, as be of good state and quality,' but this regulation must have been interpreted very widely, if indeed it was not completely ignored.

The allegations are of interest to the social and economic historian because of the light they throw on the different occupations of seventeenth century Gloucestershire. We cannot, of course, assume that they provide a representative sample showing the relative importance of particular occupations, for marriage by licence may have enjoyed greater popularity among particular groups and in particular parts of the county than it did among other groups in different parts, but a remarkable variety of trades and professions does appear in these records¹, and they do provide us, within limits, with an occupational census. One interesting illustration is the references to silk-weaving, an industry about which little is known in seventeenth century Gloucestershire.

A systematic study of these records can also throw light on the question of how far the parties proposing to get married came from the same locality, a subject closely related to problems of communications in the seventeenth century, and raising issues of how far parish and county were brought by intermarriage into contact with the world outside. Many of the parties naturally came from the same parish or from neighbouring parishes, but there were many contacts with other counties and with distant parts, including a number with London.

Many of the early entries for the years covered by this volume do not give the names of the parishes in which the marriages were to take place, and all too often the marriage did not take place in the parish from which the parties came, even when they were both of the same parish. Such elusive marriages are by no means easy to trace, but occasionally some of them are to be found in the registers of the Gloucester city parishes or in the Cathedral registers, especially in the eighteenth century. For those who have despaired of finding evidence for a marriage which they know must have taken place, these city registers often provide the clue.

¹ See Appendix C, pp. 213-214.
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It must not be assumed that a marriage allegation necessarily led to a marriage, or that when the parish is given in which the ceremony is to take place, that it did in fact take place there. Something, for example, must have interfered with the original plans of Humphry Hollihock of Maisemore, blacksmith, aged 35, who on 20 August 1666, asked for a licence to marry Margaret Fletcher, aged 40, for on 16 April 1667, he is recorded as wanting to marry Sibbill Mitchell, and he is not described as a widower. Possibly there had been a broken romance. Unfortunately the registers of Maisemore for this period are missing.

It should also be noted that when a marriage in a parish register is stated to be 'by licence' the allegation is not always to be found in the Registry. It is possible that some of the allegations were entered on loose sheets of paper and were subsequently lost, while on occasions the allegations may have been made before a surrogate in a distant part of the diocese and for one reason or another never reached the Registry. The fact that some of the surrogate entries were put in as much as two years after the making of the allegations suggests that some of them may have been mislaid, especially if the surrogate died before handing in the information. Moreover, a few pages of the Allegation Books have certainly been lost.

Marriage allegations and marriage licence bonds have always received a good deal of attention from the genealogist, but in the past they have perhaps been studied too exclusively from his point of view and their value to the social historian has been underestimated.

I should like to express my sincere thanks to those who have made this volume possible. The Records Section of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society has been a model of patience, as has the Hon. General Editor of the series, Mr Patrick McGrath, who has contributed a Note on the history of marriage licences as well as the Appendices, and who has given me much help and encouragement. Mr Percy Lloyd permitted the allegations to be transcribed under very pleasant conditions. Mr Anthony Wagner, F.S.A., Richmond Herald, was most helpful and encouraging when I first planned to undertake the work, and I am indebted to Mrs J. Varley and Miss D. M. Williamson of the Lincolnshire Diocesan Record Office, to Miss Doreen Slatter of Lambeth Palace Library, and to the Rev. J. S. Purvis of the Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, York, for help and advice on a number of points. I should also like to express my gratitude to Miss G. K. Hawkins for helping with the laborious and very important task of indexing.

I hope this work will be of help to all whose families have their roots in Gloucestershire and to all who are interested in the social history of our county.

BRIAN FRITH.

1 For example, part of the entries for January and February, 1674/5.
NOTES ON THE HISTORY OF MARRIAGE LICENCES

Although many volumes of marriage allegations and marriage licence bonds have been printed by various Record Societies, the literature on the subject is surprisingly limited, and the following notes on the history of marriage licences may therefore be of use to the reader, even though they do not profess to answer all the questions that arise in connection with a matter that requires much fuller investigation than is possible here.

The kind of licence with which this volume is concerned was a licence issued by authority of the bishop of the diocese permitting the parties to marry without the calling of banns. Efforts were made to insist that the bishop’s licence should be limited to parties one of whom at least lived in the bishop’s diocese and to see that the marriage should take place in the diocese of the bishop who granted the licence.1

The practice of calling the banns of marriage has a long history in the western church. The public announcement of an intended marriage was meant to prevent clandestine unions, and all who knew of any impediment were required to declare it. The first canonical enactment on the subject in the church in England seems to be the eleventh canon of the Synod of Westminster in 1200, when it was ordered that no marriage should be contracted without banns being thrice published in the church, except by special authority of the bishop.2 What was already a local custom in certain parts of Europe was made compulsory for all Christendom by the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215 which decreed that marriages must be announced publicly in church by the priest and that there must be a suitable delay between the public announcement and the actual solemnization of the marriage, so that whoever wished to do so could draw attention to any impediments that might exist. The Council did not, however, state how many times the banns must be called, nor the particular churches in which they were to be published.3

The available information on medieval marriage licences in England is scanty, but it would seem that from at least the fourteenth century, if not earlier, bishops from time to time issued licences dispensing the

1 For permission to marry elsewhere, the parties would normally require a special licence from the Archbishop of Canterbury.
3 See the article on ‘Bans’ in Dictionnaire de théologie catholique. In the sixteenth century, the Council of Trent drew up stricter regulations designed to prevent abuses.
4 There seems no reason why such licences should not have been granted in the thirteenth century, but the authorities whom I have consulted do not give any thirteenth century examples. Halsbury, Laws of England, 2nd edition, 1933, XI 825 and note (e) states the earliest mention of a bishop’s licence dispensing with the publication of banns is in the Constitutions of William de la Zouche, Archbishop of York, 1347, incorporated in those of his successor, John Thoresby, in 1367, and gives as authority for this Johnson, Ecclesiastical Law, and Wilkins, Concilia III, 72. J. Charles Cox, The Parish Registers of England, p. 83, claims that power of episcopal dispensing with banns is at least as old as the constitutions of Archbishop Mepham in 1328.
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parties from the necessity of publishing the banns which would normally be required by canon law. The Register of Henry Chichele, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1414–1443, contains a few illustrations of this kind of licence. Thus, in 1421 a licence was granted for John Forth and Catherine de la Ville, members of the Queen’s household, to marry even though banns had not been thrice published (‘etsi banna in facie ecclesie per tres dies solempnes edita non fuerint ut est moris constitucione provinciali que sic incipit Humana concupiscencia . . .’). Further illustrations of this practice can be found in Bishops’ Registers in the later middle ages. It does not seem possible at present to say how frequently such licences were granted in the middle ages, but one is left with the impression that, although the practice was well established, it was much less common than it became in the sixteenth century and later.

At the Reformation, the regulation of marriage remained under the canon law, and the bishops appear to have been expressly confirmed in their right of granting licences by the Dispensations Act of 1534 which also permitted the Archbishop of Canterbury to grant in both provinces such licences and dispensations as had formerly been granted by the Pope.

In the later sixteenth century and in the early seventeenth century the subject of marriage by licence received a good deal of attention both from the ecclesiastical authorities and from parliament, and the indications are that the practice was becoming increasingly common and increasingly open to abuse.

In 1571, licences granted by the Archbishop of Canterbury came under fire in the Commons, and although one member ‘endeavoured to prove, that Licences for Marriage in some cases might be needfull . . .’, a bill regulating them secured three readings and got as far as the Lords. The power of the ecclesiastical authorities to regulate marriage procedure was being criticised by a House of Commons in which there was a strong Puritan element.

There was further criticism of the granting of marriage licences in the Commons in 1580 when it was alleged ‘There is one facultie of great inconvenience granted, not only by the Courte of Faculties, but by the Chauncellor of every diocese, used. The dispensation for marriage without banes askinge, by occasion whereof, children make


2 See, for example, Register of Thomas Mylyng, Bishop of Hereford, Canterbury and York Society, vol. xxvi, pp. 59. For dispensations permitting marriage after banns had been called only once or twice, see ibid. pp. 73, 89, 99, 109, etc., Register of Henry Chichele, iv, 146, 222; Ely Episcopal Records, ed. A. Gibbons, Lincoln, 1891, p. 225.

3 25 Henry VIII, c. 21, clause ix. ‘Provyded always that this acco shall not be prejudicial to the Archebissopp of Yerke or to any Bishopp or Prelate of this Realme; but that they may lawfully . . . dispence in all cases in which they were wonte to dispence by the comen lawe or custome of this Realme . . .’

disordered matches without the assent of their parents, and orphanes are left to the spoyle of unthriftie persons.' The defence put forward by the bishops is worth quoting because of the light it throws on the existing practice with regard to licences. It runs as follows:

The answere to the thirteenth article.

1. It maie be soe qualified that noe inconvenience shall ensue thereof.

2. Their be divers reasonable occasions that dayly happen, which maie hinder the thrishe askinge of banes. Which causes are meete to be considered of, and allowed by the Ordinarie or his deputie.

3. The inconvenience that is proposed, is in most dioceses already mett withall, by puttinge theis conditions in the facultie, viz. that they have their governors consent; that there is noe sute for matrimonye dependinge; noe precontracte, nor noe other impediment which the partie is by a bond with suerties bounde unto: soe that by this means this inconvenience is better mett withall, than by askinge the banes thryse; which maie be done, and yet theis impediments remayne.

4. And since the bonds have bene qualified as is above-said, beinge about one twelve moneths past, experience dothe teache, that none of the pretended inconveniences have happened.

It would appear from the above that the bishops had sometime in 1579 taken steps to meet criticisms of marriage licences by requiring bonds that certain conditions had been fulfilled, and that this practice had been established 'in most dioceses.' It was not, however, yet embodied in the ecclesiastical canons, and although a proposal on these lines was put forward by the lower house of convocation in 1580, nothing came of it at that time.

John Whitgift was elected Archbishop of Canterbury in August 1583, and in October of that year, after consultation with the bishops of the province he sent the certain 'Articles touching Preachers and other Orders for the Church' to all the bishops, who were required to inform him that they were being conformed with in their dioceses. One of these articles stated 'As persons of honest, worshipful, and honourable calling may necessarily and reasonably have occasions sometimes to solemnize marriage by licence for the bans asking or for once or twice without any great harm, so for avoiding generally of inconveniences noted in this behalf, it is thought expedient that no dispensations be granted for marriage without banes, but under sufficient and large bonds, with these conditions following . . .' The

1 John Strype, The Life and Acts of John Whitgift, Oxford, 1822, Appendix p. 62. This is part of an answer by the bishops to A Book of Articles (thirteen in number) offered to the last session of Parliament, 1580.

2 Clause 4 may mean that bonds were required for the first time in 1579, or it may mean that from 1579 certain additional safeguards were required to be inserted in the bonds. Possibly in some dioceses bonds were required much earlier, but if they were, none seems to have survived.

3 See 'Articles delivered to the lords from the lower house of convocation,' printed in Edward Cardwell, Synodalia, Oxford, 1842, I, 548 and pp. 541–2, note.
conditions in the bond were to be that there should not afterwards appear any impediment by pre-contract, consanguinity, affinity or other lawful means whatsoever; that at the time of granting the licence there was no suit pending before any ecclesiastical or temporal judge concerning any impediment; that the marriage would not be entered upon without the consent of parents or guardians; and that it be openly solemnized in the church. The articles continued thus: 'The copy of which bond is to be set down and given in charge for every bishop in his diocese to follow.' Any who offended against this order were to be suspended for six months.

The attack on the church's practice with regard to marriage licences, which was only part of a general attack on the powers of bishops, was continued in the Commons in 1584, when bills were introduced against pluralities, non-residence and against 'dispensations for celebrating marriage without banns asking...'. Whitgift had already tried to meet criticisms by laying down a standard practice for every diocese and by insisting on bonds with adequate safeguards against abuses, and the conditions laid down in his articles of 1583 were now repeated in one of the six canons adopted by convocation and approved by the queen in 1585.

These efforts to regulate the granting of marriage licences apparently failed to remove abuses, and in 1597 the Commons once more renewed their attack. On 10 November 1597, 'Mr Walgrave moved touching the abuses of Licences for Marriage granted by Ecclesiastical persons, and prayeth consideration may be had for reformation thereof by this House.' A committee was appointed to collect evidence and draw up a bill. A great many abuses came to light, and a contemporary note runs as follows: 'Item, Of the hurt that comes by barring of askings in Church, and granting of licences to marry. These marriages are made in places peculiar, which are desired to be annexed to the bishoprics, by vagrant, unlearned, dissolve, drunken, and Idle stipendiaries, Vicars and Curates: who are placed in the rooms of the rich men; who has divers livings, and are not resident.' Strype also prints a contemporary account of abuses which appears to have been a summary of evidence produced before the committee, and if this is to be believed, the sixteenth century had little to learn from the eighteenth in the matter of scandals arising from clandestine marriages.

The shocking abuses revealed by the enquiry greatly exercised the mind of the ecclesiastical authorities. There was a proposal, possibly put forward at this time in convocation, 'That no person be licensed to

1 Henry Gee and William John Hardy, *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*, 1910, p. 484.
2 Strype, op. cit., i, 380; Cardwell, op. cit., pp. 139-140, note.
3 Cardwell, op. cit., pp. 143. De moderandis quibusdam indulgentiis pro celebratione matrimonii absque trinundina denunciatione, quam bannos uocant matrimoniales. This is a Latin version of the article given in Gee and Hardy, op. cit., p. 484. See also Cardwell, op. cit., pp. 139-140, note.
4 Sir Simonds D'Ewes, op. cit., pp. 555, 560, 561, 562
6 This document is printed below, Appendix A, p. 210. A good deal of excitement was aroused and the Queen herself intervened. See Strype, op. cit., ii, 376-377.
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mARRY, THE BANNS NOT THRICE ASKED; UNLESS HE HAVE IN GOODS AND LANDS TO THE VALUE OF 10 L. IN THE QUEEN'S BOOK. 1. NOTHING CAME OF THIS, AND THE INTERVENTION OF THE QUEEN SEEMS TO HAVE PREVENTED ANY LEGISLATION BY PARLIAMENT, BUT CONVOCATION ONCE MORE TRIED TO PUT THE CHURCH'S AFFAIRS IN ORDER, AND THE CANONS OF 1597 MADE ADDITIONAL REGULATIONS CONCERNING LICENCES. THE Earlier REGULATIONS OF 1583 WERE REPEATED VERBATIM, BUT SOME ADDITIONAL SAFEGUARDS WERE ADDED. LICENCES WERE TO BE GRANTED ONLY BY SUCH AS HAD EPISTOLICAL AUTHORITY, UNDER THEIR OWN HANDS, AND NOT BY DEPUTIES OR SURROGATES. THEY WERE NOT TO BE ISSUED TO ANY UNDER THE CONTROL OF PARENTS OR GUARDIANS, EXCEPT WITH EXPPLICIT CONSENT OF SUCH PARENTS OR GUARDIANS, GIVEN PERSONALLY OR IN WRITING. WRITTEN CONSENT WAS NOT TO BE TRUSTED UNLESS IT WAS BROUGHT BY A REPUTABLE MESSER WHO COULD TESTIFY THAT HE HAD RECEIVED IT FROM THE HANDS OF THE PARENTS OR GUARDIANS; AND A RECORD WAS TO BE KEPT OF THESE WRITINGS AND OF THE OATH OF THE MESSER. LICENCES WERE TO BE GIVEN ONLY TO PERSONS OF GOOD STATE AND QUALITY ('ILLUSTRIS ET CLARAE CONDITIONIS HOMINIBUS'), UNLESS THERE WAS URGENT NECESSITY, WHICH WAS KNOWN TO THE JUDGE. IN THE LICENCE, THE PARISH CHURCHES OF BOTH PARTIES WERE TO BE ENTERED, OR THOSE OF THEIR PARENTS AND GUARDIANS, AND IT WAS TO BE LAID DOWN THAT THE MARRIAGE SHOULD TAKE PLACE BETWEEN 8 O'CLOCK IN THE MORNING AND NOON. IN ADDITION, THE CANONS PRESCRIBED A MODEL FORM OF LICENCE TO BE USED IN EVERY DIOCESE.

THE EXPOSURE OF GRAVE ABUSES IN THE SYSTEM AT THIS TIME HAD EVIDENTLY LED TO QUESTIONING OF THE WHOLE PRINCIPLE OF LICENCES, AND CONVOCATION, WHILE ENDEAVOURING BY ITS CANONS TO PREVENT ABUSES, AT THE SAME TIME DREW UP A DEFENCE OF THE LICENCE SYSTEM IN ANSWER TO THE PARLIAMENTARY ATTACK. THIS DOCUMENT IS OF GREAT INTEREST, BECAUSE IT HELPS TO ANSWER THE QUESTION OF WHY PEOPLE WISHED TO GET MARRIED WITHOUT PUBLICATION OF BANNS. IT THEREFORE SEEMS WORTHWHILE PRINTING IT IN FULL.

REASONS FOR LICENCES TO MARRY. AN ANSWER TO A BILL IN PARLIAMENT AGAINST THEM.

I. LICENCES TO MARRY ACCORDING TO THE FORM SET DOWN WITHOUT BANNS, ARE NO CAUSE OF DISORDERED MARRIAGE, BUT RATHER THE CONTRARY. FOR THEY EXPRESS ALL CAUSES THAT MIGHT BE ANY LET OF THE MARRIAGE IN LAW; AND YIELD NO LICENCE TO MARRY IN THOSE CASES; BUT ADD TO THE PROHIBITION OF THE LAW A RESTRAINT, BY A BOND ALSO. AND IF ONE MAY SPEAK A TRUTH, IT MAY BE SAID JUSTLY, THAT IT IS A MATTER, NOT ONLY NOT HURTFUL, BUT ALSO VERY PROFITABLE TO BE CONTINUED IN THE COMMON-WEALTH. FOR FIRST, SEEING CONSENT IN MARRIAGE IS THE MATTER SPECIALLY TO BE REGARDED, AND CREDIT OF KINDRED, HONOUR, WEALTH, CONTENTMENT, AND PLEASURE OF FRIENDS, BE RATHER MATTERS OF CONVENIENCY THAN NECESSITY IN MATRIMONY; IT WERE BETTER TO TOLERATE THE MEANS WHEREWITH CONSENT OF THE PARTIES THEMSELVES MAY MORE FREELY EFFECT AN

1 STRYPE, OP. CIT. 11, 380.
2 SEE CARDWELL, OP. CIT., 1, 146 FF.
3 CARDWELL, OP. CIT., P. 152–153.
5 PRINTED IN STRYPE, OP. CIT. APPENDIX, 380–382 (COTT. LIBR. CLEOPATRA F. 2).
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honest matrimony, than by tract of time publishing a marriage before hand, either the parties be occasioned to stay through bashfulness themselves, or their friends or enemies, by forbidding the banns, should give let thereunto.

And touching parents, for whom especially the respect is had. Parents oftentimes measure their affections rather according to the humour they have themselves, (being old), than regard the good liking of the young folks to be matched. And therefore rather seek to bestow their children in wealth or honour, or strength of friends, than are willing to suffer them to bestow themselves according to their own choice; although they chuse never so well, in respect of vertue and honest education¹.

Divers times men of honourable degree have liking of mean persons. So sometimes rich have of poor, and old of young, masters and mistresses of their servants; and to conclude, superiors of their inferiors; parties in disparity each of other. All which will willinglier marry secretly, than make public declaration beforehand of their liking thereunto. Which cannot be but a let often unto honest marriage.

Likewise sometimes it may fall out, that a lame or impotent man, for comfort; a man who hath lived losly many years of his life with some one woman, may be desirous even in the very point of death to marry her, either in remorse of conscience, to make some part of amends unto her, or for the good of his children he had by her. Which cannot be effected, if he must stay till banns be solemnly pronounced. Also, the friends, or the parties themselves, being desirous to avoid charge, would be glad to match secretly, which cannot justly be reprehended, if there be no other let. And therefore in many respects it may be concluded, that licences for marriage are not so hurtful as some would have them accounted.

II. And touching the parties which have used heretofore time out of mind of man, to grant, if the licence be not evil simply of itself, it cannot be the worse, for the parties that grant; especially, seeing it appertneth properly unto them by the laws received, and the custom of this realm, to determine of matrimony itself. Wherefore much more it seemeth they may still be permitted to have consideration and determination of those things, which are but preambles thereunto.

III. And whereas it is thought a matter convenient, that the Lord Archbishops or Bishops hand be subscribed to every licence granted; it seems that great inconvenience might arise thereby. For either the Archbishop or Bishop is to give credit to the report of the under-officer; and so subscribe: or else, if they living in divers parts, as often it falleth out, the parties that seek this licence shall be driven to double that information and proof. Which cannot

¹ If either party was under age or in the care of parents or guardians, a licence could not legally be granted without their consent. What the writer must have had in mind here were cases where the parties did not require such consent but where parents or guardians might try to stop or delay a marriage by forbidding the banns.
be but both troublesome and chargeable unto them, in respect of the journey and proceedings. Besides that it may happen, that some of their servants or followers may, for expedition sake, draw a further charge on them than ordinary. Lastly, I suppose that seeing the officers grant it, the blame of any licence granted otherwise than it ought to be will lie on himself: it were better to let it so rest, that thereby he may be procured to be more careful in this granting hereof than otherwise, having the Bishop's hand for a warrant, of likelihood he would be, seeing by that mean he may the better transfer the fault from himself.

The attacks on the granting of marriage licences came to nothing, and Whitgift no doubt hoped that the Canon of 1597 had provided adequate safeguards against undoubted abuses. There still remained, however, a certain laxity in the system, and in 1601 convocation endeavoured to insist that licences should be granted only by those who were authorised. It decreed 'That none but chancellors grant licences for marriage,' and in an explanatory letter in 1602 Whitgift indicated what was in mind here when he referred to 'the granting of licences of marriages by archdeacons and their officials, and others exercising peculiar jurisdictions, who are no ways by law to be said exercere episcopalem jurisdictionem de jure.'

In spite of all thes precautions, the frequent granting of marriage licences remained a grievance to the puritans, and in the so-called Millenary Petition presented to James I on his way to London in 1603 there was tacked on to the end of a clause listing the abuses in church discipline a request 'that licences for marriages without banns asked, be more cautiously granted.'

Early in the reign of James I the Convocation of Canterbury undertook the task of systematising the canon law of the Church of England, and in 1604 it approved a book of one hundred and forty-one Canons. A number of these Canons related to marriage and marriage licences, and as they stated the church law on the subject during the period with which this volume is concerned, it is desirable to quote them at length. Canon 99 forbade marriages within prohibited degrees, and Canon 100 stated that no children under the age of twenty-one

1 Cardwell, op. cit. 1, 583.

2 Ibid. p. 562. The Canons of 1597 stated: 'Praeterea adjiciendum putamus, rei cuiquam liceat, episcopalem dignitatem non obintenti (commissario ad facultates, ac vicaris generalibus archiepiscopi et episcoporum, se de plena et sede vacante, custodibus spiritualibus ac ordinaris, episcopalem jurisdictionem de jure exercentibus, in suis jurisdictionibus respective exceptis) licentiam celebrandi matrimonia sine bannis concedere. . .' Cardwell, op. cit. 1, 153.

3 Henry Gee and William John Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History, p. 510.

4 These Canons were confirmed by letters patent and were later approved by the Convocation of York. They were not approved by the Commons who questioned their authority.

5 The Canons in Latin are printed in Cardwell, op. cit., 1, 164-244: an English translation was printed in 1604 and is given in Cardwell, op. cit., 1, 244-329.
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might marry without the consent of parents or guardians. Canons 101–104 dealt with marriage licences and are printed below:

CI. By whom Licences to marry without Banns shall be granted, and to what sort of Persons.

No faculty or licence shall be henceforth granted for solemnization of matrimony betwixt any parties, without thrice open publication of the banns, according to the Book of Common Prayer, by any person exercising any ecclesiastical jurisdiction, or claiming any privileges in the right of their churches; but the same shall be granted only by such as have episcopal authority, or the commissary for faculties, vicars general of the archbishops and bishops, sede plena; or, sede vacante, the guardian of the spiritualities, or ordinaries exercising of right episcopal jurisdiction in their several jurisdictions respectively, and unto such persons only, as be of good state and quality, and that upon good caution and security taken.

CII. Security to be taken at the granting of such Licences, and under what Conditions.

The security mentioned shall contain these conditions: First. That, at the time of the granting every such licence, there is not any impediment of precontract, consanguinity, affinity, or other lawful cause to hinder the said marriage. Secondly, That there is not any controversy or suit depending in any court before any ecclesiastical judge, touching any contract or marriage of either of the said parties with any other. Thirdly, That they have obtained thereunto the express consent of their parents, (if they be living), or otherwise of their guardians or governors. Lastly, That they shall celebrate the said matrimony publicly in the parish-church or chapel where one of them dwelleth, and in no other place, and that between the hours of eight and twelve in the forenoon.

CIII. Oaths to be taken for the Conditions.

For the avoiding of all fraud and collusion in the obtaining of such licences and dispensations, we further constitute and appoint, That before any licence for the celebration of matrimony without publication of banns be had or granted, it shall appear to the judge by the oaths of two sufficient witnesses, one of them to be known either to the judge himself, or to some other person of good reputation then present, and known likewise to the said judge, that the express consent of the parents, or parent, if one be dead, or guardians or guardian of the parties, is thereunto had and obtained. And furthermore, That one of the parties personally swear, that he believeth there is no let or impediment of precontract, kindred, or alliance, or of any other lawful cause whatsoever, nor any suit commenced in any ecclesiastical court, to bar or hinder the proceeding of the said matrimony, according to the tenor of the foresaid licence.

CIV. An Exception for those that are in Widowhood.

If both parties which are to marry being in widowhood do seek a faculty for the forbearing of banns, then the clauses before xxvii
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mentioned, requiring the parents' consents, may be omitted: but the parishes where they dwell, both shall be expressed in the licence, as also the parish named where the marriage shall be celebrated. And if any commissary for faculties, vicars general, or other the said ordinaries, shall offend in the premises, or any part thereof, he shall, for every time so offending, be suspended from the execution of his office for the space of six months; and every such licence or dispensation shall be held void to all effects and purposes, as if there had never been any such granted; and the parties marrying by virtue thereof shall be subject to the punishments which are appointed for clandestine marriages.

Marriage by licence continued to enjoy great popularity throughout the seventeenth century, and, as has been shown elsewhere, the practice was by no means confined to the upper classes. It clearly fulfilled a social need, for there must have been many people who, for one or other of the reasons suggested by the bishops in 1597, wished to get married without the publicity of banns.

That the Canons were not always strictly observed, we may gather from the orders issued by Mathew Wren, bishop of Norwich, in 1636, 'that no minister presume to marry any persons, whereof one of the parties is not of his parish, unless it be otherwise expressly mentioned in the licence; nor that he marry any by virtue of any faculties or licence, wherein the authority of an archdeacon or official is mentioned . . .' and that the bishops sometimes infringed on the prerogative of the archbishop of granting special licences is clear from the Canons of 1640 which stated 'Whereas divers licenses to marry are granted by ordinaries, in whose jurisdiction neither of the parties desiring such license is resident, to the prejudice of the archiepiscopal prerogative, to whom only the power of granting such licenses to parties of any jurisdiction, per totam provinciam, by law belongeth; and for other great inconveniences thereupon ensuing: it is therefore decreed, that no licence of marriage shall be granted by any ordinary to any parties, unless one of the said parties have been commorant in the jurisdiction of the said ordinary for the space of one whole month immediately before the said license be desired.' One of the parties was to give security in the bond that this condition has been fulfilled.

The claim of the puritans that the licence system was abused still continued, and appeared in the Root and Branch Petition of 1640. By now, however, it was a question not of abolishing bishops' licences but of abolishing bishops, and from the Civil War to the Restoration of 1660 there is naturally a gap in the records of marriage licences.

1 See pp. 213-214.
3 Edward Cardwell, Synodalia, I, 412.
4 Henry Gee and William John Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History, p. 542. A long list of 'manifold evils, pressures, and grievances caused, practised and occasioned by the prelates and their dependents' included (clause 20) 'The countenancing of plurality of benefices, prohibiting of marriages without their licence, at certain times, almost half the year, and licensing of marriages without banns asking. . . .''
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The system was revived at the Restoration, and continued to enjoy great popularity. In 1694 the government decided that marriage licences might be made to contribute to the national revenue, and 'An Act for granting their Majesties several Duties upon Velum, Parchment and Paper for Four Years towards carrying on the Warr against France' imposed the following tax: 'For every Skinn or Peice of Parchment or Sheete or Peice of Paper upon which any Licence for or Certificate of Marriage... shall be ingrossed or written the summe of Five Shillings.'

A few years later, 'An Act for enforcing the Laws which restraine Marriages without Licence or Banns and for the better registering Marriages, Births, and Burials' stated that earlier acts had been frustrated 'by several Parsons Vicars and Curates who... do... knowingly and willingly suffer and permitt diverse other Ministers to marry great numbers of Persons in their respective Churches and Chappels without Publication of Banns or Licences of Marriage.' Many such ministers 'have no Benefices or settled Habitations and are Poor and Indigent and cannot easily be discovered and convicted...'. Furthermore, 'diverse Ministers being in Prison for Debt and otherwise do marry in the said Prisons many Persons resorting thither for the purposes aforesaid and in other Places for Lucre and Gain for themselves...'. Additional penalties were imposed, and Commissioners were authorised to demand twice a year, or oftener, 'the Licences of all Persons married or Certificates of the Banns published.'

The proper regulation of licences continued to present great difficulties in the later seventeenth century and in the eighteenth century. In 1694, one of the King's Injunctions to the archbishops ordered 'That no licence for marriage without banns shall be granted by any ecclesiastical judge, without first taking the oaths of two sufficient witnesses, and also sufficient security for the performance of the conditions of the license, according to the 102nd and 103rd Canons'; and the archbishop of Canterbury instructed his bishops on their duty of 'hindering (as much as in you lies) all such from being surrogates, who are not qualified by the canon; and to see that none be instrumental in dispatching licences of marriage and solemnization of matrimony illegally...'. In 1702, the lower house of convocation expressed its concern at the abuses arising from the neglect of Canons 102 and 103. It appeared that the consent of parents or guardians was not always obtained; that marriage by licence was not always solemnized, as it should be, in the parish church or chapel where one of the parties lived; that it was not always conducted between the appointed hours of 8 and 12 in the morning; and that there existed 'an evil custom of lodging blank licences in improper hands.'

In 1710, the Queen drew the attention of convocation to the need for 'regulating licenses for matrimony according to the canon, in order to the more effectual preventing

1 5 and 6 Wm. and Mary, c. 21.
2 Continued by 9 and 10 William III, c. 25; 12 Anne Stat. 2, c. 29; and made perpetual 6 George I, c. 4. See also 28 George III, c. 28.
3 7 and 8 William III, c. 35.
5 Ibid. p. 386.
6 Edward Cardwell, Synodalia, i. 711, 712.
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of clandestine marriages,¹ and two years later there were further proposals for regulating what was undoubtedly a grave abuse.² The matter was still being discussed in convocation in 1713 and 1714.³ when, among other things, it was proposed that in future parish registers should distinguish between marriage by banns and marriage by licence, and that various details concerning the licence should be recorded in the registers.

That the Canon Law was not being observed appears from Giles Jacob's *A New Law-Dictionary,*⁴ published in 1729, which stated '... notwithstanding the canons aforementioned, Marriages especially of Persons of Quality, are frequently in their own Houses; out of Canonical Hours, in the Evening; and oftentimes solemnized by others in other Churches, than where one of the Parties lives, and out of Time of Divine Service, &c. There are besides some things disus'd on granting Licences for Marriage; as the Testification of Witnesses of the Consent of Parents, &c. Though I don't know by what Authority all these things are dispens'd with, except it be in Regard to the substance of Marriage, to make the same good without all the Ceremonies.' Jacob incidentally provides what may be a further explanation of the popularity of licences when he states 'Marriages are prohibited in Lent, and on Fasting-Days, because the Mirth attending them is not suitable to the Humiliation and Devotion of those Times; yet Parsons may marry with Licences in Lent, although the Bans of Marriage may not then be published.'

Although the scandals connected with clandestine marriages, with or without banns or licences, were not new in the eighteenth century, they eventually became so notorious that the legislature stepped in to regulate what had hitherto been a matter solely for the church, and Lord Hardwicke's famous act 'for the better Preventing Clandestine Marriages'⁵ was only the first of a series of statutes dealing with the subject. Details of these acts and of their provisions relating to marriage licences can be found elsewhere and need not be examined in this volume.⁶

Patrick McGrath.

² *Ibid.* 770. 'Proposals of the lower house of convocation about matrimonial licenses.'
⁴ Published London 1729. Article on 'Marriage.'
⁵ 26 George II c. 33.
⁶ See, for example, Robert Phillimore, *The Ecclesiastical Law,* 1842, 11 433 ff. for 'Marriage Acts' and 'Marriage.'
NOTE ON TRANSCRIPTION

An illustration of the common form used in recording allegations has been given on p. xi. It is obviously unnecessary and undesirable to repeat this on each occasion, and the editor has abstracted from the entries the date of the allegation; the names of the parties to the proposed marriage; their occupations, ages and places of residence, when given, details of bondsmen and bondswoman, if any; and any additional information that appears in the original. The name of the diocesan chancellor has not been given with each entry, but a list of diocesan chancellors during this period can be found in Appendix D.

From time to time the sequence of entries appears to be out of order. No attempt has been made to alter this, and the original order has been preserved.

Since the entries were made by a number of different persons over a period of years, the quality of the handwriting varies considerably. For the most part, it is readily legible, with only occasional doubtful readings, mainly due to alterations made over previous writing. A word wrongly written was either immediately written over, or the wrong word was smeared in order to obliterate it.

The following rules have been adopted to enable the reader to see what is actually part of the original and what is added by way of editorial comment or conjecture.

1. All christian names, surnames and place-names are printed as in the original manuscript, except that a capital letter has been used for the initial letter of all place names regardless of the practice in the MS. and the form ff has been printed as F.

2. The names of trades, professions and occupations have been given in the modern spelling, or in abbreviated form as stated in the list of abbreviations. In some cases, it was thought desirable to print the original spelling, and in these cases quotation marks are used.

3. The names of months are given in modern form, but abbreviated.

4. County names are given in modern form or accepted abbreviation.

5. Any matter not in the original manuscript but added by way of editorial comment or explanation is put in square brackets, thus: [n.s.]; [signs Yate], or [p. Wheathurst]. Where a place name has been given without a parish following, the name of the parish has sometimes been added by the editor, and in these cases, too, square brackets are used.

6. With regard to unusual or not easily identifiable forms of place names, the editor has occasionally added his interpretation in square brackets after the original, thus: St Mary before the Gate [St. Mary de Lode], Gloucester city. Any uncertainty in identification is shown thus: Moreton [? Moreton Valence].
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7. Any comment in the original has been noted without editorial addition, and any direct quotation is entered in quotation marks.

8. When there is doubt about the reading of the text, this is shown by the use of (?) immediately before the doubtful word. Thus Mary (?) Morse would show that the editor was not sure if the name was actually Morse. The symbol (?) before a word thus draws attention to the fact that the difficulty is palaeographical rather than one of interpretation or of identification. When only part of a word is decipherable, this is shown thus: Elinor Huntley of... over [not legible].

Certain early forms of spelling for some parishes are a little confusing, and the editor has not always attempted to add his idea of the correct interpretation. The early spelling of Coaley was sometimes Cowley, thus causing confusion with the parish of that name nearer to Cheltenham. Staunton and Stanton at times seem to be spelt interchangeably, and in the manuscript the spelling is often difficult to decipher. Certain places seem to have been divided between a number of parishes. Thus Chalford was partly in the parish of Bisley and partly in that of Minchinhampton, while Birdlip is still divided between the parishes of Cowley, Brimpsfield and Great Witcombe. Again, considering the peculiarities of seventeenth century spelling, we can rarely be sure that when the clerk wrote Cold Aston, he did in fact mean Cold Aston, otherwise Aston Blank, near Bourton-on-the-Water; and not Cold Ashton near Bath. There may sometimes be room for disagreement on the identification of a particular place, but the reader has the evidence before him and can, if he wishes, make his own judgment.
ABBREVIATIONS

Bdm. = bondsman.
Bdw. = bondswoman.
dioc. = diocese of.
esq. = esquire.
gent. = gentleman.
husb. = husbandman
n.d. = not dated.
n.s. = not signed.
p. = parish of.
W. = widow or widower.
Wit. = witness.
x = the person signs with a mark.
yeom. = yeoman.

Unless otherwise stated the parties are bachelor or spinster.
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Apr. 20. Thomas Whiting, Tedbury, 30, and Mary Vasey, Tedbury, 26.
Apr. 22. Edward Roane, Winchcombe, 29, and Mary Deane, Shipton Olive, W.
Apr. 22. James Yeme, Newland, W., and Anne Davies, Newland, 40; Bdm. William Coucher, Crypte, Gloucester city.
Apr. 25. Thomas Field, Gloucester city, 27, and Mary Rogers, Dowdswell, 18.
Apr. 27. Richard x Nelme, Newant, W., and Anne Stone, Upledon, 26.
Apr. 28. Will. Clark, Hawxbury, gent., 40, and Anna Morse, Stone, W.
May 1. Edward Wall, Newant, blacksmith, 25, and Jane Lambe, Newent, 23.
May 2. Charles Pyne, Cirencester, gent., 26, and Anne Poole, Cirencester, 25; Bdm. Henry Poole, Cirencester, gent. "The parents of the said Pyne are dead."
May 3. Gyles Cripps, Fairford, 26, and Alice Tipper, Fairford, 25.
May 4. John x Phipps, Slimbridge, husb., and Joane Idoll, Leonard Stanley, W.
May 10. Thomas x Chapman, Standish, 33, and Joane Shaver, Eastington, 30.
May 13. Giles x Ningholes, Newent, butcher, 26, and Anne Lee, Gloucester city, 22.
May 13. Edward x Hunt, Longford, husb., and Rebecca Cowle, St. Maryes before the gate, [St. Mary de Lode], Gloucester city.
May 20. Jenkin x Edmonds, Tudenham, 30, and Catherine Jones, Tudenham, 35.
May 29. Robert x Jones, Bitton, 30, and Debbora Topp, Rodburrough, 21.
June 2. Robert Staynor, Worcester city, esquire, 19, and Elinor Huntly, of . . . over, [not legible] 21. "He hath obtained the consent of his mother, the rest of their parents beinge dead."
June 5. Thomas x Reade, Longhope, husb., 30, and Mary (?) Morse, Linton, Herefords., 21.
June 5. William x Whittle, Corse, husb. 52, and Elianor Pagnell, Corse, W.
June 10. John x Grindle, Cheltenham, tailor, W., 35, and Elizabeth (? ) Ripp, Cheltenham, W.
June 12. Robert Attwood, the elder, Starton, yeom., W., and Elinor Gregory, Cheltenham, 26. With “consent of her father, her mother beinge dead.”
June 13. Thomas Barnewood, the younger, Stroud, husb., 24, and Alice Wintle, Strowd, 17: Bdm. Thomas x Barnewood, Stroud, husb., 50.
June 22. Henry x Rudge, Ruardeane, yeom., 50, and Alice Morgan, Ruardeane, 40.
June 24. Miles x Cooke, Bpps Cleeve, tailor, 21, and Alice Symonds, Winchcombe, 24. With “consent of his mother, the rest of theire parents beinge dead.”
June 24. Richard x Vaughan, Michell deane, carrier, 55, and Marian Dowse, Ruardeane, W.
June 27. John x Torber, Stratford upon Aven, Warwicks., husb., 27, and Margery Mustell, Hayles, 30. With “consent of her mother, the rest of theire parents beinge dead.”
June 29. William x Bavy [signs Bevin], Willersey, butcher, 30, and Katherine Menchin, Willersey, 30. With "consent of his father, the rest of their parents being dead."


June 30. George Haines, Rockhampton, yeom., 26, and Anne Marshe, Thornbury, 21.


July 1. Richard Hall, Charleton Abbotts, husb., 50, and Anne x Busteed, Sevenhampton, 30. "Their parents are all dead."


July 5. Richard Smith, Lasborough, 26, and Alice Luce, Lasborough, 28: Bdm. Dennys x Burford, Westerley, blacksmith, 60.

July 8. Thomas x Williams, Wesbury, yeom., 60, and Sibell Symonds, Standish, 30.


July 10. Christopher x Dreysy, Tortworth, tucker, 30, and Elizabeth Francombe, Tortworth, 32. "Their fathers being both dead."


July 17. Henry x Waight, Marshfield, blacksmith, 28, and Anne Kinge, Marshfield, 30.


July 25. Maurice Fawkener, St. Maryes ante portam [St. Mary de Lode], Gloucester city, clothier, 50, and Anne Rawlins, St. John, Gloucester city, W.: Bdm. Arthure Purlewent, Gloucester city, mercer, 70. [n.s.]

July 25. Richard Willis, Wesbury, and Hester Niblett, Ashellworth, 19. With "consent of her father, the rest of their parents beinge dead."


July 27. Mawrice Clements, the younger, Painswicke, yeom., 22, and Elizabeth Berry, Bruckthropp, 28.


Aug. 3. Chrystopher x Spratt, Tewkesbury, glover, 24, and Anne Church, Tewkesbury, 23. With "consent of his mother, the rest of their parents beinge dead."


Aug. 22. William Marten, Bleysdon, husb., W., and Elizabeth Freeman, Eistington, W.
Aug. 28. Samuell Cripps, Cirencester, cardmaker, 24, and Katherine Sturmy, Cheltenham, 22. [n.s.]
Sept. 2. William x Nibbs, Evesham, Worcs., yeom., 50, and Elizabeth Kinges, Corse, 26. With “consent of the father of the said Elizabeth, the rest of their parents dead.”
Sept. 5. Samuell Dansell, Bisley, broadweaver, 35, and Elizabeth Iles, Cirencester, W. [n.s.]
Sept. 6. John Bond, [signs Boond], Newland, yeom., 16, and Joane Skyn, Newland, 23. “Their parents are all dead.”
Sept. 9. Martin Savadge [signs Savige], Frampton upon Severne, shoemaker, 30, and Margery Capenhurst, Frampton upon Severne, 19.


Sept. 18. John Hobday, Cambden, butcher, 22, and Joane Reade, Eburton, 27. [n.s.]

Sept. 18. Edward Newton, Tetbury, W., and Anne Clarke, Tetbury, " Her father beeinge dead."


Sept. 25. Thomas x Saunders, Barnwood, W., and Anne Bromedge, Barnwood, W.


Sept. 27. Richard x Kent, Òxenton, yeom., 40, and Jane Straford, Òxenton, 21.

Sept. 28. George Spurrrett, Sidington Mary, clerk, Master of Arts, W., and Martha Little, Sidington Mary, 37.

Sept. 29. Richard x Canton, Elmstone, husb., 40, and Emmett Hobbs, Boddington, 22.


Oct. 2. Thomas Charnocke, Tewxbury, "hollyer," 24, and Mary Shawe, Tewkesbury, 30. With "consent of his father, the rest of theire parents beinge dead."

Oct. 3. Gyles Byrd, Wotton under Edge, gent., W., and Joane Hall, Charleton, Wilts., W.

Oct. 4. Humphrey x Owen, Cam, W., and Mary Hill, Cam, 26.


Oct. 9. Robert x Webly, Brockworth, yeom., 42, and Anne Pitt, Maysemore, W. "His parents are dead."


Oct. 12. Thomas x Cooper, Cirencester, cutler, W., 40, and Elinor Griffith, Cirencester.


Oct. 18. Anthony Diston, Dumbleton, 28, and Elizabeth Neighbour, Dumbleton, 28: Bdm. Roger Neighbour, Dumbleton.


Oct. 25. Thomas Lugge, Cheltenham, mercer, 22, and Rebecca Harris, Haydon, [? p. Boddington or Staverton], 22.


Oct. 28. Wm. x Spilman, Dimocke, 30, and Elinor Cooper, Dimocke, 24.


Nov. 11. Samuell x Hathway, Kingscote, husb., 30, and Mary Cotterell, Kingscote, 21.


Nov. 13. John Brothers als. Chapman, Gloucester city, tailor, W., 46, and Joane Capener, Gloucester city, W.
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Nov. 14. Richard Cooke, Tewkesbury, baker, 23, and Mary Eckly, Cheltenham, 24. With "consent of his mother, the rest of their parents being dead."

Nov. 14. Gyles Snell, Strowd, clothier, 24, and Elizabeth Yate, Strowd, 18.


Nov. 16. Salomon x Whitehorne, St. Brevills, "millard," 26, and Elizabeth Byman, St. Brevils, W., 34. "His parents are dead."

Nov. 17. John Manning, Bourton upon ye Hill, W., and Margery Estington, Bourton upon ye Hill, 30: Bdm. Richard x Bate, Bourton upon ye Hill.

Nov. 17. Joseph x Williams, Longney, and Joan Carpenter, Westbury, 22.

Nov. 17. Thomas Hewlett, St. Mary Gracelane, [St. Mary de Grace], Gloucester city, and Joane Gravestock, Hempstedd, 30: Bdm. William Hulett, clerk.

Nov. 17. Richard x Downe, Presbury, W., and Ellinor Baggott, Cheltenham, W.

Nov. 25. John Chadborne, the younger, Winchcombe, glover, 18, and Anne Cole, Winchcombe, 24: Bdm. John Chadborne, Winchcombe, yeom., 44.

Nov. 25. Thomas x Coates, Chedworth, husb., 30, and Katherine Oxenhall, Chedworth, 28.


Nov. 27. James Ely, Horton, W., 30, and Mary Higgs, Horton, 30.


Dec. 17. William Lewes, Elmore, W., 46, and Dorothey Croaker, Elmore, W., 50.


1637/8


Jan. 5. John x Braban, Churcham, husb., 26, and Elizabeth Kimpe, Bully, 30.


Jan. 15. Ralphe Barret, Minsterworth, mariner, 25, and Joane Hooper, Minsterworth, 18. [n.s.]

Jan. 15. Clutterbooke Deane, Minchin Hampton, clothier, and Ann Davis, Strowde.


Jan. 17. Thomas Hill, Chedworth, tailor, 36, and Anne Childe, Chedworth, 37: Bdm. Richard Childe, Upton St. Leonards, husb., 35: "Their parents are all dead."


Jan. 18. Robert x Moxly, Quedgley, husb., 50, and Elizabeth Morse, Downe Hatherly, 49.


Jan. 19. Samuell Pinke, Gloucester city, needle-maker, 26, and Anne Hayes, Gloucester city, W.

Jan. 20. Thomas x Hitchins, Ashwellworth, husb., 35, and Alice Bennett, Hartbury, W.


Jan. 28. Robert x Jones, Gloucester city, gent., 26, and Anne Hall, Gloucester city, W.

Jan. 30. William x Taylor, Paunty, cartender, 30, and Alice Robbins, Dymocke, W.


Feb. 3. George Ferribye, [signs Ferebee], Cirencester, mercer, 27, and Judith Custys, Cirencester, 17.

Feb. 5. Henry x Broaderist, St. Michael, Gloucester city, 26, and Mary (? ) Rose, St. Michael, 30.


Feb. 5. William Lugg, Gloucester city, tanner, W., and Elinor Weare, Gloucester city, 40. " Her parents are dead." [n.s.]


Feb. 5. Lewes x Higgs, Upton St. Leonard, 25, and Joane Cowe­ meadow, Upton St. Leonard.


Feb. 10. Adrian Plummer, Dursly, tucker, 30, and Joane Trottman, Dursly, 30: Bdm. George x Marten, Dursly, clothier.

Mar. 3. Walter Robbins, Fayrford, W., 51, and Catharine Addis, Poole, Wilts., W., 40.


Mar. 24. Henry Pentegrace [signs Pentygrease], South Cerney, 38, and Joane Bishop, Peter Ampney, 22.
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Apr. 2. Thomas Williams, St. John, Gloucester city, tanner, 30, and Elizabeth Willis, St. Katherine, Gloucester city, W., 40: Bdm. William Hulett, the elder, clerk, 49. "Their parents are all dead."
Apr. 2. John x Compton, Lower Swell, mason, W., 54, and Marye Ingram, Lower Swell, 34. "Her parents are dead."
Apr. 3. Richard Friend, Dursly, weaver, W., and Mary Trottman, Dursly, 24.
Apr. 4. Robert Parker, Starton, gent., 24, and Marie Bannaster, Starton, 25.
Apr. 11. William Jeffereyes, Rendcombe, joiner, 30, and Elinor Bridges, Rendcombe, 22.
Apr. 11. Richard Broadgate, Gloucester city, barber, 24, and Alice Fisher, Gloucester city, 20. With "consent of his mother, the rest of their parents." [sic].
May 18. William Heywood, Longney, yeom., and Mary Pace, Longney, 20.
Apr. 18. Henry Parr, Cirencester, millwright, 28, and Anne (?), Hodges or Hedges, Southcurny, 27.
Apr. 28. William x Eldridge, Quenington, miller, 31, and Edith Archard, Meysy hampton, 28.
Apr. 28. Robert Archard, Meysy hampton, baker, 21, and Mary Harper, Meysy hampton.
Apr. 28. Nathaniel Cowles, Framiload, husb., 26, and Sarah Pace, Framiload, 25: Bdw., Jane x Willis, Fretherne, W.
Apr. 28. Edward Wells, Stoke Orchard, p. Bishop’s Cleeve, clerk, and mr. of arts, 26, and Joyce Mortimer, Charleton Kinges, W.
Apr. 28. John Bishopp, Gloucester city, shoemaker, 22, and Elizabeth Baker, St. Owen, in or neare the city aforesaid.
May 1. Giles Flooke, Gotherington, [p. Bishop’s Cleeve], husb., 29, and Elizabeth Woollams, Gotherington, 23. "His parents are dead and she hath only a mother living." [n.s.]
May 2. Richard Reynolds, Newland, miner, W., 33, and Anne Bowle, Newland, W.
May 8. John x Yewer, Stratton, W., 50, and Rebecca Poole, Strowde, 49.
May 12. William Holder, Churcham, yeom., 21, and Elizabeth Perry, 30.
May 13. Thomas x Marshall, Cirencester, shoemaker, 23, and Anne Gryffin, Cirencester, W.
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May 23. Jacob Latymore, Yeate, clerk and Jane (?) Tounde, Yeate, 30: Bdm. William x Corbett, Yeate, yeom.


May 28. Arthure x Dauncy, Uly, broadweaver, 28, and Joane Hughes, Wotton sub Edge, 26. With "consent of his mother, the rest of theire parents beinge dead."


June 2. William Horwood, Slimbridge, broadweaver, 22, and Edith Green, Cam, 19.


June 12. John x Thomas, lower Guytinge, shoemaker, and Anne Free, Cheltenham, W.


June 18. Daniel Kemble, Tewshury, 30, and Frances Bayly, Tewshury, W., 35: Bdm. Thomas Hale, Tewshury, mariner.


June 26. George x Draper, Windrishe, husb., 30, and Dorothy Broade, Windrishe, 35.


Aug. 9. Thomas x Burcombe, Westhanna', coalminier, 23, and Judith Allen, Westhanna', 16, "Her parents beinge dead." [n.s.]

Aug. 10. Robert Hill, Southcerney, baker, 30, and Alice Price, Cirencester, W.

Aug. 11. John x Gill, Slymbridge, husb., 22, and Joane Jeffe, Slymbridge, W.

Aug. 15. John Bulney, Newent, glassmaker, 23, and Alice Powell, Newent, 26. [n.s.]


Aug. 17. Samuell x Niblett, Side, W., 40, and Joane Paine, Standish, 34.
Aug. 25. Tobias x Pegler, Dursley, broadweaver, 40, and Elizabeth Williams, Dursley, W., 40.


Sept. 24. John x Russell, Charfield, weaver, 28, and Alice Taylor, Charfield, W.


Sept. 26. William Ingles, Mickleton, 26, and Margery Welles, Battisford: Bdm. Isaac Cormill, one of the apparit' of this Courte.

Sept. 27. John x Turner, Newent, husb., 26, and Anne Milton, Upleaden, 19.


Oct. 6. Richard x Pace, Wesbury, yeom., 28, and Suzan Wintle, Wesbury, W.

Oct. 9. Thomas Hancocks [signs Hancocke], Cirencester, yeom., 21, and Elizabeth Teale, Yanworth, 22.
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Oct. 9. Thomas Gay, Payneswick, gent., 27, and Anne Goughe, Bristol city, W.

[END OF VOL. I]

1640

[The next four allegations occur on a loose sheet inserted at the end of Vol. I].


VOL. II

1660/1
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1661

Apr.  4. William Bond, Strowd, clothier, 42, and Elizabeth Heaven, Kingstanly, W.
May 15. William James, Elmore, mariner, 27, and Joane Aston, Elmore, W.
May 25. Thomas x Pew, Apperly [p. Deerhurst], blacksmith, and Mary Manne, the Leigh, 22. [n.s.]
May 27. James Berrow [signs Barrow], Newland, gent., 22, and Barbara Pawlett, Perton Court, p. Churchdowne, 23.
May 31. Thomas Phipps, Cheltenham, clerk, 26, and Mary Cole, Dunsborne, W.
June  4. Thomas Mathew, Uley, weaver, 25, and Elizabeth Manning, Uley, 21. [n.s.]
June  5. William Wilse, Aston Ingham, Herefords., cooper, 32, and Elizabeth White, Newnham, W.
June  5. Thomas Fletcher, Chipping Cambden, yeom., 32, and Izabell Perrey, Clapton, 22.
June 13. Robert x Kendall, Cam, broadweaver, 24, and Sarah Blake, Cam, W.
July  6. Walter x Poolvaine, Corse, husb., 30, and Abigall Silly, Ashellworth, 40.
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Aug. 20. Richard Fryer, Frampton upon Severne, clothworker, 21, and Elizabeth Merry, Frampton upon Severne, 20. [n.s.]


Sept. 13. Richard Geeringe, Letchlade, W., and Elizabeth Lewes, Letchlade, W.


Oct. 3. Edward x Moore, Staunton, yeom., (?) 60, and Christian Stephens, Staunton, W.

Nov. 2. Isaac Gwinnett, Shurdington [Shurdington], gent., 25, and Elizabeth Peirce, Shurdington, 25.
Nov. 8. Thomas x Peirce, Bisley, millwright, 60, and Jane Keene, Misardeane, 25.
Nov. 9. Robert x Callaway, Uphatherlie, yeom., 50, and Catherine Smyth, Gloucester city, W.
Nov. 9. Richard x Millard, Cam, clothier, 22, and Elizabeth Howell, Cam, W.
Nov. 13. Thomas Partridge, Painsweeke, gent., and Elizabeth Lewes, Painsweeke, W.
Nov. 13. William Norman, Cirencester, innholder, 30, and Elizabeth Holles, Cirencester, W.
Nov. 20. William Bellamy, Westburie, glover, 21, and Jane Procer, Monmouth, W.
Nov. 21. Walter x Mathewes, Hempsteed, husb., 25, and Mary Gardiner Quedgly, 30.
Nov. 23. William Wood, Barton streete, [near Gloucester city], yeom., 23, and Hester Elbridg, Shurdington, 22.
Dec. 7. John x Sommers, Yate, yeom., 50, and Sarah Kinneson, Westerleigh, W.
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1661/2

Jan. 4. Robert Vyner, Strowd, clothier, 23, and Anne Fletcher, Painsweke, 21.
Jan. 11. Michael Bower, Gloucester city, pewterer, 26, and Jane Lane, Mitchell deane, 21.
Jan. 11. John Bowser, Frampton upon Sabrine, 27, and Alice Tyler, Shipton Moyne, 21.
Feb. 1. Christopher x Hooke, Taynton, narrow-weaver, 22, and Mary Ible, Huntley, 21.
Feb. 5. Arthur x Davis, Hawkesburie, yeom., 27, and Mary Rodway, Hawkesburie, 37.
Feb. 11. William Heward [signs Howard], Sandhurst, yeom., 26, and Mary Flucce, Deerhurst, 23.
Feb. 17. William x Barnes, Gloucester city, carpenter, 26, and Anne Nicholls, Shrewsburie [Salop.], 21.

1662

Mar. 31. Thomas Iles, Bisly, clothier, 23, and Elizabeth Freame, Bisly, W.
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Apr. 2. John Clifford, Northampton, dungster, 48, and Elizabeth Tanner, Newent, 36.
Apr. 7. Richard Aldridge, Maysmore, hsb., 30, and Mary Spencer, Maysmore, 25.  [n.s.]
Apr. 7. John Venfeild, Bourton on the water, gent., 26, and Anne Widowes, Lower Swell, W.
Apr. 7. Thomas Griffin, Strowd, clothworker, 41, and Elizabeth Beard, Strowd, W.
Apr. 8. Charles Townsend, Rowell, [? Roel, near Guiting Power], gent., 26, and Anne Colles, Mawgersbury, 29.
Apr. 15. William Corsley, Gloucester city, goldsmith, 24, and Anne Fletcher, Gloucester city, 20.
[n.d.] Thomas x Webb, Wotten under age, broadweaver, 36, and Abigail Osborne, Wotten under age, 29.
May 20. John x Beard, Brosely, Salop, waterman, 22, and Mary Pynnock, Tewkesbury, 22.
May 24. Thomas Randell, Cowly, yeom., 23, and Elizabeth Bridges, Cubberly, 22.
May 28. Thomas x Willts, Banewood, yeom., 30, and Anne Graftstocke, Hempstead, 40.
June 2. John Hughes, North Nyblie, yeom., 58, and Dynah Crew, Wootton Underedge, 22.


[n.d.] Thomas Harvey, Gloucester city, gent., and Anne Suckling, W.


June 24. Henry Wadley, Painswicke, carpenter, 32, and Mary Page, Painswick, 23.


July 9. John x Strange, Maumsbury, Wilts., yeom., 52, and Elizabeth Wales, Kings Stanly, W., 52.


July 18. Thomas x Eldridge, St. Marys, Gloucester city, woolcomber, 25, and Anne Foords, Upton St. Leonards, W., 55.
Aug. 2. William x Foords, Cowly [? Coaley], yeom., 36, and Mary Yarrington, Cowly, 22.
Aug. 4. Daniell x Bennett, Standish, broadweaver, 20, and Jane Houlder, Stroud, 22.
Aug. 15. William Trye, Berkely, gent., 46, and Elizabeth Webb, Stone, W.
Aug. 27. Thomas Graile, Lassington, clerk, (?) 28 or 38, and Hester Crump, Bully, 28.
GLOUCESTERSHIRE MARRIAGE ALLEGATIONS


Sept. 6. James x De Hugh, Newnham, glass-maker, 21, and Penelope De Hugh, Newnham, W.

Sept. 8. Clement x Daw, Longhope, husb., 25, and Anne Savager, Longhope, 34.

Sept. 13. Ferdinand Meighen, Gloucester city, gent., 29, and Margaret Gray, Gloucester city, 20. Her "parents are dead."

Sept. 15. Robert Sewell, Strowd, baker, 26, and Elizabeth Mathews, South Cerny, 22.


Oct. 2. John x Parler, Awre, yeom., 30, and Mary Sampson, Michaell Deane, 23.

Oct. 4. John x Wheeleright, Slimbridge, baker, 40, and Iddy Banister, Slimbridge, W., 39.


Oct. 29. John Smith, Gloucester city, maltster, 27, and Prudens Knight, Gloucester city, W., 35.


Nov. 1. James Cooper, Dymocke, husb., 37, and Joice Dabitott, Bromyard, Herefords., 33.


Nov. 8. Robert x Ducke, Upton St. Leonards, husb., 27, and Elizabeth Berrie, Upton St. Leonards, 25.

Nov. 10. Edward Ley, [signs Lye], Stanlie St. Leonard, tailor, 21, and Elizabeth Cambridg, Stanlie St. Leonard, W.

Nov. 11. William Chester, Wolham, Herefords., husb., 36, and Alice Clarke, Tredington, 40.

Nov. 13. Jonathan x Hyde, Badgworth, husb., 30, and Hannah (?) Hewling or Hawling, Badgworth, 23.

Nov. 13. Richard Bevin [signs Beven], Tortworth, skinner, 33, and Debora Wilkins, Tortworth, 28.


Nov. 21. Thomas x Batt, Bisely, clothworker, 24, and Mary Archard, Cerney Wicke, 21.

Nov. 21. Thomas Bright, Longhope, husb., 27, and Mary Weale, High-Ledden, 22.


Nov. 22. Richard Webley, London city, fishmonger, 26, and Barbara Hayeward, Sainthurst, 22.


Nov. 27. John Eliots, Stonehouse, carpenter, (?) 46 or 56, and Deborah Arundell, Randwicke, 30.
Nov. 28. Thomas Snowsell, Shearborne, wheelwright, 35, and Anne Charleton, Gloucester city, 22.

Nov. 29. Thomas Twyning, Painswick, broadweaver, 30, and Rebecca Greene, Painswick, W.


Dec. 3. Edward Freeman, Cirencester, woollen-draper, 26, and Elizabeth Hulebert, Cirencester, 21.


Dec. 13. Henry Gardner, Painsweeke, yeom., 50, and Margaret Ingham, Painsweeke, W.

Dec. 15. William x Barnes, Notgrove, yeom., 29, and Frances (?) Matson or Malson, Dowdswell, W.


Dec. 27. Miles Mutley, Gloucester city, tailor, 23, and Joyce (?) Martley or Murtley, Gloucester city, 22.

Dec. 27. Cornelius Plott, Gloucester city, tailor, 37, and Joyce Pritchard, Gloucester city, 30.

1662/3


Jan. 24. Robert Hall [signs Hull], Bristol city, merchant, 22, and Anne Wyrrall, English Bicknor, W.


Feb. 2. Gyles x Clarke, Sandhurst, husb., 25, and Elizabeth Church, Sandhurst, 26.

Feb. 3. Robert x Bristow, Marston Meysey, yeom., 30, and Elizabeth Ovenhill, Meysey Hampton, W., 35.


Feb. 4. Thomas Smallwood, Minsterworth, silk-stocking-weaver, 25, and Mary Carter, Maisemore, W.

Feb. 11. John Stephens, [signs Stevens], Tiddenham, yeom., 27, and Anne Morgan, Tiddenham, W.


Feb. 13. Thomas Hull [signs Hulles], Compton Abdell, husb., 60, and Elizabeth Dicks, Compton Abdell, W., 50.


Feb. 21. Andrew Miles, Newent, clothworker, 29, and Anne Tanner, Chipping Sodbury, W.
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Mar. 2. Thomas Barrett, Gloucester city, cutler, 26, and Joane Merricke, Ross, Herefords., 22.

1663

Apr. 2. Richard Estcourte, Rodborow, gent., 25, and Abigail Stansfeild, Rodborow, 22.
Apr. 20. Thomas x Pitt, the Berrow, Worcs., husb., 25, and Mary Cox, Forthampton, 21.
Apr. 20. Thomas x Smith, Westbury, yeom., 23, and Elizabeth Nichollson, Westbury, W.
Apr. 20. Walter x Parker, Lower Guyting, husb., 30, and Margaret Burrowes, Shipton Ollive, 30.

Apr. 21. Richard Harris, Whaddon, yeom., 50, and Mary Driver, Painsweeke, 45.


Apr. 23. William x Griffin, Randwick, broadweaver, 23, and Elizabeth Harris, Randwick, W.


Apr. 23. William Woolly [signs Wolley], rector of Miserdine, and Sarah Norwood, Cheltenham, W.


Apr. 30. William Parker, Eastington, clothier, and Anne Winniatt, Kempley. [n.s.]


VOL. III


May 11. William x Hornidg, Maisemore, husb., 25, and Joan Phippes, Maisemore, 30


May 12. Thomas Lawrence, Brimpsfeild, gent., 24, and Mary Leech, Rodborow, 18.

May 18. William Oldland, Berkley, cordwainer, 21, and Joane Jones, Wotton Underedge, 22.


May 28. John Piggion, Didbroocke, carpenter, 37, and Elizabeth Hands, Greete, [p. Winchcombe], W.

May 28. Thomas x Barnefeild, Tewkesbury, brazier, ( ? ) 80, and Margaret Parrel, Tewkesbury, W.


May 29. Richard x Proscer, Hardwicke, husb., 24, and Anne Danbie, Elmore.


June 12. Giles x Robins, Cirencester, woolcomber, 22, and Mary Nicholas Cirencester, (?) 27.

June 12. Thomas Brinkworth, Little Deane, miner, 23, and Elizabeth Tellingham, Little Deane, 23.

June 18. William Iles, Dryseeld, gent., 27, and Alice Butterton, Fairford, 22.
June 24. John x Hodges, Nimphsfeild, hsb., 27, and Dorothy Peggler, Nimphsfeild, W.
June 25. William Fox, Awre, hsb., 23, and Alice Smith, Awre, 25 [Signed William x Ireland].
June 27. Gyles Smith, Painsweecke, chandler, 29, and Anne Tickle, Gloucester city, 20.
June 29. William x Freeman, Eastington, broadweaver, 21, and Joane Fryer, Eastington, 23.
July 11. Josias Woolie [signs Woolly], Gloucester city, watchmaker, 40, and Fraces Clarke, Gloucester city, 42.
July 16. Christopher Clarke, Oldbury upon the Hill, yeom., and Anne Foorde, Layterton, W.
July 17. John Nelme, Berkly, joiner, 40, and Elinor Carpenter, Berkly, W., 23.
July 18. Richard Pyrke, Greate Deane [Mitcheldean], gent., 24, and Mary Morse, Greate Deane, W.
July 21. Lawrence Mase, Westcott, yeom., 25, and Sarah Weager, Charlton Kings, W.
July 29. William x Merrett, Whaddon, husb., 28, and Dorothy Harris, Harsfield, 36.


Aug. 22. Thomas Mee, Gloucester city, skinner, 26, and Elizabeth Peirne, 22.


Aug. 22. Toby x Mill, Gloucester city, cordwainer, 40 and Anne (?) Hipps or Higgs, Gloucester city, 28.


Sept. 15. Richard Hooper, Newland, yeom., 25, and Anne Hooper, Newland, 22.


Sept. 16. Jasper x Davies, Upton St. Leonard, carrier, 25, and Alice Hewlings, Upton St. Leonard, W.


Sept. 17. Tobie Cosbie, Berkeley, yeom., 40, and Susanna x Sellman, Berkeley, W.


Sept. 21. John Sevill, Bisley, yeom., 23, and Hester King, Eastington, W.
Oct. 5. Thomas Belcher, Brombsberrow, husb., 40, and Anne Braye, Brombsberrow, 30.
Oct. 5. William x Richman, Sherdington, yeom., 40, and Elizabeth Galloway, Sherdington, 40.
Oct. 7. John x Rugg, Wotton under Edge, cordwainer, 30, and Anne Malson, Wotton under Edge, W.
Oct. 15. Henry x Burdock, Eastlach Martin, husb., 40, and Mary Heughes, Eastlatch Tervill, W.

Oct. 28. George Lane, Westburie in the dioces. of Bristoll, yeom., 55, and Hester Wathen, Rodberrow, 24 : Bdm. William x Wathen, Rodborough, yeom.


Nov. 2. Robert Duswell, Tarmarton, clothier, 48, and Martha Hoskins, Tarmarton, W.


Nov. 4. James x Harris, Eldersfeild, Worcs., husb., 32, and Mary Cockshotte, Corse, 26.


Nov. 24. Thomas Woodcooke, Upton St. Leonards, yeom. 25, and Mary Lewis, Upton St. Leonards, 24.

Nov. 25. William Ibell, Taynton, yeom., 26, and Elizabeth Daw, Huntley, W.


Nov. 30. Arthur Watts, Strowd, clothier, 38, and Elizabeth Baker, Thornebury, 30. [n.s.]
Nov. 30. John x Lewis, Berkely, husb., 19, and Sarah Harvey, Berkely, 30.

Nov. 30. Thomas Boswood, Dombleton, cordwainer, 26, and Alice Parker, Dombleton, 21: Bdm. Thomas Williams, Dombleton, tailor.


Dec. 2. James Keen, Bisley, yeom., and Joan (?) Dromine, Donsborne Millitis, W.


Dec. 30. Francis x Chin, Newnam, W., 60, and Mary Baker, Newnam, 30.
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Jan. 4. Mathew Packer, Cheltenham, W., and Jane Robinson, Gloucester city, W.
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Jan. 11. Thomas Coale [signs Colle], Wickwarr, cloth worker, 28, and Mary Boltsheare, Winterborne, 20.
Jan. 15. William Bishop, Hempsteed, tailor, 23, and Elizabeth Jennings, Hempsteed, 22.
Jan. 20. George Wall, Ooselworth, yeom., and Elizabeth Fernely, Ooselworth, 30; Bdm. Thomas Fernely, Ooselworth, yeom.
Feb. 1. John x Witts, Stroud, broadweaver, 24, and Mary Biddle, Stroud, 31.
Feb. 2. Robert Hobbs, Beverston, W., 30, and Jane x Hudd, Beverston.
Feb. 8. Tobias x Williams, Brockworth, yeom., 40, and Margery Phelips, Kempley, 25.
Feb. 10. William Golding, Little Farrington, Berks., W., 58, and Jone Hancock, Daglingworth, W., 56; Bdm. Thomas Wolley, Gloucester city, gent.
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Feb. 15. Anthony x Willetts, Tewkesbury, W., and Elizabeth Mould, Twining, W.
Feb. 16. Hugh Holloway, Leonard Stanly, W., and Jane Freeman, Eastington, W.
Feb. 17. William Tyler, Deorham, tailor, 30, and Elizabeth Bruton, Deorham, 25: Bdm. John Clarke, "one of the Apparators of this Court."
Feb. 17. Edward Bruton, Deorham, 25, and Anne Packer, Doynton, 21, Bdm. John Clarke, "one of the apparators of this Court."
Feb. 19. Henry x Lissiman, Bosbury, Herefords, tailor, 22, and Alice Brian, Haresfield, 22.
Apr. 4. John Cowles, Gloucester city, bodice-maker, 24, and Anne Powell, Gloucester city, 23.
Feb. 23. Edward x Trevis, Hampton, tiler, 25, and Deborah Clift, Strowd, 22.
Feb. 29. Thomas x Raingford, Cirencester, joiner, 27, and Hannah Hynton, Cirencester, 21.

1664
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Apr. 13. George Clements, Weston subedge, 30, and Mary Fox, Condicot, W., 40.
Apr. 15. Giles Steedman, Tedbury, physician, (? ) 29, and Katherine Talboyes, Tedbury, W.
Apr. 16. John Willcox, Bristol city, brewer, 26, and Anne Warren, Tetbury, W.
Apr. 18. Richard Draper, Newent, cordwainer, 23, and Bridget Wall, Newent, 19.
Apr. 21. Michael Rutter, Cirencester, innholder, 50, and Elizabeth Millard, W.
Apr. 21. William x Haines, Dearhurst, yeom., 50, and Elizabeth Little, Dearhurst, 30.
Apr.  29. Christopher Williams otherwise Woollams, Stanway, yeom., 22, and Anne Boothe, Prestcott, 27. Signed by Edmund Boothe.
May  5. George Brett, Downe Hatherly, W., and Mary Barkley, Rendcombe, W.
May 11. Phillip x Lewes, Newland, yeom., 38, and Anne Pride, Newland, 35.
May 11. William Beard, Gloucester city, victualler, 52, and Joane Mathews, Gloucester city, W.
May 13. Thomas Booth, Wesbury, yeom., 22, and Elizabeth Banaster, Wesbury, " age about the same age."
May 18. Thomas Thurnoe, Thornebury, yeom., 17, and Susannah Browning, Thornebury, 19.
May 18. John x Howell, Cam, yeom., 24, and Margaret Mayle, Cam, 22.
May 18. Samuell Sebome otherwise Plomer, [signs Plomer], Wotten subedge, clothier, 26, and Sarah Isbury, Hauksbury, 22.
May 28. Robert Willmotts [signs Willmot], Gloucester city, W., and Sara Baston, Churcham, W.
June 2. William Howes, Colne Dennis, yeom., 41, and Jane Rodway, Colne Dennis, 28.
June 4. Giles x White, Shurdington, mason, 22, and Fraunces Hands, Shurdington, 30.
June 4. Richard x Beard, Harsfield, yeom., 30, and Tacie Bayly, Whittmaster, W.
June 21. John x Nourse als. Williams, Cirencester, mason, 26, and Anne Haines, Cirencester, W.
June 27. Richard Cooke, Little Sodbury, yeom., 32, and Anne Jackson, Little Sodbury, 23.
June 29. Daniell Pearce, Randwicke, broadweaver, 26, and Elizabeth Stratford, Standish, 22.


June 30. Tymothy Beven, Berkely, mercer, 21, and Elizabeth Bartlet, Allmondsbury, 20: Bdm. Thomas Bayley, Berkely, yeom.


July 4. Richard Tindall, North Nibley, yeom., 40, and Hester Harding, Cam, 32.

July 4. John x Hill, Corse, yeom., 34, and Hester Nest, Tiberton, W.


July 8. Nicholas x Hitchings, Newland, narrow-weaver, 35, and Margaret Man, Newland, W.


July 17. Nicholas x Mathews, Upton St. Leonards, butcher, 24, and Anne Ducke, Upton St. Leonards, 24.


Aug. 1. Robert Coward [signs Cowherd], Wotton subedge, cardmaker, and Sarah Haines, Wotton underedge, W.


Aug. 11. William Huntington, Thornbury, yeom., and Joane x Noote, Thornbury, W.


Aug. 20. Thomas Chadwell, Little Barrington, clothier, 33, and Dorothy Dicks, Kempley, W.
Aug. 23. Edward Clarke, Thornbury, gent., 24, and Hester Estcourt, Rodborow, 17. He "by virtue of his oath sayeth that hee had leave and freedome from the mother of the said Hester to treat with her about the said intended marriage but hath not yet her full consent thereunto in regard shee stands upon such conditions as boath hee and his intended wife doe think unreasonable And saving what is before expressed sayeth that there is no lawfull lett or impediment . . ." etc.


Aug. 29. Thomas Stafford, Thornbury, gent., 30, and Catherine Addams, Thornbury, W.


Sept. 5. Giles Mathews, Brockworth, butcher, 25, and Hester Batchelor Tetbury, 25.


Sept. 8. Thomas Lockyer, Wootton underedg, Chandler, 21, and Joane (?) Stock or Stack, Wootton underedg, 22.


Sept. 15. Thomas x Costin, Worcester city, yeom., 29 and Mary Jennings, Gloucester city, 22.


Sept. 17. James x Hamonds, Aston Ingham [Herefords.], yeom., 35, and Alice Procer, Newent, W.

Sept. 17. William Freeman, Laberton [p. Buckland], yeom., 60, and Anne Reeve, Laberton, W.
Sept. 17. Rowland Freeman, Cirencester, mercer, 30, and Anne Hawkins South Cerny, 20. 
Sept. 19. William Tovey, Southwicke, p. Tewxbury, yeom., 23, and Susannah Ireland, Cheltenham. 
Oct. 6. William x Smith, Elmore, husb. (?) 49, and Dorcas (?) Corner or Carver, Stanly, 30. 
Oct. 10. Edmund Boothe, Prescott, yeom., 40, and Mary Barton, Withington, W.

Oct. 12. John Coustons [signs Coulston], Churchdowne, (?) 30 or 60, and Jane Aldridge, Taynton, W.


Oct. 29. Charles Tovey, Hasfield, yeom., 26, and Margaret Moore, Hasfield, 24: Bdm. Thomas x Smith, Tewxbury, maltster.


Oct. 31. John Beach, Tewxbury, gent., 21, and Anne Gwinnett, Sherdington, 23.


Nov. 2. John Langley, Gloucester city, gent., 25, and Bridgett Harvey, Gloucester city, W.


Nov. 7. Thomas x Poalling, Gloucester city, tailor, and Sarah Harris, Gloucester city, W.


Nov. 16. William x Hooper, Much Martle, Herefords., yeom., 27, and Ellinor Edwards, Newent, W.

Nov. 16. William x Jackson, jun., Bristol city, merchant, (?) 29, and Elizabeth Perry, Frampton upon Seaverne, 20.


Nov. 29. Thomas Walker, Thornebury, gent., 26, and Mary Dobbs, Thornebury, W.

Nov. 29. William Trotman, Thornebury, gent., 25, and Hannah Hayward, Thornebury, 25.

Dec. 2. Thomas Wythers, Thornebury, yeom., 24, and Elizabeth Baker, Rockhampton, 22. [n.s.]

Dec. 3. Nicholas Legge, Chipping Sodbury, innholder, 32, and Alice Harris, Berkely, W.

Dec. 3. John Smith, Wotten under Edge, gent., and Mary Eves, otherwise Kempe, Wotton under Edge, W.


Dec. 9. John Dimery, Oldbury super Sabrina', p. Thornebury, blacksmith, 52, and Margaret Hill, W.


Dec. 27. Robert Hathway, Dursley, clothier, 30, and Mary Attwood, Dursley, 24.

Dec. 29. George x Rodway als. Bradley, Stroud, broadweaver, 20, and Anne Bick, "of Rendwick in the same parish," W.
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Jan. 4. Stephen Hooper, Westerleigh, gent., 29, and Margaret Bidle, Alderly, 32.


[n.d.] Anselme Nash, Berkley, gent., and Sarah Yewen, Berkley, W.


Jan. 16. Thomas x Thomkins, Awre, miller, 50, and Margaret Clarke, Awre, 28.


Jan. 28. John x Phillpps, Bisley, clothworker, 33, and Anne Brunsdowne, Bisley, 22.
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Feb.  3. Thomas Greaves, Elmeston, yeom., and Elizabeth Keare; Bpp's Cleeve, W.
Feb.  4. William x Merrick, Hartbury, yeom., 34, and Mary Kerby, Hartbury, 32.
Feb.  4. Anthony x Hathaway, Cam, victualler, 29, and Mary (?) Ashmade, Cam, 27.
Mar.  1. William Fowler, Stonehouse, clothier, 36, and Elizabeth Hicks, Cam, 26.
Mar.  2. William x Whiteacre, Cirencester, mason, 22, and Katherine Deighton, Cirencester, W.
Mar.  4. Thomas Gwinnell, Dursly, broadweaver, 26, and Elizabeth Curtis, Dursly, 30.

1665

Mar. 27. Henry x Smith, South Cerny, yeom., 25, and Anne Stephens, South Cerny, 20.
Mar. 28. Thomas Shewell, [signs Showell], "Heighnam in the parish of Churchdowne" [Churcham], yeom., 50, and Hanna Venn, Standish, W.
Mar. 28. Thomas Dowdy, Hardwicke, yeom., 24, and Mary Smith, Quedgly, 30.
Mar. 29. James Ramsey, Longhope, yeom., W., and Mary Window, Dursley, W.
Mar. 30. Thomas x Harris, Ruerdeane, collier, 40, and Jane Cooke, Ruerdeane, W.
1665
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Apr.  6. George Richard, Huersfeild, mason, 23, and Barbara Grundall, St. Brevills, W. [n.s.]
Apr. 10. Thomas x Organ, Frampton upon Seaverne, yeom., 28, and Katherine Odely, Frampton upon Seaverne, 30.
Apr. 15. Thomas x Heughes, Stonehouse, broadweaver, 22, and Sarah Mynett, Harsfeild, 30.
Apr. 15. Nathaniell Beard, Rodberrow, clothier, 32, and Sarah Prestbury, Churchdowne, 22.
Apr. 15. Thomas Lysons, Hempsteed, 28, and Mary Deuxell, Whaddon, 20.
Apr. 22. Thomas Potter, Avenhall, W., and Jane Browne, Whittchurch, Herefords., W.
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May 2. John Surman, Tredington, gent., 30, and Margaret Randle, Bagworth, [? Badgeworth], 23.

May 2. Evan x Howell, Nympsfield, yeom., W., and Jane Freeme, Avening, W.

May 5. Thomas x Davies, Churcham, yeom., 33, and Joane Phillipps, Churcham, W.


May 6. Devorax' Deane, Sandhurst, yeom., 26, and Anne Bicke, Sandhurst, 30.


May 10. John Perry, Rudford, clothier, 40, and Joane Caline, of "the Collige within ye dioces of Glocr.," 36.


May 27. Thomas x Seate, Kemble, Wilts., yeom., 42, and Alice Gyde, Seedington, 40.


June 3. Henry Stockwell, Gloucester city, woolcomber, 24, and Elizabeth Engley, Gloucester city, W.
June 5. Ferdinando x Dodswel, Cam, broadweaver, 48, and Winnifred Harding, Hawkinsbury, 36.
June 23. Francis x Beach, Tredington, yeom., 24, and Catherine Ball, Tredington, 30.
June 24. George Hands, Eastington, yeom., 60, and Susannah Stratford, Standish, 40. [n.s.]
June 24. William Clutterbuck, Kings Stanley, broadweaver, 50, and Elizabeth Bridge, Kings Stanley, W.
June 24. Heugh x Lewis, Frampton upon Seaverne, yeom., 60, and Anne Wetmore, Frampton upon Seaverne, 34.
June 17. [?] 27. Anthony x Certaine, Rodmarton, weaver, 30, and Jane George, Rodmarton, 30.
July 5. Thomas Eaton, Dymocke, clerk, and Jane Foord, Newent, W.
July 15. James x Woodward, Gloucester city, bricklayer, W., and Elizabeth Nicholls, Gloucester city, W.
July 29. John x Garver, Tewxbury, mason, 72, and Mary Burford, Gloucester city, 60.
Aug. 6. Walter Remington, Stratton, yeom., 77, and Elizabeth Hodges, Churchdowne, 30.
Aug. 16. Thomas x Hall, Colbsbourne, tiler, 50, and Alice Hyde, Gloucester city, 46.
Aug. 28. Thomas Hauling [signs Hallinge], Horsly, chandler, 30, and Mary Workeman, Cam, 25.
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Aug. 31. William King, Stroud, clothier, 22, and Margery Grendy, Wotten subedge, W.
Sept. 5. Robert Dawes, Wotton underedge, clothier, 34, and Elizabeth Tyler, Deorham, 28.
Sept. 11. Abel Wantner, Gloucester city, yeom., 23, and Alice Elton, Tedbury, 23.
Sept. 16. Robert x Hamling, Bagworth, turner, 30, and Elizabeth Sparkes, Churchdown, 22.
Sept. 29. Ralph x Jenkins, Shipton Olive, yeom., 34, and Ruth Smith, Whittington, 32.
Oct. 3. Thomas x Hawling, Bishopp's Cleeve, yeom., 32, and Anne Ken... [torn], Bishopp's Cleeve, 30.

VOL. IV


58
Oct. 27. Thomas Balldwyn, Corse, yeom., 24, and Anne Mayall, Much Martle, Herefords., 24.
Oct. 27. William Lugg, Bisley, clothier, 24, and Sarah Payton, Bisley, W.
Oct. 12. William Iles, South Cerney, yeom., 52, and Idith (?) Moore or Morse, Cirencester, W.
Nov. 4. Charles Merrett, Standish, yeom., 30, and Mary Stratford, Standish, 30.
Nov. 4. Cha. Underhill, Sandhurst, gent., 35, and Barbara Webly, Sandhurst, W.
Nov. 6. John x Plaine, Strowd, carpenter, 61, and Amy Clarke, Charleton Kings, W.
Nov. 9. William Knottsford, Corse, yeom., 21, and Jane Ricketts, Corse, 31.
Nov. 22. Thomas Wintle, Minsterworth, W., and Jane Weale, Longhope, W.
Nov. 22. Thomas Clevely, Churcham, W., and Hester Harris, Hempsteed, 26.
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Dec. 15. Thomas Ford, Chipping Cambden, tanner, 28, and Elizabeth Freeman, Broade Cambden, 22.


Dec. 16. Thomas Veysye, Strowd, clothier, and Hannah Veysy, Rodberrow, W.


Dec. 23. Thomas Phelpes, Gloucester city, gent., and Elizabeth Kendall, Gloucester city, W.


Dec. 29. John x Richmond [signed Ritchman], Alderly, yeom., 26, and Sarah Smith, Alderly, 30.
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Jan. 5. Edward Gibbes, Badmington Magna, gent., 35, and Elizabeth Batthurst, Badmington Magna, 27.

Jan. 5. William x Nelmes, Abenhall, yeom., 26, and Mary Dowle, Abenhall, 30.


Jan. 18. James Legg, Berkely, yeom., W., and Alice Wooles, Berkely, W.


Jan. 23. Giles x Selly, Maisemore, husb., 30, and Alice Davies, Maisemore, W.

Jan. 24. William x Bennett, Ashleworth, yeom., 38, and Jane Brooke, Gotheider [? Goodrich], Hereford., 38.

Jan. 30. Zachariah Hayward, Gloucester city, maltster, 29, and Jane Clarke, Gloucester city, 17


Feb. 1. John Tilladam, Dursley, 30, and Mary Alexander, Tedbury, 18.


Feb. 3. Richard Foords, Stanly St. Leonards, baker, 22, and Edith Foords, Cowley, 19


Feb. 6. Robert x Pearce, Bisley, mason, W., and Mary Taylor, Rundwicke, W.
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Feb. 10. Samuel Robbins, Dimmock, yeom., 30, and Elizabeth Tovy, Dimmock, 22.
Feb. 15. William Litton, Dursley, clothier, 21, and Mary Arndell, Dursley, W.
Feb. 16. Samuel Hayward, Gloucester city, tailor, 26, and Deborah Pengry, Gloucester city, 21.
Feb. 24. George Whiting, Cubberly, yeom., 30, and Jane Stockwell, Withington, W.
Feb. 27. Samuel x Davies, Bisley, yeom., W., and Mary Lugg, Bisley, 36.
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Mar. 10. John Stone, South Cerney, yeom., W., and Joane Jones, South Cerney, 30; Bdm. Richard Jones, South Cerney, tailor.

1666

Mar. 29. William Tommes [signs Tomes], Dunsborne Rous, yeom., 30, and Anne Chandler, Badgington, 28.
Apr. 3. William x Davis, Hartpury, yeom., 24, and Ann Bosly, Gloucester city, 28.
Apr. 4. Richard x Organ, Cowly, yeom., W., and Mary Ostmin, Uly, W.
Apr. 7. William Mayo, Read Marly Debitot, Worcs., gent., 23, and Anne Etheridge, the Lighe, 20.
Apr. 7. John Tomlinson, Slimbridge, W., and Jane Sanniger, Slimbridge, 35.
Apr. 16. William Smart, Rodborow, clothworker, 21, and Merlin Rowland, Stroude, 22.
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Apr. 17. Elias Britten, Upton, p. Bitton, yeom., 40, and Mary Britten, Weston, dioc. of Bath and Wells, W.: Bdm. John Smith, Gloucester city, gent. [This entry is crossed out].
Apr. 18. Joseph Yate, Arlingham, yeom., 27, and Elizabeth Beard, Morten Vallience, 22.
Apr. 21. James x Nelme, Berkly, yeom., 29, and Elizabeth Fryer, Berkly, W.
Apr. 21. Edward Braseington, Tetbury, woolcomber, 26, and Olive Browne, Kemble, Wilts., 22: Bdm. Henry Coke, Kemble, chandler. [This entry is crossed out].
Apr. 24. Francis Jobbins, Wotten sub edge, clothier, W., and Elizabeth Derrett, Wotten sub Edge, W.
Apr. 28. William Richmond, Buckland, yeom., 30, and Hannah Freeman, Buckland, 25.
Apr. 30. Richard x Eliotts, Awre, yeom., 25, and Margaret Walborne, Awre, 34.


May 14. James Rogers, North Nibley, tailor, 26, and Anne Smith, Dursley, W.


May 19. Thomas x Damsell, Strowd, broadweaver, 24, and Anne Smith, Strowd, 26.


May 19. Thomas Rogers, Cowly, [? Coaley], baker, 24, and Prisilla Miles, Cowly [? Coaley], 18.


May 19. John x Randle, Badgroth, yeom., 26, and Elizabeth Capiner, Badgroth, 22.


May 30. Thomas Hawling [signs Halling], Eastington, carpenter, 32, and Milicient Freeman, Eastington, W.


June 1. Thomas x Russell, Chipping Sodbury, carrier, 24, and Mary Higgs, Horton, 20.

June 2. George Kingston, Huntly, gent., 27, and Margaret Okey, Huntly, 19.


June 7. Henry x Beylis, Cheltenham, carrier, W., and Joane Wakefeild, Crickelade, Wilts., W.


June 12. William James, North Nibly, clothworker, 22, and Mary Binge, North Nibly, 24.


June 23. Henry Ravenhall, Bully, butcher, 22, and Mary Edwards, Bully, 23. [n.s.].

June 25. Francis x Hooper, Preston, tailor, 21, and Anne Phillips, Preston, 33.


July 4. Walter x Harvey, Gloucester city, innholder, W., and Anne Griffiths, Gloucester city, 35.

July 6. John Lawrence, Rundwick, mason, W., and Joane Chaundler, Randwick, W.


July 9. Edmund Kinge, Quenington, yeom., 22, and Mary Thomas, Quenington, 24.


July 18. John Mathew, Wootton underedge, yeom., W., and Eizabeth Bayly, Berckly, W.
July 21. Thomas x Fletcher, Maisemore, yeom., 27, and Mary Wells, Lassington, 23.
July 23. Daniel x Burdocke, Painsweek, yeom., 24, and Mary Tommes, Painsweek, 22.
July 25. Isaac Jowlings [signs Jollings], Minchinhampton, broadweaver, 27, and Mary Clayfield, Minchinhampton, 30.
Aug. 16. Joseph x Langley, Barkly, yeom., 30, and Joane Gastrell, Barkly, W.
Aug. 18. Joseph Wintle, Wesbury, yeom., (?) 25, and Mary Ayre, Newnham, 32.
Aug. 20. Humphry x Hollihock, Maysemore, blacksmith, 35, and Margaret Fletcher, Maysemore, 40.
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Aug. 23. John Packer [signs Parker], Dynton, yeom., 25, and Elizabeth Roberts, Dynton, W.
Aug. 24. Anthony Poole, Painsweecke, yeom., W., and Dorothy Davis, Painsweecke, W.
Aug. 25. John x Payne, Newent, currier, 25, and Alice Jones, Newent, W.
Sept. 1. Giles Warner, Strowd, clothier, 23, and Mary Sliser, Gloucester city, 22.
Sept. 3. Richard Nash, Gloucester city, felt maker, W., and Anne Keyse, Huntly, W.
Sept. 8. Thomas x Neast, Corse, cooper, 47, and Elizabeth Cooke, Dodeswell, (?) 38 or 48.
Sept. 21. John x Clarke, Hartpury, yeom., W., and Margarett Fletcher, Maismore.
Sept. 29. Thomas x (?), Bertonely or Bertonely, Hartbury, husb., 23, and Mary Underwood, Hartbury, 32.


Oct. 22. Richard x Harding, jun., Hempstead, W., and Elizabeth Clemans, Hempstead, 23.


Oct. 25. Thomas x Gray, Buckland, yeom., 30, and Anne Izord, Buckland, 40.


Oct. 31. Richard Jelfe, St. John Baptist, Gloucester city, felt maker, 22, and Priscilla Willis, St. John Baptist, 26; Bdm. Robert x Young, St. John Baptist, yeom.

Nov. 1. David Jones, Langarren, Herefords., yeom., 26, and Mary Tanty, Leckhampton, 22.


Nov. 8. Phillipp Guye, Minching Hampton, clothier, 28, and Anne Lyddiat, Minchinhampton, W.


Nov. 15. Giles Griffeth, Cirencester, worsted-comber, 25, and Anne Masters, Coates, 25.
Nov. 20. Richard Gaye, Fainsweek, clothworker, 21, and Mary Payne, St. Mary Load, Gloucester city, 22.
Nov. 20. Edward Deale, St. Brevills, yeom., W., and Anne Berrow, St. Brevills, W.
Nov. 22. Peter x Clissold, Bisly, blacksmith, 30, and Mary Keene, Bisly, W.
Nov. 23. William x Wintle, Wesbury, yeom., W., and Joane Wintle, Wesbury, W.
Nov. 27. William x Meare, Wesbury, mariner, 22, and Anne Batherne, Wesbury, 23.
Nov. 28. Thomas Leech, ye Barrow, p. Bodington, yeom., 30, and Anne Smith, the Lye, 17.
Dec. 9. Joseph Smith, Cowly [? Coaley], blacksmith, 20, and Anne Hickes, Cowly.
Dec. 11. John Jellings, North Nibly, broadweaver, W., and Mary Owen, North Nibly, W.
Dec. 27. John Nealme, Berckly, yeom., 37, and Anne Knight, Berckly, 27.
Dec. 28. Robert x Lod als Sherle, Cirencester, yeom., W., and Alice Harvy, Cirencester, W.
Dec. 29. Francis Iles, South Cerny, mason, 55, and Alice Wittny, Cirencester, 22: Bdm. Richard x Walker, South Cerny, yeom.
Dec. 29. John Pugh, Kerry, Montgomeryshire, gent., 24, and Mary Morgan, Lidny, 22.
Dec. 29. Thomas x Mallet, Childswickha', yeom., 32, and Joan Williams, Childswickha', 22.
Dec. 31. Edmund x Slye, Churchdowne, carpenter, W., and Anne Paine, Churchdowne, 23.

1666/7

Jan. 7. John Jeffis, Asheworth, yeom., 32, and Sarah Wright, Sandhurst, W.
Jan. 16. Robert x Sparrowhawke, Gloucester city, silk-weaver, W., and Isabell Pynor, Longney, W.
Feb. 2. Thomas Webb, Kingswood, clothier, 28, and Mary Hicks, Cam, 20 : Bdm. Daniel Hicks, Cam, clothier.
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Feb. 6. Thomas x Johns, Cheasly, Worcs., yeom., W., and Hannah Fowler, Wesbury, W.
Feb. 16. Thomas x Sewell, Bisley, cordwainer, 33, and Joane Davies, Bisley, 30.
Feb. 18. Daniell Webbe, Strowd, clothier, 30, and Mary Harris, Strowd, 22.
Feb. 18. John Craft, Tibberton, yeom., W., and Edith Barnard, Tibberton, W. [n.s.].
Mar. 2. Richard Saunders otherwise Mills, South Cerney, mercer, W., and Barbara Merret, Cirencester, W.
Mar. 5. Thomas Barnesly, Cirencester, vintner, 26, and Anne Harte, Bristol city, 23.

1667

Apr. 6. John Elees, Uly, clothier, W., and Elizabeth Dorney, Uly, 36.
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Apr. 11. Samuell Miller, Tewksbury, tailor, W., and Katherine Pitt, Tewksbury, 40.
Apr. 13. Edward Richmond, jun., Willersy, wool-winder, 33, and Anne Willis, Willersy, 35; Bdm. Edward x Richmond, sen., Willersy, wool-winder, 35 [? error for 55].
Apr. 18. Francis x Greene, Charlton Kings, yeom., 40, and Margaret Greene, Northlatch, W.
Apr. 18. John Essington, Slimbridge, gent., W., and Dorcas Driver, Avening, 22.
Apr. 27. James Hiett, Highnam [p. Churcham], yeom., W., and Alice Aylberton, Westbury, W.
Apr. 27. John (?) Owen or Ewen, Naylsworth, p. Horsly, clothier, 22, and Hester Hopton, Berkly, 23.
Apr. 29. John Rickards, Berkly, yeom., 24, and Mary Dening, Berkly, 27.
May 9. William x Arundell, Edgeworth, tailor, 29, and Rebecca Weeks, "of the Poole in the dioces of Sarum," 22.
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May 25. Thomas x Williams, Sandhurst, yeom., 30, and Eliz. Merry, Sandhurst, W.
June 15. Richard Aylway [signs Allway], Westbury, yeom., W., and Anne Hyett, Westbury, 36.
June 15. John x Poole, Paynsweeck, yeom., 30, and Anne Jones, Painsweeck, W.
June 24. Thomas Loker [signs Looker], Littledeane, gent., 32, and Mary Hill, Littledeane, 27.

July 12. Robert Webster, Bristol city, cutler, W., and Mary Hoare, Barckly, W.
July 16. Fardinando Allen, King Stanly, cordwainer, 22, and Jane Smith, Bisly, 19.
July 22. John x Davis, Newent, yeom., 30, and Elizabeth (?) Hines, Newent, W.
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Aug. 2. William Lawrence, Brimpsfield, yeom., 30, and Mary Small, Cyrencester, 25.
Aug. 8. William Coltman, Chipping Campden, mercer, 25, and Alice Dickins, Chipping Campden, W.
Aug. 10. Jesse x Nash, Gloucester city, feltmaker, W., and Joane Hodges, Longhope, W.
Aug. 27. Maurice x Chapperllin, Ashton Kaines, Wilts., yeom., W., and Joane Hall, South Cerny, 24.
Sept. 2. John Sanford, Churchdowne, yeom., 26, and Margery Cother, Churchdowne, 30: Bdm. John x Cother, Linton, Herefords.
Sept. 7. John Awood, Cam, gent., W., and Joane Davis, Slimbridge, 22.
Sept. 9. Ephraim x Smith, Saule, yeom., W., and Anne Harris, Frampton upon Seaverne, 27.
Sept. 20. John Batten [signs Baen], Westerleigh, yeom., 33, and Sarah Neale, Iron Acton, W.
Sept. 20. Simon x Randle, Shipton Solace, yeom., W., and Mary Mase, Churchdowne, W.
Sept. 21. Thomas x Maslin, Minty, “in the County of Gloucr.,” yeom., W., and Joane Ball, Cherington (?) 24 or 27.
Sept. 25. Richard x Brock, Minsterworth, yeom., W., and Margarett (?) Rudge or Lodge, "Weston in the diocese of Gloucr," 46.
Sept. 25. Phillipp x Mutilloc, Longe Hope, yeom., W., and Elinor Nicholas, Lynton, Herefords., W.
Sept. 25. Thomas x Cherington, Bisly, yeom., 28, and Jane Fletcher, Bisly, 22.
Oct. 5. James x Ingra', Dymock, yeom., and Anne Bradford, Dymock, W.
Oct. 7. John Jee, Street High [Streethay], Staffs., yeom., W., and Rose Nicklin, Oxnell, W.

Oct. 25. Richard x Jones, Rosse, Herefords, cordwainer, 26, and Anne Brewer, Gloucester city, 23.


Oct. 28. Samuell x Cox, Cheltenha', blacksmith, 25, and Alice Okey, Cheltenha', 25.


Nov. 2. Richard Pinfold, Minchinhampton, clothier, 30, and Sabina Thomas, Quenington, 20.

Nov. 2. Thomas Drinkwater, Taynton, yeom., 26, and Joane Hill, Dymock, 23.

Nov. 2. John Loveridge [signs Lovering], Bristol city, pewterer, 30, and Deborah Hill, Gloucester city, 24.


Nov. 9. Thomas Togwell, Minchinhampton, clothier, 22, and Joane Winchcombe, Didmarton, 26. [n.s.]


Nov. 11. John Izard, Gloucester city, yeom., W., and Elizabeth Weaver, Gloucester city, 35 : Bdm. Griffith x Thomas, Gloucester city, gent.


Nov. 19. William Phillimore, Cam, clothier, 27, and Jane Young, Frocester als. Frauster, 27.


Nov. 27. John x Lucas, Berckly, cordwainer, 29, and Elizabeth Harte, Berckly, 28.
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Dec. 30. Thomas x Roch, Oldbury upon the Hill [p. Diddmarton], yeom., 29, and Mary Alexander, Oldbury upon the Hill, 23.

1667/8

Jan. 2. Timothy Harris, (?) Wootton, yeom., 24, and Hester Church, Ashellworth, 29.
Jan. 3. John x Collins, (?) Coss, yeom., 40, and Sarah (?) Cake, (?) Coss, W.
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Jan. 20. Thomas x Wood, Prestbury, yeom., 30, and Elizabeth Wilkins, the Ligh, 26.


Jan. 23. John x Maning, Little Deane, mason, 22, and Elinor Moore, Little Deane, W.

Jan. 27. Thomas x Hornedge, Gloucester city, bodice-maker, 23, and Jane Stokes, Maismore, 21.

Jan. 27. Thomas Phillipps, Minchin Hampton, clothier, 21, and Elizabeth Webb, Minchin Hampton, 19.


Feb. 27. Edward Tovey, Tewxbury, miller, 21, and Mary Welles, Tewxbury, W.

Feb. 29. Miles Mutlow, Gloucester city, tailor, W., and Mary Bancknett, Gloucester city, 20.

Feb. 29. John x Bayly, Elmore, husb., 26, and Jane Ryder, Westbury, W.


Mar. 10. Gerard x Webb, Bishop's Cleeve, yeom., 38, and Anne Key, Wynchcombe, 30.


Mar. 23. Jerimy x Watts, Tedbury, cordwainer, 28, and Sarah Perkins, Tedbury, W.
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Mar. 27. William x Beames, Rockhampton, yeom., W., and Hannah Ricketts, Berkly, 40.
Mar. 28. John Hayward, Gloucester city, felt maker, W., and Mary Jeynes, Gloucester city, 40.
Apr. 3. William Sisemore, Gloucester city, barber, 21, and Elianor Gundy, Gloucester city, 21.
Apr. 13. Andrew Miles, Chipping Sodbury, gent., W., and Margery Palmer, Stone, W.
Apr. 18. Lawrance Sherar, Mynching Hampton, butcher, W., and Susannah (?) Barker or Parker, Ham [p. Berkeley], W.
Apr. 18. Edmund Chamberlayne, Gloucester city, gent, 24, and Elizabeth Yate, Gloucester city, 15.
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Apr. 28. Thomas Smith, jun., Thornbury, yeom., 18, and Anne Stones, Thornbury, 24: Bdm. Thomas Smith, sen., Thornbury, yeom.

Apr. 29. Thomas x Nelme, Hartpury, yeom., W., and Mary Millwater, Moorton Valence, W.


May 10. Thomas Moore, Bristol city, cordwainer, 26, and Alice Fryer, Arlingham, 36.


May 12. Thomas x Smith, Tewkesbury, maltster, W., and Hester Hale, Tewkesbury, 33.

May 12. John Churchis, Woodchester, clothier, 32, and Anne Halling, Frocester, 22.


May 13. Ferdinando Dorney, Barckly, broadweaver, W., and Mary Croome, Hill, 27.


May 15. Walter x Webb, Thornbury, yeom., W., and Mary Tanner, Thornbury, 32.

May 15. George (?) Sisu, Wotten underedge, clothworker, 23, and Anne Morgan, Wotten underedge, W.


May 16. Walter Lane als. French, Cheltenha', yeom., W., and Jane Warden, Staunton, W.

May 18. John Morse, Chedworth, yeom., W., and Elinor Haynes, Chedworth, W.


May 23. John Hanes, Gloucester city, tanner, 27, and Elizabeth James, Strowd, 30.


June 1. John x Exell, North Nibly, broadweaver, W., and Anne Young, North Nibly, 26.


June 6. Phillip Hancock, Alderly, yeom. 40, and Sarah Ball, Wickwar, 35.


June 13. William x Hancockes, Dimmock, Translator, (?) 31 or 51, and Alse Hodges, Dymock, W.


June 22. Lewis x Thomas, Gloucester city, yeom., 36, and Alce Powell, Custen [? Cutsdean], Worcs., 35.

June 24. Moris x Chamberlaine, Dursley, broadweaver, 23, and Jane Roe, Dursley, W.

June 24. John x (?) Richball, Deane parva, yeom., 30, and Elizabeth (? ) Elletts, Ruardeane, W.


June 27. Edmund Browne, English Bicknor, yeom., 30, and Joyce Sellens, Awre, 27.


June 28. Richard Hoskins, Bromsborough, weaver, 30, and Elizabeth Hyll, Dymock, 35.

July 1. William Allen, Stroud, cordwainer, W., and Elinor Bridge, Bisly, W.


July 3. Thomas x Martyn, Deerhurst, yeom., and Anne Beale, Deerhurst, 29.
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July 9. William Neale, Tiderington, yeom., 37, and Alice Brige, "flavel in ye parish of Thornbury," [? Falfield], 32.
July 16. Anthony Adderley, Stroude, barber, 36, and Mary Bubb, Stroude, 32.
Aug. 15. William Burge, Cyrencester, yeom., W., and Rebecka Groves, Cyrencester, W.
Aug. 17. Thomas x Vaughan, Gloucester city, joiner, and Mary Churcher, Strowd, 40.
Sept. 14. (?) Jeremy Aldey, King Stanley, yeom., 28, and Anne Oakley, King Stanley, W. [n.s.]
Sept. 26. Giles Middlemoore, Froster, yeom., W., and Anne Evans, Horsley, W.
Sept. 29. George x Parker, Rodburough, rugmaker, W., and Elizabeth Browneing, Rodburough.
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Oct.  6. Alexander Thorne, St. Brevills, yeom., 26, and Sarah Hyman, St. Brevills, W.


Oct. 22. Richard x Herbert, Hascombe, W., 50, and Edith Beard, Sale [? Saul], 40.


Nov. 21. Solomon x Hobson, Stroud, butcher, 23, and Jane Peirce, Stroud, 23.


[n.d.]  Edward Manley, Seavinghamton, tailor, 29, and Elizabeth (?) Parker or Barker, Seavinghamton, 23.
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Dec. 19. Thomas Bywaters, Kemply, yeom., 25, and Anne x Williams, Kemply, W.: Bdm. (?) Amye x Williams, Kemply, W.


Dec. 26. Michaeell Cale, Gloucester city, innholder, W., and Dorothy Addams, Gloucester city, W.


Dec. 28. Thomas Willett, Wootton underhedge, yeom., and Edith Crewe, Wootton underhedge, W.


1668/9
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