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ABSTRACT

Setting out the parameters for Protestant church government in 1559, Elizabeth I of England granted "that the priestes and mynisters of the Church may lawfully, for the aduoyding of fornication, have an honest and sober wyfe." With that relatively unenthusiastic concession, marriage became a legal and lasting option for all clergy of the Church of England. Surplices and sanctions on economic and martial activity remained as medieval Catholic continuities in early modern Protestant clerical identity. Marriage, on the other hand, was an innovation that brought critical changes. Its effects went far beyond the strategic (and not always successful) containment of illicit clerical sexuality. The end of institutionalized celibacy had essential implications for clerical manhood, clerical spirituality, clerical poverty, the development of clerical professional networks, the administration of clerical discipline, the structure and maintenance of clerical dignity and the dynamics of clerical-lay relations in English parishes. It created an entirely new and distinct group of women in England's social and gender hierarchy: clerical wives. Yet the social and cultural history of clerical marriage and clerical families in post-reformation England has received insufficient scholarly attention. A handful of works, most notably Eric Carlson's and Helen Parish's studies of the clerical marriage debate during the Tudor Reformations, have addressed this revolution in clerical domestic life.
The evolution of clerical domesticity during the seventeenth-century period of Protestant conflict and consolidation has been especially understudied.

This dissertation poses several interrelated questions about gender, marriage, family and the clerical vocation in seventeenth-century England. How did the role and realities of being a husband, father and householder shape clerical identity and honor, during a critical period of change and upheaval in the English church? How did clerical dignity and the ascetic pursuits of clerical holiness influence and organize spousal relations and family life? How were the special expectations for clerical conduct officially extended to and imposed upon the members of clerical households? Finally, how did clerical wives and children collaborate in—or sabotage—pastoral performance and the orchestration of clerical dignity and identity? Together these questions explore how clerical honor and identity structured relations within the minister's household and between the minister's household and the larger parish or congregation.

Using print sources and ecclesiastical and family records from the northern dioceses of York, Chester, and Lincoln, the four chapters of this dissertation address different types of interaction between vocational and household honor and identity: the collaborative family maintenance of clerical dignity through clerical household honor, the intimate and domestic reproduction of clerical identity through devotional courtship and marital and family piety; the extension of ministers' domestic role of household patriarch into the parish, through the concept of 'spiritual fatherhood', and the role of wives and children in religious politics and parish controversies.
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INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Sometime in 1700, the Northumbrian gentleman William Cresswell drew up his will. "Being sick" at the time, Cresswell's impulse to order his affairs was normal. The terms of his will, however, were less typical. One provision struck the well-wishers clustered around Cresswell's sickbed as especially irregular: a several hundred pound trust granted to the "Childe then in…[the] wombe" of Mistress Dorothy Stafford, the rector's wife.¹

News of this odd legacy spread through Christopher Stafford's two Northumbrian parishes of Shipwash and Bothall, and then beyond.² It spawned rampant speculation "that the said Mr Cresswell did beget…[Dorothy Stafford's] said son…in adulterous embraces."³ Tormented by the whispers of parishioners and maddened by "great Jealousy & discontent," Rector Stafford "withdr[e]w & absent[ed] himselfe from the company & society of…the said Dorothy Stafford his wife and his family & from his Parish Church…remov[ing] to London or some other place."⁴ With their minister gone missing and his wife rumored to be cohabitating with Cresswell in the Shipwash parsonage house, the people of Bothall grew desperate. They begged the diocese of Durham to intervene.⁵

Examining the 1632 charges against the Earl of Castlehaven for the rape and sodomizing of his servants and wife, Cynthia Herrup has shown how an aristocratic
"house in gross disorder" brought into question the capacity of an aristocratic patriarch to govern both his family and the nation. In the deeply internalized ideology of early modern household patriarchy, a man's right to rule—at the village, county or national level—flowed from the competent rule of his own house. Thus, the Castlehaven scandal momentarily shook the secure, patriarchal self-perception of England's highest elite. The crown and peerage required the execution of Castlehaven and social ostracism of his wife in order to disassociate themselves and the power they wielded from the taint of immorality and misrule. Yet in the end, neither the alleged perpetration nor the eventual prosecution of Castlehaven's domestic perversities had disrupted dramatically the day-to-day government of Caroline (1625-1642) England.

The parish of Bothall was another story. In Bothall, infidelity in the rectory had a palpable impact on local life and worship. Dorothy Stafford's desertion of her marriage bed led to Christopher Stafford's desertion of his pulpit. Before Stafford altogether abandoned his spiritual post, shame and frustrated desire had reportedly rendered his behavior violent and erratic, far from the peaceable and self-controlled comportment that was a professional standard for the English clergy. The rumors of Mistress Stafford's sexual adventuring, fed both by news of Cresswell's suspicious will and by alleged sightings of Cresswell and Dorothy Stafford together, had corrupted the reputation of Stafford family, a family expected to serve as a model of Christian conduct to the rest of Bothall. In Stuart (1603-1714) England, the parsonage was usually the official moral and spiritual center of a parish. And in Bothall, that center had not held.

The case of Christopher and Dorothy Stafford suggests several questions about Protestant ministers and their households in Stuart England. Certain questions are raised
by the impact of Dorothy Stafford's infidelity on parish morale, and the decision of the
Durham church court to prosecute Mistress Stafford not only for adultery but for conduct
unbecoming a minister's wife: What was a minister's wife was expected to be in Stuart
England? What role was a minister's family expected to play in the parish or
congregation? To what degree were ministers' wives and families incorporated into the
vocational identity and practice of the clergy or into the clergy's formal institutions?

Further questions are raised by the way that Christopher Stafford's mess of a
marriage proceeded to affect his ability to function as the rector of Bothall: How were a
clergyman's manhood and ministry interdependent? How did ministers use their families
and their status as heads of households to define themselves vocationally? Finally, the
reference by the diocese of Durham in their articles against Dorothy Stafford to an
Elizabethan (1558-1603) ecclesiastical injunction concerning the conduct of clerical
wives begs one final question: How does the story of early modern clerical families fit
into the larger narrative of England's "long reformation," in which the religious, cultural
and political effects of Protestantization by statute were felt, negociated and contested
through the Elizabethan and Stuart periods?8

These are questions centered around the early modern English clergy. But they
are questions that foreground the issue of gender, and foreground the primary institution
for the reproduction of gender in early modern English society, the single family
household.9 The permanent introduction of clerical marriage in 1558 was arguably the
most significant social change wrought upon the English clergy by the Protestant
reformation. And this change had tremendously gendered implications for the English
church and English society. It brought fundamental (and gendered) alterations in clerical
manhood, clerical career structures, the performance of pastoral work and the dynamics of clerical-lay relations. It created an entirely new and distinct group of women in England's social and gender hierarchy: clerical wives. Yet these questions by and large have not been posed.

Three Early Modern Historiographies: Clerical Marriage, the English Clergy and Gender

Monographs by Eric Carlson and Helen Parrish, and articles by Mary Prior and Hilda Grieve have addressed the topic of clerical marriage during the Tudor (1485-1603) reformations. However these studies have focused on demographics, policy issues, and doctrinal debates. Thus these studies have quite helpfully examined some of the major social, political and intellectual circumstances surrounding the introduction clerical marriage into sixteenth-century England. But these studies have not explored the very gendered aspects of what clerical marriage *does*, in terms of constituting and maintaining the gender identities of the clerical husband and wife, in terms of structuring power relations within clerical households, or in terms of positioning the minister and members of his household within the hierarchy of English society.

Yet the absence of gender as category of analysis in these earlier studies is understandable, given how the early modern English clergy have been traditionally understood. As the first of the "learned professions," the clergy were exclusively male. In patriarchal society organized around the household as the primary unit of economic production and political power, this very exclusion set the legal and clerical professions apart. In farming and the trades, in the management of estates and in the exercise of
aristocratic influence, men may have held primary roles, but wives, widows and even singlewomen were vital secondary players. Wives were expected to have the capacity to act in the stead of their husbands, whether the job was bringing in the corn or defending the family manor against a military siege. Early modern widows had the status of heads of households, with the economic responsibilities that went with it. And through the eighteenth-century, both married and unmarried women can be found acting as independent shopkeepers and tradeswomen.11 Because the production of informal power and material goods in early modern households always depended on the presence and contributions of women, the largely male roles in that production process of master, manager and patron were more permeable to women's participation.

The clergy and legal professions, however, were restricted to men. In the case of the clergy, this exclusion had a range of Scriptural and theological justifications. These included verses in the epistles of Paul and Peter forbidding women from preaching or specifying that priests should be men, and church doctrines that modeled the priesthood on the person (and thus the gender) of Jesus.12 But for both professions, the complete exclusion of women emanated functionally from the specific arenas in which clerical and legal training and labor took place: the universities and churches, the legal inns and law-courts. These sites of learning and work differed from most of those in early modern England. They were what late medieval and early modern historians would term "formal" or public (i.e., state) institutions, rather than households. The formal, rather than familial, character of these institutions rendered them closed to women.

Thus, when examining the early modern English clergy, historians have tended to see churches and chapels, rather than rectory and vicarage houses. They have tended to
see transparent and universal male subjects, rather than very specifically gendered men, women and children.

For example, Rosemary O'Day's 1979 study of the Elizabethan clergy analyzed Elizabethan reforms of clerical training and discipline as a process of professionalization. Using modern sociological models, she argued that the Elizabethan reformation ultimately created a clerical profession: an organized and self-regulating group of cultural practitioners with a unique and cohesive identity and a standardized program of formal training. O'Day thus emphasized the public and formal elements of her subjects' vocation that fit the professionalization model, such as university education, episcopal oversight and an exclusive membership of ordained men.13

Although questioning the speed and regional uniformity of Protestant reform of the English clergy, subsequent historians have largely agreed with O'Day's contention that the Elizabethan and Stuart reform program eventually created a clergy with a standard level of minimum skills, a shared experience of university education and a common and unique vocational identity.14 But some work on the early and late Stuart clergy has also criticized aspects of the professionalization model introduced in O'Day's work.15 In fact, while continuing to maintain that clergymen, lawyers, physicians, pharmacists and surgeons constituted "learned professions" in early modern England, O'Day herself has taken a much more critical stance in recent work towards the historical use of a sociological model of professionalization.16

Tom Webster in particular has questioned the utility of a sociological framework designed to describe groups of nineteenth- and twentieth-century bureaucrats and technicians. Instead of looking for commonalities with modern professions, Webster has
emphasized the early modern particularities in early Stuart clerical sociability, training and organization. Focusing upon these particularities, Webster called attention to the clerical household as an important site of informal clerical socializing and mentoring. But though he quite thoughtfully examined work and identity in the heterosocial context of the clerical household, Webster did not look at the presence or involvement of women and children in that work or identity.17

Meanwhile, a dominant theme in the history of women in early modern Europe has supported the exclusion of women and families from the history of the clergy. Historians have argued quite powerfully that the early modern period was a period of progressive limitation of women's access to forms of political, economic and cultural power and participation. Furthermore, historians have identified the Protestant and Catholic reformations as central culprits in this process.18 Protestantism in particular has been singled out for its suppression of monasticism, its replacement of saints and pilgrimages with preaching and Scripture, and its support of patriarchical authority in the household and the magistracy. Historians such as Lyndal Roper, Merry Wiesner and Patricia Crawford have argued that these elements of Protestant reform drastically narrowed women's options for religious expression, essentially eliminated women's access to formal religious authority and undermined women's informal authority in the household and community.19

Additionally, earlier feminist historians have viewed the early modern reforms that created more "professional" Protestant and Catholic clergies as part of a larger historical process of institutionalizing the social arenas of intellectual, economic and political activity. According to these historians, this process gradually shifted more and
more of the production of knowledge, goods and power from heterosocial households and household-workshops to homosocial institutional settings or "public spheres" from which women were excluded. In these narratives of decline, the Protestant introduction of clerical marriage has attracted little interest. At most it has appeared as part and parcel of the hyper-masculinization of the Protestant clergy, and concomitant spiritual disempowerment of Protestant women.

More recent work on gender in early modern England and Europe has not fully rejected these narratives, but it has profoundly complicated them. Work on Enlightenment salons and coffee shops has pointed out that many "public spheres" actually operated in domestic and heterosocial venues. Scholarship on seventeenth-century religious sects and eighteenth-century political parties has demonstrated that the increasingly formalized boundaries of religion and politics were not completely impenetrable to women's participation. In addition, a growing focus on early modern masculinities has pushed scholars to examine how sexual honor and household relations placed constraints on the identities and agency of men as well as women.

The insights of recent gender history have begun to have an impact on early modern English church history. Tom Webster has expanded the view of early modern clerical practice to include the parsonage as a site of vocational sociability. Webster has also surveyed rhetorics of clerical masculinity in early Stuart puritan sermons. In an essay on the domestic manual authored by the early Stuart minister William Whatley, Jacqueline Eales has raised the question of how household honor and domestic power relations shaped clerical pronouncements on marriage. And Jeremy Gregory's
exploratory essay on manhood and the eighteenth-century English clergy has called for further research.25

This dissertation concentrates on pulling together the recent insights and critiques of both early modern gender history and the history of the early modern English clergy. This dissertation uses the analytic lens of gender and household history to further explore Tom Webster's suggestion that the early modern clergy was indeed understood as a "learned profession," but was not "professionalized" in the modern sense. At the same time, it contributes to the development of a more complex history of early modern gender relations and roles. It does so by examining the household as a critical site of clerical work and in the reproduction of clerical identity, complicating notions of increasingly formalized profession. It does so by exploring how clerical wives, children and servants were participants in clerical work and carriers of clerical identity, problematizing the degree to which Protestantism successfully restricted women's pastoral activities. Finally, it does so by exposing in what way the dynamics of manhood and reputation influenced the exercise of clerical authority, demonstrating how the identity of the English ministry was bound up, not only in vocational competence and distinction, but also in gender, sexuality and honor.

**Clerical Marriage in Early Modern England: An Historical Overview**

Clerical celibacy became a legal norm throughout Europe with the eleventh-century Gregorian reforms. When the Tudor regime of Henry VIII (1509-1547) subjected England to a "top-down" reformation through statute and proclamation, the status of clerical marriage in England went into flux. During this period, clerical marriage became
the focus of two strands of reformation debate: one theological and one social and political.

Clerical celibacy comprised a critical part of the Catholic sacramentalist theology of the priesthood. In this theology, the most fundamental function of the priesthood was to dispense to the laity the sacraments of baptism, the mass, penance (confession), confirmation, marriage, and extreme unction (last rites). Through these sacraments, the priest mediated and administered the salvific power of Christ. Priests possessed the power to perform these sacraments in part through the purity of sexual abstinence. This purity mattered most to the central sacrament of the mass, in which the priest re-enacted Christ's sacrifice, transubstantiating the bread and wine at the altar into divine flesh and blood. However, clerical purity was a general legitimating force in the priestly performance of all sacraments.26

Reformation theology mounted a sustained attack on sacramental theology. Reformation theologians reduced the number of sacraments from seven to two. They dramatically lessened the role of the sacraments in individual salvation. They stripped the most potent of the sacraments, the mass, of much of its power by rejecting the doctrine of transubstantiation. And they reconstructed the model of the priesthood. They replaced a sacramental priesthood, whose ascetic purity endowed them the power to provide the laity with sacred rites, with a preaching priesthood, whose literacy and learning enabled them to help the laity seek God's grace through understanding of the Holy Scriptures. By rejecting the sacramentalist model of the priesthood, reformation theologians obviated the need for priestly celibacy. Furthermore, they denied the premise that such purity could be achieved—by either clergy or laymen. The devaluation of the
sacraments reflected the larger Protestant conviction that the human will was hopelessly depraved, and that salvation could thus not be achieved by human actions. Only God's gift of grace, offered freely to the individual, could effect salvation. This theological scheme claimed that the notion that priests could achieve purity through willed sexual abstinence was a dangerous fallacy. Reformation theologians pointed to the persistence of clerical concubines (popularly known as "priests' whores") and clerical patronage of prostitution as proof of their contention.

However, both medieval and early modern contemporaries viewed clerical celibacy as having more than spiritual ends. The social and political fabric of medieval and early modern Europe was structured in part around the ownership and transmission of property, through marriage and inheritance. Property, in the form of land, title and office, comprised the defining form of political power. Constituting a permanent class of unmarried men and women, the clergy and monastic classes resolved problems of property transmission for both the church and aristocracies. Elite families could place younger sons and daughters in convents or the clergy, enabling them to consolidate and streamline the transmission of property through their eldest offspring.27

More importantly, for the medieval church, clerical celibacy provided a means of political independence from baronial families. Regardless of whether high-ranking clerics remained sexually continent, the ban on clerical marriage meant that they could have no legitimate children, and thus no legitimate heirs. This theoretically prevented aristocratic priests from turning bishoprics and other critical church offices into family property, passed down from father to son. With clerical celibacy, when a clergyman died, the ownership of his clerical office reverted back to its patron, thereby keeping church
lands and positions under church control. As the excesses and controversies of the late medieval church demonstrate, there were limits to this strategy, given the ingenuity of monarchies and elite families determined to exert control over church offices.

Nonetheless, clerical celibacy was one of the key reforms in the Gregorian program to establish the Western church as an independent power in Europe. And as a social marker of the priesthood, it became associated with the political privileges extended to clergy as part of the medieval church's autonomy.

When Henry VIII severed ties between the English church and Rome, debates raged over both the sacramental and social implications of clerical marriage. Clerical opponents decried it as a desecration of both ordination vows and the mass. Catholic peers and gentry feared that bishops would use marriage as a means to merge aristocratic and church land holdings, creating the most powerful baronial class in England.

Meanwhile, reformers touted clerical marriage as both a logical extension of Protestant theology and as a solution to a range of social abuses and sexual misconduct associated with monasticism and the priesthood, from the involuntary monastic imprisonment of unmarriageable young nobles, to the notorious brothels surrounding cathedrals in order to service the canons and chantry priests.

The mass seizure of monastic and church lands by the Henrician regime, and the accompanying statutes stripping the English clergy of their medieval exemptions and privileges made the aristocratic anxiety of powerful episcopal baronies impossible. But Henry Tudor remained theologically ambiguous towards the nature of the mass. He was equally averse to the potential social upheaval involved in changing the celibate status of
priests. Thus, throughout his reign, Henry Tudor consistently refused to legalize clerical marriage.

During the brief reign of his adolescent son Edward VI (1547-1553), the English church was subjected to a far more coherent and radical program of reform, albeit a program subsequently reversed during the reign of his eldest sister Mary I (1553-1558). The Edwardian parliament crafted statues legalizing clerical marriage. Radical Edwardian bishops such as Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley actively promoted clerical marriage in their visitations and sermons to the clergy. But when Edward died in 1553, he was succeeded by his staunchly Catholic eldest sister. Mary began an immediate and aggressive program of re-Catholicization. A statute was issued invalidating all clerical marriages. Priests who had married during Edward's reign were removed from their livings and required to disown their wives. Those who did so voluntarily were typically assigned to another parish. Those who did not faced prosecution for heresy. Evidence suggests that the majority of married clergy prosecuted by the Marian regime cooperated in dissolving their marriages. However, evidence also suggests that at least some of those supposedly re-celibate priests simply continued cohabitating with their ex-wives. But much like her brother's short-lived reformation, Mary Tudor's counter-reformation ended with untimely her death in 1558.

An accomplished humanist and the daughter of the Henry VIII and the Protestant activist Ann Boleyn, Elizabeth I succeeded to the English throne in 1558. Assisted by committed Protestant privy councilors and a cadre of Calvinist bishops who had gone into exile during Mary's reign, Elizabeth pushed through a moderate program of Protestant reform. Unlike Protestant establishments in Scotland and on the continent, the
Elizabethan Settlement cloaked its novel Calvinist doctrines in familiar liturgical and administrative trappings. The English church retained almost intact its episcopal structure of church government and its disciplinary system of church courts. It did away with Latin worship, but replaced it with a scripted English liturgy that featured familiar sensory cues such as priestly vestments and the gestural sign of the cross. But at the same time, it placed a vernacular bible in every parish church and promoted an agenda of clerical education and increased preaching.

Likewise, the Elizabethan Settlement permitted "that the priestes and mynisters of the Church may lawfully, for the aduoyding of fornication, have an honest and sober wyfe." But the Elizabethan regime also expressed clear reservations about the social and spiritual seemliness of clerical marriage. The wives and children of university lecturers and fellows were banned from Oxford and Cambridge. A similar ban was imposed on the families of the cathedral clergy, but lapsed due to lack of episcopal enforcement. Early Elizabethan scandals involving unsuitable clerical matches led to the episcopal licensing of clerical brides; no minister could marry until his wife was deemed acceptable by the bishop. Elizabethan society was initially ambivalent as well. Clerical wives and children endured insults, abuse and snubs. This hostility was most extreme in regional Catholic strongholds; there was a notable incident in the north of a midwife refusing to attend a clerical wife in labor.32

Elizabethan bishops nonetheless appeared to view clerical marriage as a sign of Protestant reform. The Elizabethan diocese of Lincoln to kept count at successive visitations of the numbers of clergy with University degrees, of those licensed to preach and of those demonstrating competence in Latin; rising numbers were seen as an
indication of Protestant success. Another indicator of success was sought in statistics on
the growing numbers of married clergy. By the end of the Elizabethan era, those
numbers were above seventy-five percent. Occasional parish slanders against clerical
marriage continued to occur well into the seventeenth-century, as did debates regarding
its theological and Scriptural validity. But like Protestantism itself, the practice of
clerical marriage was widely and lastingly established in England by the end of the
sixteenth century.

Chronology, Methodology and Evidence

This study addresses evidence and events occurring roughly between 1590 and
1714. As indicated by episcopal statistics, 1590 inaugurates the period when marriage
had become a common practice among the English clergy.\textsuperscript{33} Meanwhile, 1714, the end
of the Stuart era, marks the moment when policies regarding clerical income and
religious toleration solidified the social position of the Anglican clergy and established
the Dissenting ministry as a distinct professional group.\textsuperscript{34} This periodization will strike
English church historians as unusual. It covers three periods that are normally treated
separately in the history of the English church: the early Stuart era, the Civil Wars and
interregnum, and the late Stuart era. However, the fracturing of seventeenth-century
church history stems from a focus on intra-Protestant conflict: between early Stuart
puritans and ceremonialists, between Civil War Royalists, Presbyterians, Independents
and sectarians, and between Late Stuart Anglicans and non-conformists. This focus on
liturgical and ecclesiological differences between early Stuart, Interregnum and late
Stuart clergy has often quite glaringly blinded historians to the commonalities and
continuities within the seventeenth-century English clergy, across factions and across time.

Previous work has already demonstrated different groups of seventeenth-century English Protestants generally shared the same attitudes towards gender, marriage and family government.35 This dissertation concentrates on those specific elements, examining them in the spiritually-intensified context of clerical households. When different liturgical or political affiliations appears to have had some impact on the style of clerical family life or the experience of clerical families, those differences are noted. However, the evidence analyzed in this project overwhelmingly indicates that, for the specific questions about gender, family and vocation posed in this dissertation, the commonalities between clerical families are far more significant than the differences.

The chapters below draw on three distinct bodies of evidence about clerical family identity and clerical family practices: records of ecclesiastical administration and discipline; printed sermons and pastoral manuals; personal and family papers and life-writings. The largest share of institutional sources comes from the northern dioceses of York, Lincoln, and Chester. However, records from every region in England are consulted and cited.

Each type of record offers specific forms of insight; each type of record also poses specific evidentiary problems. Disciplinary records are particularly useful in exposing the dynamics of local and domestic relations, and in illustrating the forms of resistance and agency available to people in subordinate positions such as women, servants and children. This is because disciplinary records generally document incidents of local conflict. In a cooperative and highly hierarchical society like early modern England,
these moments of conflict typically arose when the expected rules of conduct are violated. And those violations could provoke people with less power, like women, to justifiable acts of resistance. Printed sermons and pastoral manuals functioned for the clergy as a meta-discourse about their vocation. They provide public articulations of the primary tropes of clerical identity, the debated standards of pastoral practice and the clergy's most common vocational grievances. Meanwhile, personal and family papers and life-writings offer unique glimpses of clerical family routines, domestic relations, and the emotional and mental worlds of clerical family members.

These different forms of evidence are each limited by the conditions of its production. Those conditions include not only the material and performative circumstances under which a sermon is preached and then reconstructed in writing, or a church court deposition is given and then transcribed. They also include the literary and narrative conventions which shape every kind of document, from visitation returns to courtship letters. Thus, church court testimony could be determined in part by the questions posed, the narrative models rehearsed or internalized by the deponent and the interpolations of the scribe. They could also be determined by unknowable influences such as bribes and local loyalties. Likewise, early modern printed sources were profoundly cannibalistic and genre bound. Printed sermons might bear a very limited relationship to the sermon that was actually preached. Both sermons and manuals followed specific conventions, and borrowed liberally and often literally from their predecessors, without attribution. Finally, diaries, letters and memoirs also followed conventions which shaped how events were reported and thoughts and emotions were described. All were driven by agendas of self-presentation. Furthermore, the events
recounted in memoirs were especially subject to the filtering of memory. Thus, while these sources provide invaluable material, they must be read critically and with caution. This caution is compounded by the fact that frequently, the evidence of the experience of clerical wives and children is only available through the mediated form of records authored by men.

The four dissertation chapters focus upon different types of interaction between vocational and household honor and identity. In the Chapter One, I look at the collaborative family maintenance of clerical dignity and clerical household honor. In Chapter Two, I analyze the intimate and domestic reproduction of clerical identity through devotional courtship and marital and family piety. Chapter Three addresses ministers' extension of their domestic role of household patriarch into the parish, through the concept of 'spiritual fatherhood'. Finally, Chapter Four demonstrates how ministers' families became both active participants and unwitting targets in their husbands' and fathers' parish battles and political controversies.

Throughout these four chapters, I seek answers to the questions posed by the successes and scandals of seventeenth-century English clerical families, such as the calamitous infidelity of Dorothy Stafford, the wife of the rector of Bothall. For instance, by better understanding the impact of clerical household honor on clerical dignity and clerical authority, we can start to comprehend how Mistress Stafford's home-wrecking metastasized into parish-wrecking. By exploring the domestic rituals and styles of intimate relationship that clerical families depended on to cultivate spiritual discipline, emotional stability and a sense of personal holiness, we can begin to see how the breakdown in spousal relations and the collapse of spiritual order and morale in the
Stafford household deprived Christopher Stafford of the psychological supports needed to maintain his clerical persona. By investigating how clergymen attempted to assert patriarchal authority over parishioners of varying gender, age and rank, we can detect a hint of how the decision of a local gentleman to cuckold his rector might reflect problematic relations between local men of station and authority. Finally, by establishing just how fully parishioners, congregants and ecclesiastical authorities identified ministers' wives and children with the position and vocation of the minister, we can recognize why the parishioners, churchwardens and diocesan authorities of Bothall and Durham held Dorothy Stafford responsible, not just for violating her marriage vows, but for neglecting her higher duty as a clerical wife to promote moral and spiritual order in the parish. And in each case we will see how profoundly the profession of the seventeenth-century clergy was permeated by gender, shaped by sexuality and dependent on the collaboration of family.
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CHAPTER 1
THE TRIBE OF LEVI: MARRIAGE, CLERICAL DIGNITY AND THE PROBLEM OF
HOUSEHOLD HONOR

Introduction

In 1668, the clergyman William Mompesson braved the plague at Eyam, Derbyshire. In an incident that would win him aristocratic commendations and folk-hero status, he tended the dying and halted the spread of infection by persuading all parishioners to remain within the village. In 1697 William Mompesson was braving ecclesiastical censure in the consistory court of York. The now twice-widowed Mompesson—by then vicar of Eakring, Nottinghamshire—stood accused of impregnating a servant, Faith Shepard. The implications were devastating to the aging Mompesson's reputation and career. And the response of supporters was swift and insistent. Seven clergymen as well as eight laymen and women witnessed in Mompesson's defense. Testifying to his innocence, Mompesson's colleagues also aggressively asserted his vocational good fame. They attested to his model behavior in the pulpit, the parsonage house and the clerical community, laying emphasis on his godly household order and family prayers.¹

In the same year, John Pighells the Rector of Pattrington Yorkshire, was in the church courts contesting a different but no less dire allegation. His wife Elizabeth had petitioned for divorce on the grounds of excessive cruelty. Accused of brutal beatings
and attempted murder in the marriage-bed, Pighells marshaled eleven parishioners and
three maidservants to take his legal side against Elizabeth. Their counter-claims loyally
lauded Pattrington's "wellbeloved" parson for his harmonious ministry and his gentle
disposition as a husband. And they proclaimed Elizabeth an unpopular neighbor and a
scolding spouse. But their aspersions on Elizabeth's character did much more than
present a disobedient wife. Alleging her an adulteress, an active enemy of true religion
and a dabbler in poison and magic, they depicted Elizabeth as the ultimate anti-spouse of
a minister. According to John Pighells's parishioners, Elizabeth posed a domestic danger
not only to her husband, but to his function as a minister, to the souls of his parishioners
and to the honor and well-being of the church itself.²

These two late Stuart cases illustrate the interpersonal politics of maintaining
early modern clerical honor. The who's who of witnesses and participants in these two
consistory court-room dramas reveals what groups and individuals were invested and
actively involved in maintaining a minister's honor. Mompesson's vulnerability activated
networks of clerical support. John Pighells's parishioners flocked to his defense,
adamantly protective of the honor of their minister and the honor of their parish church.

Even more revealing are those endangering Mompesson and Pighells's good
fame. Here, a pregnant maidservant or a battered wife possessed power to disrupt a
minister's parish functions, undermine his pastoral authority and potentially ruin his
career. These cases vividly demonstrate the interdependence of vocational identity and
domestic honor for the seventeenth-century English clergy. They illustrate that
professional standards of clerical behavior included godly household government. They
suggest the resulting integration of clerical household members in the vocational identity,
honor and perhaps even practice of the clerical householder. And they tell us what ministers, ecclesiastical officials and parishioners saw at stake when clerical identity and clerical honor were threatened: the individual practice of a public vocation, the collective reputation of a profession, the social and spiritual harmony of a parish and the honor and promotion of the true Christian religion.

Clerical household government comprised part of the clergy's brief to teach by example, to embody their theology in their everyday conduct. This prescribed code of exemplary personal conduct contributed to the collective identity of the clergy. It functioned as a marker and carrier of clerical dignity, the clergy's distinctive form of vocational honor. Clerical dignity generated spiritual and professional authority by emphasizing vocational uniqueness. According to the Jacobean preacher Jerome Phillips, clerical dignity and conduct placed the minister "higher than all the people...[so that] there is none like him"; for the Caroline rector Jasper Fisher it rendered the clergy a group "set apart." Yet clerical distinction in conduct was also an essential method of Christian ministry, by providing parishioners with a virtuous model to emulate. Charged with teaching Christian behavior as well as Christian doctrine, clergy were instructed to "give...[a] good example in your life & conversation" for parishioners to imitate.

Set apart, set above, yet also setting an act to follow—as an ideal, clerical dignity called for a calibrated performance of the part of a Christian man: a performance exceptional enough to distinguish the minister as a religious specialist and authority, but a performance universal enough to encourage modest imitation. Specific to an exclusively male vocation, clerical dignity was also a fundamentally masculine form of honor and
identity. Historians of early modern honor have emphasized that personal honor was an essential carrier of gender identity. To a large degree it constituted a man or woman's public version of their masculinity or femininity. In this sense, clerical dignity was a dominant element of a highly articulated vocational masculinity, a model of manhood specific to the clerical profession. Yet the vocational masculinity of the Stuart clergy was as problematic as it was unique.

In a patriarchal society, masculinity by its nature is a gender identity structured around the reproduction and assertion of power and authority. But clerical manhood was partly rooted in the enduring paradox of Christian authority that rejected many basic cultural modes of expressing male potency. Set over their male parishioners as an authority and set among them as a model of conduct, the Stuart clergy was nevertheless canonically excluded from many of the common rituals and expressions of early modern English manhood.

The Edwardian and Elizabethan reformations had, however, included the clergy in one of the most essential and generic masculine roles in early modern English society: the authoritative role of the married householder. A cornerstone of Protestant pastoral ideology, the Elizabethan legalization of clerical marriage gave ministers and male parishioners a common ground of masculine experience. As godly husbands and householders, married clergymen could model a Christian manhood that served the purposes of pastoral care and professional prestige. Godly householding provided an accessible example to laymen. But it also enhanced the unique vocational honor and identity of the clergy. Through the new Protestant tropes of the husband-priest ministering his way through companionate marriage and the clerical patriarch
intellectually spawning clerical protégés in the household seminary while physically 
spawning clerical bloodlines in the parsonage bed, the English clergy remade early 
modern marriage in their own vocational image.12

In the process, they implicated household honor and family harmony in the larger 
collective fortunes of the clerical profession, the English church and the Christian 
religion. Through marriage ministers and laymen shared the ups and downs of 
fatherhood and heterosexual intimacy. But marriage also gave ministers and male 
parishioners the shared vulnerability to dishonor through the acts and reputations of 
wives like Elizabeth Pighells or servants like Faith Shepard. Like laymen, it made 
ministers dependent on women's cooperation in maintaining their manhood.13 As 
seventeenth-century visitation articles and returns make clear, good family government 
was an expected feature of clerical conduct, an aspect of their roles as christian 
exemplars. Meanwhile, poor family government was subject to episcopal discipline, 
deplored as a dishonor to both church and calling.14 Marriage made ministers dependent 
on women's cooperation in maintaining their *vocational* honor, vocational identity, and in 
a sense, vocational practice.

When expressing ideas of vocational camaraderie and collective identity, Stuart 
clergyman employed the familial rhetoric of the Israelite 'House of Levi', the priestly 
caste of the Hebrews. Describing themselves as a 'Tribe' of 'brothers' and 'sons', they 
deployed notions of intimate kinship and family honor to characterize claims to 
vocational distinction and the exclusive bonds of vocational solidarity.15 Yet this Old 
Testament rhetoric also evoked the image of the patriarchal household, and the people it 
implied— children, servants and wives. This familial rhetoric could and often did blur
the discursive line between the metaphorical 'house' of the clerical profession and the literal households of English clergymen. Through this rhetoric wives of ministers became 'wives of Levi', "daughters of Aaron" and women who married into "the House and Family of God" and into "the Sacred tribe." Clerical endogamy amplified this discourse, as women who were at once the daughters and wives of clergymen became vessels for a "Race of Ministers." This rhetorical move suggests both the problem posed by clerical marriage and the solution devised by the English state, the English church and English clergymen. The unique vocational position of the clergy as professional exemplars of Christian conduct meant that their marriages, their families and their wives were expressions and extensions of their ministry, domestic partners in their profession. For the English ministry, becoming a married clergy had meant much more than accepting women into their lives. It had meant accepting them into the 'Tribe'.

But by making that acceptance explicit, the church, the clergy and English society could attempt to set the terms of women's tribal membership. Imposing vocational standards of conduct and a version of the clergy's vocational identity upon wives and family members, the danger they posed to clerical honor could perhaps be minimized.

Below I will sketch the unique characteristics and constraints of early modern clerical dignity as a vocationally specialized masculinity, in order to suggest both the peril and unique opportunity marriage offered in constructing clerical manhood. Then I will examine how the interdependence of vocational and household honor within clerical marriage extended clerical vocational identity upon clerical family members, and especially clerical wives—subjecting them to unique scrutiny, expectations and mechanisms of discipline. Drawing on three distinct bodies of evidence, the
ecclesiastical records of clerical discipline, the clergy's vocational prescriptive literature, and on clerical personal records, I will show that marriage not only linked the clergy's vocational masculinity to the conduct of family members and wives, but gradually created an ancillary vocational identity for the wives and family of ministers. In order to maintain their vocational identity and authority, the clergy inducted their family into the "Tribe of Levi."

**Clerical Dignity and Clerical Masculinity**

Intended to maintain collective vocational honor and establish individual authority, clerical dignity depended for its recognition on an imposed and policed code of clerical dress and conduct. This code was designed to render Stuart ministers vocationally distinctive and morally exemplary figures. Through a range of prescriptive and disciplinary records in both the early and late Stuart periods—pastoral manuals and sermons *ad clerum*, episcopal correspondence, visitation articles and parishioners' presentments—this code remained explicit and relatively consistent. Their non-Sunday dress was to be grave, dark, untrendy and unadorned. When in public, a loose, long-sleeved "preists cloake" should be decorously draped over chest and legs. As professional peacemakers, they were to display a meek attitude and gentle mien. They were at all times to "advance love, peace and quietness" to their parish. They were to confine their recreations to scholarly, charitable and peaceable pursuits. They were to spend free time in study, prayer and pastoral visiting. If a minister needed more fresh air and exercise than his pastoral rounds provided, the Late Stuart bishop Gilbert Burnet recommended a bit of gardening.
These prescriptions governing clerical dress and conduct also came with a parallel set of proscriptions. In general, clergy were to refrain from non-Christian behavior, the type of conduct "punishable by the ecclesiastical censures." But there were also cautions against quite specific behaviors. And the fashion, recreations, attitudes and activities declared off-limits to the Stuart clergy went well beyond the minimal morality required by consistory courts. These included: wearing a sword or dagger, going "in publique...in dublet and hose," being seen drinking at an alehouse, the economic activities of "buying, selling and trading," and the recreations of sporting, hunting or dancing. While some of these activities might offend more scrupulous Christians, in fact none of these were legally actionable Christian crimes.

They were, however, markers of rank and masculinity. Cloak-length could convey gravity and non-laboring status. But doublet and hose alone also emphasized the male physique; in courtly dress it could be a potently sexualized style. Colors, cuffs, sumptuous materials might seem foppish to the disdainful godly, but they were also markers of a man's wealth and power. Sporting and dancing provided young men of all ranks with opportunities to compete with other men and solicit feminine attention. Weapons, dueling and hunting were the expressions and accoutrements of masculine violence, a fundamental aspect of gentry and aristocratic manhood. Meanwhile, economic activity, the accumulation and display of prosperity and resources, were routes to masculine competence and status for commoners in farming and the trades.

Almost all proscriptions on clerical dress and everyday clerical conduct had gendered implications. As a peaceable non-participant in military and economic life, the early modern habitus of the English Protestant minister had changed relatively little from
the persona of the medieval English priest. As the historians Patricia Cullum and R.N. Swanson have observed in their work on masculinity and the late medieval English priesthood, these highly gendered markers in dress and conduct functioned to set the clergy apart as a distinctive profession and as a different model of manhood.27 This separateness in both professional status and masculine identity continued to be insisted upon by the seventeenth-century church and by seventeenth-century English parishioners.

Their insistence revealed the lack of separation between common notions of clerical dignity and cultural proscriptions on clerical participation in common expressions of manhood through aggression, wealth or competitive displays of potency. In his 1638 Norwich visitation, the fastidious Laudian bishop Richard Montagu betrayed the blurred line between clerical misconduct and clerically proscribed forms of masculinity. He characterized such clerically forbidden fashions as "silk, sateen, velvet…[and]horsemens coats & riding jacquets" as "indecent apparel…fitting a swaggerer [more] than a priest."28

Seventeenth-century parishioners in Lincoln and Ely similarly maintained the incompatibility of clerical functions with displays of non-clerical manhood. In 1638 disgruntled Lincolnshire parishioners contended in 1638 that their vicar, Richard Coxall, conducted the perambulation "booted & spurred & carringe a cudgill in his hand."29 Parishioners in Folkingham complained that their rector, John Hoskins, "hast preached…with a sword by his side & a dagger at his back…in ministry scandalu[sic] [to the scandal of the ministry]."30 Meanwhile, parishioners in Jacobean Whittlesford, Cambridgeshire had no worries about their curate's violent tendencies, but took offense at Anthony Keane's overzealous farming and economic activities, "[it] being a disgrace to the ministry."31
The historian Joan Scott and the sociologist Robert Connell have both suggested that gender operates as a cultural, social and political matrix for producing and structuring relations of power and authority in a society. Here, male gender identities function to represent, project and reproduce patriarchal sources of power and order. The English church and English society persistently promoted and demanded a non-violent, non-economic code of clerical conduct. Both church and parishioners saw this code as essential to maintaining clerical dignity and authority. The recognition and uncontested possession of clerical dignity was crucial to a minister's ability to preside as the spiritual leader of his parish. Yet it seemingly rested on an identity devoid of many obvious markers of early modern manhood and male power.

When ministers attempted to exercise their moral authority over gentry or significant yeomen, this could and sometimes did lead to dangerous clashes between a seemingly impotent spiritual authority and an effectively threatening physical power. When reprimanded in 1672 for his non-conformity, the Flintham Yorkshire gentleman Richard Harker "tooke hold of…[the] Coller" of his vicar Edward Guy, "violently pulled him to the ground…tooke him by the haire of his head and bunched and smote him with his foote." Communion was an especial flashpoint for violence upon clergy. The minister's contested prerogative to decide a parishioner's moral fitness to communicate brought spiritual and worldly manhood into collision. In 1638, the vicar of Haselingfield was physically struck at the communion table, when he turned away a male parishioner. Refused communion on the grounds of immorality in 1678, a Kirton Lincolnshire gentleman supposedly threatened to stab his vicar, John Rastrick. On the pretense of discussing repentance, he then allegedly lured Rastrick to an unoccupied room at the
local inn, "elapt the Door behind…[them] and said, in a dreadful Rage, We'll die together in this Room."^36

In these incidents the vicar was typically described as passively turning the other clerical cheek, often necessitating immediate rescue by horrified onlooking parishioners. These incidents are easily classified as anticlericalism. However, these conflicts also reveal the friction between different kinds of early modern male authority, and illustrate that laymen and clergymen had resort to very different means for contesting and asserting such male authority.

For clergymen, displays of manhood took spiritualized forms. Religious oratory was one of the most obvious opportunities for a clergyman to prove himself as a minister and a man. As scholars such as Lisa Jardine and Anthony Grafton have suggested, Renaissance humanism had reinvented eloquence as a mode of male prowess. And as Jane Kamensky has shown in her essay on Cotton Mather, Protestant preaching was masculine eloquence for evangelical ends. Like humanist oratory, it converted rhetorical performance into male potency and identity. The moral and physical courage of enduring Christian persecution was of course another. Between violent parishioners and vicious church politics, seventeenth-century pastors of all political stripes had ample opportunity to prove their ministerial manhood by stoically standing their spiritual ground in the face of injury, ejection or even imprisonment. Finally, there was also the scholarly athleticism of ascetic piety and study. Samuel Clarke's late Stuart catalogs of godly clerical heroes compiled details of clerical ascetic and scholarly regimes. Rigorous schedules of fasting and routines of that substituted study and prayer for sleep were held up to the reader as signs of a minister's self-mastery and strength.
Preaching, Christian fortitude in the face of persecution and the ascetic rigors of high-impact piety and scholarship were all markers of a manhood to which the clergy had a special and traditional claim. Preaching was one of the exclusive arts of their trade, jealously defended against the sectarian laity. Confessional courage, however, could be shown by any Christian. Ascetic piety and religious learning were pursuits available to the laity as well. But for ordinary laymen with access to conventional expressions of manhood, fasting or Scripture reading were markers of religiosity, not masculinity. It was the clergy's vocational identity as religious experts that transmuted these acts of piety into potential displays of prowess.

**Clerical Marriage, Clerical Householding and Vocational Manhood**

Marriage also provided seventeenth-century English clergymen with a means to manhood. And arguably, through marriage they accessed the most essential of all Stuart masculinities. As a married male householder, a seventeenth-century clergyman engaged perhaps the most general and fundamental aspects of early modern English manhood: sexuality, fatherhood, intimate emotional attachment and an equally intimate exercise of dominance over his dependents. This was a masculine role that no one group of men in seventeenth-century England could monopolize. When it came to the manly art of householding, the clergy had no claim to expertise. In the Elizabethan period, the first generations of married ministers were, in fact, conspicuous novices.42

In her essay on the Jacobean minister and domestic author William Whately, Jacqueline Eales has pointed to the unique pressures of visibility and exemplarity placed on early Stuart clerical marriages. She has argued that the authoritarian elements of
many early Stuart domestic sermons should be viewed as a reflection of the concerns and dilemmas unique to clerical marriage, and not as a reflection of common early modern marital experience. Among these concerns Eales lists the need for the clerical couple to appear beyond moral reproach and the continuing debates with English and continental Catholics regarding the doctrinal status of clerical marriage.

Excluded from most conventional expressions of early modern manhood, marriage and householding gave ministers common masculine ground with laymen. This was both an advantage and a disadvantage. Through the positions of husband and household head, it gave clergymen access to an explicit, shared and highly-charged marker of conventional male dominance. However, only competent householding conferred that marker of successful manhood. As Elizabeth Foyster has explored, the failure to maintain control over one's wife, children and dependents conferred the reverse: household dishonor and failed manhood.

Here the clergy courted extra danger on multiple fronts. As Eales has noted, their professional role as paragons of Christian living meant that their households had to be models of both patriarchal order and Christian piety. Viewing the domestic honor of individual clergymen as intrinsic to the honor of the church, early Stuart visitations usually included a brief query into a minister's government of dependents. They typically questioned whether "the parson, vicar or curate keep any man or woman in there houses, that are suspected to be eyether of evill religion or of bad life?" In this case, the church was merely demanding the minimum requirements of good household government. All Stuart householders, regardless of vocation, were expected to police the sexual and social activities of their dependents.
This extended to the conduct of servants, who often proved in personal accounts and parishioner complaints to be particularly resistant to clerical standards of household discipline. In 1644, Fowlmere, Cambridgeshire parishioners reported to Manchester's agents that their minister John Morden "doth not well governing his family in regard he hath three maid servants gone away from his house with child." After fruitless sessions of counseling, exhortation and prayer, the restoration nonconformist minister Phillip Henry parted ways with his young servant David Phillips "drunk…at Malpas Fayr & guilty of swearing, lord forgive." According to William Mompesson's supporters, Mompesson allegedly acted as a perfect clerical householder when learning of his maidservant's pregnancy. He interrogated Faith Shepard until she gave him the partial identity of the supposed father, exhorted her to seek god's forgiveness, and then turned her out as she appropriately "fell downe upon her knees and begged…pardon for being guilty of soe great a sin in his house."

Stopping scandalous behavior in household subordinates, ideally before it started, was certainly the primary requirement of the clerical householder. But it merely held ministers to the average standards of household government, applicable to any layman. As the seventeenth-century progressed, however, the clerical householder often found himself held to above-average standards of family piety and godly family conduct. For the most part, family piety was prescriptively enjoined pastoral manuals, sermons and ecclesiastical biography, rather than proscriptively enforced by episcopal inquiry. However, more stringent standards of clerical family life occasionally appeared in visitation articles, such as the Derby Archdeacon William Higgins's (1641) expectation that his clergy "make their families patterns to the people of God" or the restoration
bishop Edward Reynolds's query into whether "Doth he [your Minister] so frame his own Life, and the Lives of such as are of his Family, that he and they may be examples to the Flock of Christ?" And an evident or reputed lack of family piety could be turned against a minister. When petitioning for his ejection in 1643, John Baker's Bartlow, Cambridgeshire parishioners cited testimony from a former boarder that "to her knowledge...he never used to pray in his family."52

Alternately, family piety and spiritual exhortation of dependents could be harnessed as evidence of spotless clerical family government. In William Mompesson's case, colleagues attested that they had "beene att prayers with him in his family."53 Mompesson's housekeeper testified that Mompesson scrupulously kept "the family in good order, constantly admonishing all of them against prophaneness, drunkenness, lewdness [and] whoredom."54

And among certain social circles of the seventeenth-century clergy, domestic piety had in fact become a point of professional pride, one of the standards of clerical accomplishment. The phenomenon of the 'household seminary', in which divinity graduates boarded and trained with a seasoned parish minister before taking orders, reflected the significance domestic piety possessed for certain sectors of the Stuart clergy, as a marker of clerical identity and a central aspect of clerical practice.55 Would-be ministers were drawn to clerical households famed for their domestic worship and spiritual ambience. For instance, the minister Richard Blackerby's family regime of constant prayer and Scriptural exposition attracted graduates such as Samuel Fairclough and Christopher Burrell.56 In these domestic seminaries, young ministers acquired more than pastoral skills or spiritual mentoring. They also watched and learned how to head
clerical households, how to bend family needs around the demands of preaching and pastoral care, how to impose an intensively religious family order upon dependents, and how to preserve household and professional honor. In this sense, the households of clerical mentors functioned as sites for the cultural reproduction of clerical manhood.

This training could prove profoundly helpful. The dual requirements of clerical householding—exemplary government and exemplary godliness—meant that ministers had more to expect and more to enforce in family conduct. Yet their somewhat non-standard masculinity foreclosed access to certain masculine tools for enforcement. Their scriptural and social role as peacemakers strongly proscribed displays of aggression, physical or verbal. The same role made household harmony a point of vocational honor. When John Rastrick's "domestick branglings" with his first wife became widely known in his Lincolnshire parish, he described himself as shamed and undermined in his ministry. Yet to resort to marked verbal aggression or physical violence was a far greater catastrophe to clerical honor. Edward Johnson's "cursing and banning" of his wife and the occasional beatings he reportedly administered appalled his Milton, Cambridgeshire parishioners. The consensus that a minister was not to go about his parish bearing a cudgel or a sword had a household corollary: he was not approach his wife with a thumb-sized stick. Pattrington parishioners taking Elizabeth Pighell's side in her petition for divorce claimed that her husband John's abuse made his spiritual leadership laughable. Meanwhile, Pattrington parishioners attempting to cast
John as the victim, rather than victimizer, of a shrewish and violent wife, depicted him as "meekly" enduring wifely insults and blows. A scolded minister was still more palatable than parsonage-house tyrant.

Jacqueline Eales is correct that the authoritarian precepts of wifely obedience found in Stuart marriage sermons should be read as a response to the stringent demands of clerical householding. But they should also be read with attention to the challenges posed by household dominance to a vocational manhood lacking in conventional masculine coercive powers. As the early Stuart preacher Thomas Taylor warned a newlywed colleague: "You have…taken upon you authority and headship and with that a double-care…your authoritie…will not be kept by force…or violence: but [only] by religious example."

These sermons also need to be examined as an attempt to culturally position clerical manhood on the common masculine field of marriage and householding. Styling the household as a church and husbands as priests, domestic sermons and manuals spiritualized both marriage and householding. They fashioned a version of domestic manhood that validated and valorized the skills and householding style of ministers. Dominating without dominance, eliciting household obedience by sheer spiritual authority and persuasive ability, Stuart domestic sermons depicted the clerical style of householding as a superior domestic masculinity. From Elizabethan amateurs at the common masculine role of husband and householder, seventeenth-century clergymen homiletically postured as Stuart experts. Such a rhetorical move provided a counter to the vulnerability of clerical dignity to household dishonor. It turned successful clerical
households into testaments to collective clerical manhood, domestic proof of the potency of the 'Tribe'.

'The Daughters of Levi': Imposing Standards of Clerical Conduct on Ministers' Wives and Children

Finally, Stuart marriage sermons and Christian household manuals can also be viewed one discursive thread in the cultural process of integrating women and dependents into the identity of the so-called English 'House of Levi'. Jacqueline Eales and Eric Carlson have each called attention to the role of Elizabethan and early Stuart clerical wives in upholding or undermining the vocational honor of their husbands and of the profession as a whole. Eales has also suggested that clerical wives were uniquely pressured and constrained by this responsibility. She argues that while clerical wives were held accountable for their husband's vocational reputation, they had no opportunity to obtain personal status or satisfaction from contributing to their husband's actual vocation.

Unlike the wives of tradesmen, clerical wives indeed could not inherit their husband's trade. Women could not attend university, receive ordination or conduct official worship. However, the clergy's role as behavioral exemplars made wives vocational partners in both official worship and in informal arenas of pastoral care. Disciplinary processes and prescriptive discourse all attest to the fact that the early modern English church, English state and English laymen and women perceived clerical wives as participants in the ongoing and dynamic process of orchestrating clerical manhood and pastoral practice. The processes of institutional regulation and cultural
prescription set in motion to cope with the implications of that participation had the result of conferring a subordinate and feminized version of clerical identity upon ministers' wives. This second-class induction of wives into the 'Tribe' was highly strategic. It educated cooperation in the joint enterprise of upholding clerical honor and enabling pastoral practice, by encouraging clerical wives to identify themselves with the fortunes of the clerical profession and with the Christian mission of the English church.

Elizabeth Tudor's reputed aversion to clerical marriage ironically initiated this process of identification. Responding in 1561 to the inappropriate and sometimes scandalous spousal choice of some early Elizabethan clergymen, the crown issued an injunction requiring all clerical wives to be approved and licensed by their future husband's bishop. The license required that at least two local Justices of the Peace conduct an inquiry into the reputation and character of the would-be clerical bride, and submit a letter testimonial confirming her moral fitness.  

The one surviving set of these letters testimonial covers forty licenses issued in the diocese of Lincoln from 1593 to 1611. Both the form and content of these letters charts the developing cultural identity of 'the minister's wife'. The earliest letters simply address the central concern of the injunction, to certify that the clerical bride was "an honest maide…of good fame and name" and would cause no foreseeable scandal. However, later letters were often lengthier and many articulated a notion that the uniqueness of the minister's vocation required a uniquely virtuous and pious spouse. Letters after 1600 repeatedly refer to the woman's qualifications to be the wife of a clergyman "Brought up in the fear of god in her father's house," Ann Pelsant possessed all traits "iudge[d] requisite for one that shalbe wife to a man of this holy function and
profession. Likewise, Elizabeth Ince was "qualified with those good ptes that the lawes of god & of man do require a ministers wife to be indowed withal."

Later letters also increasingly add qualifications of religious soundness, godly conversation and perceptible piety to the simpler requirement of chaste reputation. Finally, some began to theorize the role that a minister's wife might play in her husband's profession. Certifying the fitness of Elizabeth Fitzjohn to marry Robert Kydd the parson of Branfield, Justices William Fanshawe and Henry Butler opined that Kydd's ministry would greatly benefit from Elizabeth's presence: "his wifes godly livinge…may encourage his p[ar]ishioners…to follow that doctrine which he out of gods worde doth preche."

This licensing procedure appears to have gradually lapsed during the reign of James I. However, as it lapsed, ministers' wives began appearing in print, through funeral and marriage sermons. Thomas Taylor's sermon on clerical marriage, preached at the wedding of a colleague, appeared in print in 1625. The first printed funeral sermons for clerical wives appeared in 1626 and 1638, commemorating the lives of Elizabeth Gouge and Joyce Featley, wives of the famed early Stuart preachers William Gouge and Daniel Featley. These marriage and funeral sermons conveyed the special status and calling that came with marriage to a minister. Taylor claimed that "the wives of Ministers are set in the foremost ranke of Christ." They also identified the minister's wife not simply with her husband, but with his profession. Elizabeth Gouge's charity, religiosity and good housekeeping not only became her as a Christian woman, but "did much grace her Husbands Vocation."
As the funeral sermon and devotional lives market expanded during the interregnum and later Stuart period, increasing numbers of clerical wives were described and commemorated in print. These later biographies reinforced the association of clerical wives with the clerical profession, and were often more detailed in depicting the ideal role and character of the clerical wife. Luce Perrot, wife of the restoration London minister Robert Perrot, so identified with Robert's profession that she proclaimed "Gods ministers…so dear are they to me…I could…fall…and kiss their feet." On her deathbed, Perrot also reportedly prayed "Lord keep thy Ministers, hold them fast in thy hand, and tread their enemies down."74

Interregnum and restoration clerical wives Dorothy Shaw, Margaret Corbet, Katharine Clarke and Elizabeth Walker were described as model clerical wives in a fashion that began to approach formulaic. They indefatigably encouraged and incited their husbands to excel in their ministries. They displayed a simultaneous mastery of frugal housekeeping and a cheerful shouldering of Christian sacrifice that enabled them to cope with the personal and financial privations that came specifically with the clerical lifestyle. They displayed an indifference to fashion that matched their husbands' sartorial gravitas and followed Tertullian's dictum against feminine adornment. They assumed a coexistensive responsibility for their husbands' parish or hospital charges, becoming exemplars of feminine behavior and prominent sources of peacemaking and social care. Privately, they possessed a sufficient intellectual and religious aptitude to provide their husbands with spiritual companionship and to lead household worship in their husband's absence.75
This model converted a potential source of household and professional dishonor into a source of vocational capital. Late Stuart ministers such as the Essex rector Anthony Walker and the Yorkshire dissenter Oliver Heywood perceived the practical benefits, referring to their wives as fellow servants in Christ. Yet the origins of this model still lay in the threat of "offense…and slander" to the ministry. The original Elizabethan injunction and its gradually expanded interpretation remained embedded in these articulated expectations and in the acts and practices enforcing them. It was most visible in cases such as the 1702 adultery prosecution of Dorothy Stafford, wife of the Rector of Bothall, Northumberland. Mrs. Stafford was cited for violating not only the general stricture against fornication and infidelity, but also the Ecclitical Constitutions or Injunctions…still in force, [requiring] Every Clergyman's wife…to be grave in her carryage, sober in her Life…religious in her conversation &…an example to other women to live well & Christianly.\(^76\)

The libel against Mrs. Stafford referred to the 1559 Injunctions, but its language and expectations exceeded them. The progressive identification of clerical wives with clerical honor and conduct may have heightened the clergy's vulnerability to spousal shaming. By the Restoration, a clerical wife's tribal affiliation could continue into widowhood; when a colleague's relict made a questionable second marriage, Phillip Henry feared it would "reflect upon her first husb[and]" and the honor of his ministry.\(^77\) With greater pressures to "much grace [their] Husbands Vocation" came a proportional power to disgrace the same.\(^78\)

This identification of ministers' wives with their husband's vocation also emerged in practices of parishioners. It was evident in those who turned to minister's wives as pastoral figures. For female and poor parishioners especially, minister's wives appeared...
to function as more approachable figures of spiritual guidance and social support. John Cotton's female parishioners in Lincolnshire reportedly preferred to confide their spiritual concerns to his first wife, Elizabeth.79 Anne Greswold was allegedly doctor and social worker to her husband's restoration Warwickshire parishioners: "helpful to her sick neighbours…always covet[ing] to make peace among them…[and] for many of the Poorer [parishioners]…ready to advise and assist in any trouble that [they]…brought to her."80

Thus, when attempting to discredit the marital complaints of their pastor's wife in 1697, Pattrington Yorkshire parishioners took this established model of vocational matronhood and turned it upside down. Where Elizabeth Cotton provided spiritual counsel to parishioners, Elizabeth Pighells was accused of supplying spiritual subversion. Parishioners accused her of engaging in a concerted campaign to dissuade neighbors from attending Sunday services, deploying a donatist claim that her husband's immorality made his ministry spiritually ineffectual. Where Anne Greswold made peace between parishioners, Elizabeth Pighells was accused of sowing discord among neighbors. Where Elizabeth Walker and Katherine Clarke modeled exemplary piety in church and at home, Elizabeth Pighells refused to attend public worship, and dabbled with love-spells instead of doing closet-prayers. Finally, where wives like Dorothy Shawe and Luce Perrot assiduously supported their husband's pastoral missions, Elizabeth Pighells was accused of actively undermining John Pighells's authority and function. On weekdays she allegedly derided his homiletic skills to parishioners, on the Sabbath, she supposedly hid his surplice, forcing him to "perform holy service in his nightgown."81 According to the parishioners of Pattrington, Elizabeth Pighells was the ultimate minister's anti-wife.
Conclusion

The demands of moral exemplarity and pressures of parish visibility inevitably stamped a minister's marriage, his wife and his household life with the imprint of his vocational identity and function. Over the course of the seventeenth century a clerical wife was held by her husband, parishioners and other ministers to a increasingly specific and recognized model of personal, household and neighborly conduct, one designed to complement the requirements and characteristics of clerical manhood. This vocational womanhood was not radically different in its conception from general early modern ideals of matronhood and feminine piety. Its difference lay in its context and the subtleties of its execution--- in the fact that it was seen as an expression and extension of not just her husband's household honor but his public role and Christian mission; and in the way it was molded—in such areas as dress or neighborly peacemaking—to the contours of clerical dignity. The dilemma that household honor posed to the clergy's collective honor necessitated the creation of this 'tribal' femininity, to resolve the problem of wives functioning as extensions of their husbands' reputations. However, as Elizabeth Pighells illustrates, seventeenth-century wives were both extensions and autonomous actors. Endowing wives with 'Tribal' membership, the English 'House of Levi' conceded that clerical manhood was dependent on women's willing cooperation, as clerical marriage made the Protestant ministry a joint partnership. As Phillip Henry admonished his freshly-ordained son Matthew and his daughter-in-law Katherine in 1687: "Walk low, but aim high, spotless be your life/ [for] You are a Minister, and a Minister's Wife."82
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CHAPTER 2
'MY NECESSITYS WITHIN': CLERICAL COURTSHIP AND CLERICAL FAMILY HOLINESS

Introduction

In the early 1650's, Oliver Heywood, the young minister of the Chapel of Coley, Yorkshire, decided to find a wife, because "my necessitys within and without put me on seeking a suitable yokefellow." Setting the intangible spiritual and emotional fruits of marriage before its material and social benefits, Heywood's priorities are worth noting. Historians of early modern marriage and the family have largely been preoccupied with those necessities without of material subsistence and social standing. Scholarship on early modern English courtship has stressed the prominence of financial and material factors in decisions to wed. The historiography of the early modern family has demonstrated the degree to which couples consciously understood their marriage as a working partnership and their household as a unit of economic production. Social historians such as Ralph Houlbrooke, Alan MacFarlane, Rosemary O'Day and Linda Pollock have noted the ample evidence of attachment and affection between early modern spouses, parents and children. But these works, responding to Lawrence Stone's earlier portrait of early modern family relations as stunted and sociopathic, have mainly focused on proving that marital and parental love existed. Meanwhile, work on sex, passion and
conflict between husbands and wives by historians such as Laura Gowing, Elizabeth Foyster, Alexandra Shepard and Cynthia Herrup have mainly investigated the impact of marital and family relations on credit and reputation. Thus, although documenting such household "necessities within" as marital intimacy and family relationships, historians have mostly explored them as adjuncts or factors of necessities without, such as honor or the household economy.

The nature of the seventeenth-century clerical vocation, however, specially blurred the distinction between "necessities within and without" for ministers and their families. As a spiritual and scholarly calling, one large portion of a minister's job involved mental and emotional labors to beseech God, to discipline his own mind and soul and carriage. Another large portion involved producing, through worship, teaching and pastoral care, changes within the minds and spirits of others. And yet another significant share comprised peacemaking: resolving interpersonal conflict and repairing damaged relationships between his parishioners. In short, most pastoral work was mental, emotional, spiritual and interpersonal. When performed conscientiously, a minister's duties constantly engaged his "necessities within" and those of his congregation.

Courtship, marriage and family life had the potential to impair or enhance a minister's ability to perform this work. They represented the dangerous possibilities of sexuality, passion, emotional conflict, domestic disorder and the temptation of worldly activities and intimacy. All these could distract a minister from his mental labors and corrupt his efforts at spiritual discipline. On the other hand, they also presented the invaluable prospects of sated desire, intimate spiritual partnership, and a richer
experience of domestic piety. All these, as Oliver Heywood anticipated when he went seeking a bride, could significantly support and enrich a minister's mental and religious labors.

In this chapter I will examine how ministers and their families sought to mold the dynamics of courtship and household relations in order to meet their spiritual "necessitys within." I will look at how seventeenth-century expressions, rituals and interpersonal dynamics of sexuality, romantic affection and household relationships could present either spiritual obstacles or opportunities to clergymen and their families. In particular I will analyze how they affected two categories of clerical "necessitys within": personal holiness and family holiness. Personal holiness comprised a religious and professional habitus of cognitive and emotional discipline and an active regulation of conduct that pursued pious and ascetic activities and eschewed worldly behaviors. A minister's cultivation of personal holiness represented adherence to an externally imposed code of professional conduct. But it could also reflect the pursuit of an internalized professional value. Family holiness was the active application of pastoral goals and ideals to the lifestyle, government and relations of the household. In 1964 Christopher Hill coined the term "the spiritualized household" to describe the ethos and regimes of domestic piety popularized in Protestant prescriptive literature. Scholars of religion and gender in early modern England have since relied heavily on modified versions of Hill's concept to discuss the religiosity of women and families. As a tool of historical description and analysis, the spiritualized household is too limited and too historiographically calcified to be useful here. Family holiness included the devotional and educational routines of the spiritualized household. But it further encompassed a family's shared self-image as a
household consecrated to Christian striving and service, the interactive and fluid spiritual fashioning and negotiation of household relations and the experiences and perceptions of individual family members as participants in the ongoing project of family holiness. All of these elements worked synergistically with personal holiness, both enhancing and benefiting from it.

In a clerical household, family holiness was the means by which a clergymen assumed the role of pastor within their household, and imposed the role of parishioner upon family members. Through family holiness a minister sought to transfer his pastoral skills and his pastoral mission to the relationships of husband and wife, father and child and master and servant. At the same time, he expected his family to cooperatively respond to his ministrations. In sermons and memoirs, seventeenth-century ministers used a phrase from 1 Peter 3:7 to describe the practice and process of leading, teaching and ministering to their families: it was to "dwell as a man of knowledge." In his 1625 marriage sermon for a clerical colleague, Thomas Taylor used this phrase to compare the pursuit of personal and family holiness, as he narrated the shift in spiritual responsibility that came with heading a family. As a bachelor and minister, Taylor's friend practiced personal holiness alone, while in his parish he "taught others as a man of knowledge." As a husband and head of a family, Taylor's colleague now "must dwell as a man of knowledge." He had to combine personal spirituality and pastoral duty. He had to cultivate holiness not only in himself but in his collective family and in each family member as an individual.

This scriptural rhetoric depicted the family hierarchy of household holiness in rather dualistic terms. It ascribed agency and leadership to the minister and head of
household, passivity and dependence to other family members. In practice, family holiness involved a high degree of agency and interdependence up and down the household hierarchy. When examined closely, accounts of clerical family holiness show that family holiness was itself partly a function of the minister's own mental, spiritual and emotional dependence on his family. Despite its many solitary practices, personal holiness did not exist in an interpersonal vacuum. A minister's maintenance of personal holiness depended on his ability to draw spiritual support and religious reinforcement from his personal relationships, and his ability to exclude or filter irreligious contaminants—such as inappropriate feelings or conversation—from his interactions with others. In the close quarters and intimate attachments of household life, a minister could only keep up his personal holiness with family cooperation. The same intimacy and interdependence that made it vital to personal holiness also made family holiness far more interactive (and somewhat more egalitarian) than regular worship and pastoral care. As part of family holiness, clerical wives and children queried, counseled, (albeit very carefully) admonished, read and prayed to their family head. A minister's "necessitys within" meant that he did not simply "dwell as a man of knowledge." He also depended upon children and even servants of knowledge. Above all, he needed a woman of knowledge. For a minister's personal holiness, the specially disruptive potential of sexuality, romantic passion and conjugal conflict made a functioning religious and emotional relationship with his wife a must. A wife's family power and authority as household mistress also made her practical collaboration in family holiness utterly crucial.
In this chapter I bring together an examination of clerical family mentalités, relations and intimacy with an examination of devotional routines and domestic conditions. To do so, I examine a very different body of evidence than either the domestic conflict historiography, which has focused on court cases, or the spiritualized household historiography, which has relied a great deal on domestic prescriptive literature. In this chapter I use a cluster of diaries, personal memoirs, family letters and family papers. These texts offer evidence of family relations and devotions precisely because they were products of family relationships and devotional routines. Clergy and their families wrote these letters, diaries, memoirs and papers to confide feelings, to negotiate or reflect upon family relationships, and to organize and control family life. They wrote diaries and memoirs in particular as part of devotional programs, and used them as a means to discipline their feelings and behavior toward each other, and to seek God's guidance and help in family conduct and choices.

The papers I draw upon most heavily here come from six clerical families; this material is supplemented by several other clerical family journals, memoirs and papers. Three of the six families were headed by ministers of the Church of England: Isaac Archer (1641-1700), a curate and vicar to several successive Cambridgeshire and Suffolk parishes, Isaac Basire (1607-1676), a royalist chaplain, Durham rector and canon, and Anthony Walker (ca. 1630-1692), an Essex rector. Two families were headed by dissenting Presbyterians: Samuel Bury (1663-1730) a minister at Bristol, and Oliver Heywood (1630-1702) who preached in Yorkshire. The final family was headed by John Rastrick (1650-1722), who served a Church of England cure in Kirkton, Lincolnshire from 1673 to 1685, then ministered to Presbyterian congregations in Lincolnshire,
Yorkshire and Norfolk. Although these families no doubt had different experiences based on their ecclesiastical allegiances, they share enough domestically and devotionally to serve as an illustrative sample of clerical family experience. I draw on the supplementary sources to sketch a more rounded and general picture of different spiritual and affective aspects of clerical courtship and clerical family relationships. However, the very subjective and intimate nature of personal and family holiness makes it difficult to broadly generalize about its experiences and practices. Thus, in this chapter I use the six families above as cases, to explore the specific experiences and practices of specific clergymen and their families. These cases cannot tell us what every clergyman thought, felt or did in courtship, and later as a husband and father. Nor can show us the emotional dynamics and devotional practices of every clerical family. But they can show us how specific clergymen and clerical families negotiated the "necessitys" of personal and family holiness.

I will first examine clerical courtship. I will argue that the sexual desire, social rituals and power relations associated with courtship placed pressure on the personal holiness and pastoral identity of ministers. I will examine how ministers deployed devotional strategies to spiritualize courtship and to allay part of the powerlessness they experienced as suitors. I will then examine clerical marriage and family life. I will argue that ministers who strove for an ideal of family holiness required substantial and active cooperation from their wives and families. I will look at how ministers and families collaboratively used the devotional elements of family holiness to resolve conflict, impose discipline and strengthen their households' spiritual identities.
Clerical youth and 'desire of the flesh'

From its first printed English vindications in the early sixteenth-century, clerical marriage was touted as a remedy for "the blot or blemish of the priestes incontinency" that arose from men's "unauoydable appetite" for sex. Both sixteenth-century reformation polemicists and seventeenth-century churchmen and laity expressed concern for the public "slander unto the church," the "great scandall to the holy Function...[a]nd...[the] offense to good people" caused by the sexual incontinency of pastors. When they led to sexual acts outside the bonds of wedlock, ministers' physical desires had outward impact. The fornication of an unmarried minister or the adultery of a married one could damage his personal and professional reputation, the confidence and comfort of his congregation, the public image of the church and the standing of any political faction within the clergy to which he might have an allegiance.

Many—most likely most—unwed ministers in seventeenth-century England seem to have kept their sexual urges within the bounds of relative continency and propriety. But even unexpressed, erotic desire could still have an inward—and negative—impact on the unmarried minister himself. In her study, Manhood in Early Modern England, Elizabeth Foyster has suggested that men viewed courtship as a perilous process. In seeking the hand of a woman, Foyster argues, men exposed themselves to the danger of romantic passion, which could overthrow the rational self-mastery that was one essential element of adult male identity. Diaries and memoirs of clergymen and clerical wives suggest that young clerics did sometimes experience courtship as the cause of romantic distress or distraction. But other junior ministers resorted to courtship as a cure for pre-existing sexual and emotional passions. Whether courtship was the source or the
solution, premarital desire could threaten more than a young minister's sense of masculine self-control. It could also strike treacherously at his sense of spiritual focus and rectitude.

The Pauline dictum "better to marry than to burn"—with either physical or emotional passion—was typically a motivation of young deacons and ministers deciding to marry for the first time. For young ministers especially, "fleshly concerns" could pose a serious problem. Junior clergymen had to build both a clerical career and a clerical identity for themselves. Desire could be a practical distraction from their pastoral efforts. And it could be disruptive to the private piety and mental and emotional self-regulation that was often essential to maintaining a young minister's clerical self-image.

Desire's destructive potential drove some young ministers to initiate courtship as a remedy. Desire and passion even sometimes prompted them to "hastily" making a marriage, before they had considered the full implications or acquired the requisite financial security of a beneficed position.

Of the seventeen-century English narratives of clerical youth and courtship I have consulted, none convey the sexual pathos and marital urgency of the diary of the Harvard lecturer and New England minister Michael Wigglesworth. Wigglesworth chronicled with exceptional detail and torment the homoerotic attractions, nocturnal "dreams and self pollution," "lust," and "carnal concupiscence" that prompted his first marriage in 1655 in order "to maintain [the] purity which my heart loveth." But there are descriptions in the English accounts of clerical matches made in the haste and pressure of passion. And these descriptions often accompany reports of the spiritual and pastoral disruptions of love and sex that prompted the rush to wed. Theodosia Alleine recalled
that she and her husband-to-be Joseph—at the time a curate and boarder with the Taunton minister George Newton—were pressured by Joseph's mentor and employer to marry early "contrary to our purpose, we resolving to have lived much longer single." Newton apparently viewed his employee's romantic "restlessness" and impetuous twenty-five mile journeys to see his sweetheart as a distraction from the pastoral tasks at hand. Newton likewise saw relocating Theodosia to his Taunton parsonage house as the means to recover Alleine's ministerial focus.19

Alleine's romantic devotion was—at least in the eyes of his mentor—logistically as well as mentally disruptive to his development as a minister. For the Cambridge student and curate John Rastrick, sexual urges were primarily a subjective distraction. Preparing himself spiritually and intellectually to enter the ministry in the period 1668-1671, he found his thoughts and studies "disturbed and haunted with impious carnall Inclinations and cumbred with too strange desire of ye Flesh."20 "[W]hich (with other things concurring)," Rastrick recorded in his later memoir, "did precipitate me too soon & hastily into Marriage."21

Both Rastrick and Alleine were describing their respective courtships and marriages after the fact. In his Autobiography, the minister Henry Newcome similarly represented his decision to marry Elizabeth Manwareing in 1648 as "rash and inconsiderate."22 In each case the suggestion of premature wedlock could reflect the prejudice of an older narrator relating or regretting (or succumbing to the narrative convention of regretting) youthful acts. But the impatience and irrationality of romantic love was recorded in young ministers' contemporary, as well as retrospective, accounts of courtship. Despite his pretensions to purely spiritual affection, the twenty-eight year old
chaplain Isaac Basire frantically pleaded in a 1635 post-script to his paramour Frances Corbett to "write unto mee plainly of all occurrences touching the hope of your father's inclination" regarding their match. While passion made Basire desperate to wed, it made the twenty-three-year-old Ralph Josselin reluctant to pursue career opportunities. Although offered a more professionally attractive position in Norfolk in 1639, Josselin's recently developed "affection" for a local girl—his future wife Jane Constable—would not "suffer mee to stirr" from his curacy in Buckinghamshire.

Josselin assured himself that providence had decreed his attraction to Constable and would provide a beneficed position in due time. Given the distracting potential of long-distance pining, keeping close to Constable perhaps conserved his pastoral concentration, if not his prospects. Meanwhile, Basire dealt with his own passion by spiritualizing its expression on the one hand and pressing urgently for marriage on the other. Both young men repackaged their acts and expressions of desire in spiritual terms congruent with clerical identity, with the moderate feelings and high-minded motivations that clergymen were supposed to have. Providence allowed Josselin to rationalize a romantic choice as a religious one. The language of pastoral care allowed Basire to intermittently protest that his affection for Corbet was disinterested concern for her soul. However, styling sexual attraction as Christian agape did not always suffice to sublimate the distractions of desire and neutralize its negative impact. Urges that seemed too powerful or an irresistible but unsuitable object of affection could create an inner crisis for a young clergyman. In such cases, marriage to a relatively appropriate woman often seemed the only answer.
Freshly ordained and Cambridge-degreed in 1662, the twenty-one year old Isaac Archer's diary account of serving his first cures conveys with some immediacy the subjective pressure on a young minister to establish an inward sense of clerical identity, the conflicting subjective pressure of heterosexual attraction and the resolution and relief ultimately provided by marriage. Archer had been plagued "by lascivious, and vaine thoughts" at Cambridge. Worse still, as a student he "very often yielded to them, not considering that thoughts ought to be constrained...so that I was distracted in my studyes...and vexed with myself." In his first months in 1663 as the young Vicar of Chippenham, Cambridgeshire, however, Archer monitored his thoughts and emotions more closely "then when I was at the college...because [now] by my place I was to be an example to others."

Yet having left the all-male confines of his college, Archer's determination to inwardly master his mind, heart and other associated organs was tested by his new heterosocial environment. While boarding with his patron Sir John Russell at Chippenham Hall in 1665, the unmarried Archer developed a close relationship with a "handsome" young gentlewoman "of a light carriage and wantonly given" who was attending Lady Russell. Archer worried that their friendship "was not fitting for a minister." Yet Archer described himself as compulsively "drawne" to her company, torn between outright attraction and an urge to test his clerical manhood and Christian self-control. Archer exposed himself to her temptations and allurements...[having] a curiosity to...see what she drove at, because I could governe my selfe, by God's grace, in the secretest place, and the fittest opportunities that were offered by her."
Finally perceiving danger in this game of sexual and spiritual roulette, Archer took repeated and progressively drastic measures to "come of from my familiarity with her."28 He first attempted to limit their contact "by degrees," then with a "solemn vow to God" forswore her company for an entire month.29 His cold turkey covenant appeared effective. However, when the woman left Chippenham Hall a few months later, Archer nearly succumbed once more to his attraction: "such were her insinuations and subtleties that at the last farewell, I was almost overtaken."30

A month later Archer settled his affections on a more appropriate object, Anne Peachy, daughter of the Vicar of Isleham. Although Peachy was to prove a pious and respectable choice, Archer's early attachment to her was also marked by romantic urgency. He overrode his father's attempts to stop or stall the match, being "too far gone in affection."31 Archer married Peachy despite his father's concern that neither Archer's £28 per annum vicarage nor Peachy's portion could provide the couple with a sufficient financial start. His impulsive decision further strained his already difficult relationship with his non-conformist father. But it provided subjective relief from the sexual thoughts and urges that disrupted his spiritual focus, resisted his efforts at self-regulation and marred his vocational self-image. Three months after their wedding Archer was "without distraction" and noted that "[b]y marriage all my former youthfull desires were cured; and extravagant thoughts ceased. I found it a remedy."32

Sexual urgency and romantic passion were standard experiences of young adulthood in early modern England. Inflamed attachment and eager wooing did not, in themselves, set young ministers apart from other men their age. Whether the young man in question was clergy or lay, the sometimes pressing influence of sexual desire on
youthful choices to court and wed were perceived by contemporaries as part of the life-cycle, an inevitable but impermanent condition of early adulthood. John Rastrick implied that the sexual distractions of his late teens and early twenties were an artifact of late and post-adolescence. Isaac Archer explicitly attributed his erotic perturbations at university and Chippenham Hall to "my age and heat."  

The impact that youthful sexuality had on vocational identity and development, however, separated the experience of young clergymen from their lay peers. Romantic passion, as Elizabeth Foyster has argued, could destabilize any young man's sense of masculine self-control. But the self-mastery sought by young ministers was more extensive and more ascetic. And more than general manliness was at stake in its maintenance. The intensive mental labor that was part of clerical training and clerical work was especially vulnerable to disruption by sexual thoughts and attachments. Sexual desire and passion could radically impede the regulation of thoughts and emotions intrinsic to clerical spirituality. Heavily invested with centuries-old connotations of original sin and spiritual pollution, premarital desire could be particularly damaging to a young minister's confidence in his religious distinction and leadership. Yet these fragilities were also partly specific to this first stage of clergymen's vocational life-cycle. Limited experience made young ministers less capable of maintaining focus. Newness of office made them more insecure in their identity as men spiritually "set apart." Here, the problems and pressures of a minister's physical and vocational youth coalesced. Courtship and marriage were together the entryway to licit sexuality and the next stage of the masculine life-cycle. Thus, some young clerics seized them as an escape from the conflict between their youthful sexuality and their youthful ministry.
Personal holiness and devotional courtship

Courtship in early modern England was governed by customs and rituals that included the couple, their friends and kin. Some of these rituals were financial negotiations. Through the financial rituals of offers and counter-offers, economic suitability was established. The final transfers of cash and property unified the two parties as one family economy. Other courtship customs helped the couple meet socially and bond emotionally. Traditional matchmaking practices brought available individuals together and provided them with the counsel of family and friends. These included the recreational gatherings at alehouses and neighbors' homes where people might meet, the calculated introductions of prospective spouses made by interested relatives and friends, and the ensuing consultations with parents, guardians, relations and intimates as decisions were made. Meanwhile, the cultural rituals of courtship communicated attraction and fostered liking and love. The essential stuff of early modern romance, these included giving gifts or tokens--typically small luxuries such as "coins, "rings, ribbons, gloves, girdles and similar knick-knacks," exchanging letters and messages, and visiting.

Accounts of seventeenth-century clerical courtship show how cultural customs designed to connect couples socially and affectively were reshaped by ministers' vocational and spiritual requirements. Certain elements of ordinary courtship could conflict with the strictures of clerical conduct and ideals of clerical character. Resorting to worldly venues such as taverns or making flirtatious displays could violate public expectations of clerical sobriety. Perhaps most seriously, these pitfalls of conventional
courtship could damage a minister's reputation. But even less provocative and less public practices, such as gifting small delicacies and exchanging love letters, could compromise a minister's efforts to sustain a consistent standard of holiness in his personal life. Giving jewels and trinkets to a financee on Friday and preaching against the vanity of adornment on Sunday could—at least for the more scrupulous—induce fears of personal hypocrisy and declension.

Resetting courtship rituals within a devotional framework resolved many of these conflicts. Rendezvous were transferred to more appropriate venues, such as prayer meetings. Earthly trinkets were replaced by spiritually edifying items such as devotional pamphlets or dedicated sermons. The idiom of courtship and consultation was spiritualized. Suitors articulated their affection and interest in pastoral terms. God was solicited as a central matchmaker, his advice sought through prayer and providential signs. This preserved clerical dignity from any potential improprieties. On public and personal levels, it allowed clergymen to engage in rituals of heterosocial intimacy in ways that complemented personal piety and seriousness. And it furthered their pursuit of a marriage which would add a companionate dimension to their private religiosity, satisfying those "necessities within."

I would argue that it also allowed them to alleviate some of the anxieties of courtship, by altering the balance of power between the clerical suitor and his possible bride. Elizabeth Foyster has pointed to way in which courtship evoked the masculine fear of being overpowered by passion; the emotion of romantic love represented a potential, emasculating loss of self-control. However, as Nicole Eustace has observed in her work on courtship in colonial Pennsylvania, masculine loss of control was not only a
subjective but situational feature of courtship. The woman's prerogative in courtship to accept or reject a suitor temporarily reversed, albeit passively, the patriarchal power relationship between men and women.36 Assuming the superior (and patriarchal) role of spiritual advisor to one's potential bride did not change that power dynamic. But playing the pastor did inject another more conventional—not to mention professionally familiar—dynamic of gendered power into the relationship. For some ministers, this probably introduced some degree of comfort into the general insecurity of courtship. For those especially seeking a spouse for religious society, it established the future marital dynamic of religious authority as well.

Courting was a physically situated practice; by both custom and necessity much of it took place in specific social locations or at specific social events where sufficiently intensive socializing between the sexes could occur. Whether in public inns and taverns or in private households, the convivial activities associated with some customary venues for courtship—such as drinking, playing games or dancing—were demeaning to clerical dignity and a departure from a minister's godly lifestyle. Devotional courtship relocated meetings and visits to more appropriate sites and times, such as post-sermon socializing in the churchyard, prayer meetings in private homes or pastoral visits. With the congregation assembled before him, worship was one public and appropriate opportunity for ministers to notice local women, especially those who were "forward in religion."

As a curate, Ralph Josselin spotted his future wife his first Sunday on the job.37 Isaac Archer's second wife caught his eye as "a diligent hearer of mee," attending his sermons" in the hardest weather.38
Seventeenth-century religious sociability extended beyond public worship to a range of voluntary, informal gatherings. Although such events were vital to defining and sustaining early Stuart puritanism and late Stuart nonconformity, certainly prayer-book evangelicals also engaged in religious visiting. Invited by parishioners, patrons or fellow clergy, ministers attended and presided over such affairs, where group prayer was conducted, scripture and devotional works read aloud, sermons repeated and discussed. Eagerness to spend one's leisure time in voluntary religion was a promising sign of piety in a prospective clerical wife. The Lincolnshire vicar John Rastrick's relationship with his second wife, Mary Harrison, began when she attended the devotional reading sessions at his vicarage. Dorothy Heathcote, the lionized first wife of the Yorkshire minister John Shawe, not only frequented but organized such gatherings in her youth. As a girl in 1630's she attended a puritan devotional salon in a neighboring village; as a young woman managing her father's household after her mother's decease, she promptly turned the Heathcotes' Derbyshire manor into a "receptacle to the Saints."

Such social occasions supplied wife-hunting ministers with circles of "serious Christian" women and offered an intoxication- and frivolity-free forum for heterosocializing. Once having met a heavenly spinster or widow, a minister could pursue her personally by making pastoral house-calls. Calling to offer spiritual conference and consolation gave ministers respectable and low-risk pretexts to see the women they fancied. This could place an odd premium on women who were not only "serious" but also afflicted with spiritual uncertainty or melancholy. The Restoration minister Anthony Walker met his wife Elizabeth Sadler when she was suffering from an episode of religious distemper; his pastoral visits to her "as a consolatory Friend"
ultimately doubled as courting calls.\textsuperscript{42} The convention of the pastoral visit could turn worldly events into opportunities for spiritual socializing and thus devotional courtship. In the guise of giving spiritual counsel, a minister could partly withdraw to speak privately and (according to them) piously with a woman. John Rastrick met his first wife at a wedding, where he was solicited to "administer by Discourse and Advice any Comfort and Satisfaction" regarding her salvation.\textsuperscript{43}

For bookish men ill-at-ease with small-talk or gaiety, devotional gatherings and quasi-pastoral visits provided comfortable topics of conversation and placed ministers in a reassuring social role. Here, if a minister felt too awkward as a suitor, he could retreat into his pastoral persona. And if conversation grew too stilted, he could read aloud from an improving book. John Rastrick recorded at length his childhood and adult struggle with social discomfort; his "Melancholiz'd reserved temper" left him "straitened in my spirit unto…silence" around other people, unless he could discuss religion or "rea[d] to them from some serious book."\textsuperscript{44} "Tongue-tied on prosaic topics, devotional courtship was Rastrick's only viable option for charming a woman into marriage. Meanwhile, for ministers (such as the young Isaac Archer) discomfited by their own convivial tendencies, sticking to religious social events imposed reassuring controls on conduct and conversation, keeping courtship within the behavioral and emotional bounds of personal holiness.

Thus, when ministers spiritualized the locations of courtship, they often spiritualized the gestures, language and relational dynamic of courtship as well. Cleaving to a Christian aesthetic that ranked inner beauty over outward charms, ministers courting in a devotional mode articulated sexual attraction in terms of spiritual attraction. They
also conflated expressions of Christian agape and romantic love. Presenting their attraction and affection the guise of impersonal Christian love and concern—a presentation implied in Rastrick’s pastoral attentions to the spiritually ailing Jane Wilson and the "consolatory" visits paid by Anthony Walker to the religiously worried Elizabeth Sadler—effectively safeguarded ministers from any imprecations of unsuitable conduct. But it also alleviated the tension, for any serious Christian and especially a minister, inherent in the earthly investment of romantic love. Ministers like the chaplain Isaac Basire, writing to his intended in 1636, used the language of agape to moderate their earthly attachment. Basire urged his future wife Frances Corbett to join him in a "love be pure without passion…[a] true, cordiall and Christian love." A few lines later Basire protested to Corbett that he "desire[d] neither thee nor any thing in the world, but for the glory of…[our] Maker."45 Thoughout his pre-marital correspondence with Corbett, Basire's was repeatedly concerned to define their affection as selfless and spiritual; his preoccupation suggests an anxiety over the potential conflict between the disinterested love of a fellow Christian and the creaturely love of a wife.

This combined semiotic of earthly and heavenly attraction and affection similarly shaped the exchange of courtship gifts. The sending and accepting of courtship tokens such as ribbons, fruits, coins and often ultimately a ring, were repeated gestures that proceeded courtship through its phases. Courtship tokens progressively signified interest, affection and finally an agreement to wed.46 Food, poesies or little adornments, these gifts were often small pleasures for physical and aesthetic appetites, evoking the sensual nature of heterosexual affection. It is doubtful that even the most ascetic of ministers were above either the feeling or the expression of sensual affection towards their
prospective brides. But devotional courtship enabled ministers to temper the earthly implications of courtship tokens by adding religious commodities to the mix.

The chaplain Isaac Basire, as we will see in more detail below, sent his intended Frances Corbet devotional books. Though the books' bindings were prettified with gilt, Basire cautioned Corbett that it was the text, and not its sensual packaging, that should most count: "the insides are the thing I sent them [the books] to you for, more then the outsides." Courting his first wife Jane Wilson, John Rastrick presented her with a completely non-material token; he preached two visiting sermons written especially for her. Ministers received as well as gave spiritual tokens of affection. Elizabeth Angier deftly fused romantic attachment to heavenly aspiration when she gave her Oliver Heywood a kneeling cushion embroidered, in chivalric tradition, with her initials "EA." Heywood recorded after her death that the cushion still incited and inspired him with her memory each time he knelt on it at prayer. Traditional courtship trinkets—especially wedding rings—could also be fortified with added moral or religious meaning. Thomas Crashaw, early Stuart minister of the city of York, presented his bride with a ring inscribed "Faith, Truth and Constancie." Anthony Walker sealed his betrothal to Elizabeth Sadler in 1650 with a ring inscribed "Joined in one by Christ alone."

Stumbling upon that inscription on the first ring viewed at the goldsmith's shop, Walker wrote that he interpreted his find as an omen indicating God's blessing upon his marriage. As David Cressy has noted, early modern Englishmen and women viewed life decisions such as marriage through a providential lens. God was thus ultimate matchmaker and approving patriarch for every Christian betrothal. Ministers seeking a truly spiritual partnership consulted him exhaustively, through signs and solicitations.
After all, in marriage ideally centered around Christian service and piety, God would be a constantly present third party in their relationship; the earthly union of minister and wife was ideally to facilitate each spouse's heavenly union with Christ.

During his courtship, Walker searched for other phenomenon that might signify divine approval. Waiting in the Sadlers' parlour to discuss his intentions with Elizabeth Sadler's father, he engaged in Augustine-style bibliomancy, throwing open the Sadler family bible to a random verse. Turning up Proverbs 19:14, "House and Riches are inheritance of Fathers…a prudent Wife is from the Lord," reassured Walker that their marriage had both divine causation and sanction. Many ministers, Walker no doubt among them, also sought God's marital advice and blessing more directly. Isaac Basire beseeched Frances Corbett in 1636 to pray with him "for an holy submission to his gracious Providence, about the manner, meanes, time, place in a word, all the circumstances of our preferment." Both Oliver Heywood and John Rastrick record exhaustive day-long prayers and fasts in 1667 (Heywood) and 1685 (Rastrick), in order to consult with God before proposing to their respective second wives. Rastrick also engaged local clerical colleagues to pray with him on his decision. Heywood and Rastrick may have displayed special endurance in their premarital meditations (and special historical thoughtfulness in leaving an account of it). But it is impossible to conceive that they or Basire were exceptional in the act itself. For ministers invested in their vocation, prayer would have been a reflexive preparation for any serious motion of marriage.

Praying for divine permission to marry, ministers humbly submitted to the highest authority, the will of God. Courtship subjected ministers to more than God's will; their
hopes depended on the earthly cooperation of kin, guardians and the women they wanted
to wed. But with God, unlike skeptical fathers or enigmatic spinsters, ministers arguably
had a privileged relationship as ordained agents of the Gospel, special mediators of
Christ's teaching, special facilitators of the means of grace. Women, with a degree of
family approval, generally held the power to accept or reject the minister who courted
them. But by setting courtship practices in a devotional context, ministers could sidestep
their relative powerlessness and assume a position of authority in the relationship.

Devotional courtship shifted the focus of the relationship: from a man seeking a woman's
love (or at least agreement to marry) to two Christians mutually seeking salvation. And
in this heterosocial pursuit of grace, the clerical suitor was the superior in training, office
and authority.

In the rituals of devotional romance, clergymen stressed their identity—and thus
authority—as professional men of God. Oliver Heywood willingly acknowledged
Elizabeth Angier's power over him, entreating her "as I have given my Heart to You, You
ought to give me Yours, You cannot in Equity deny it me." But he also reminded her of
his special status and "grave calling, as I am a Minister…very urgent at the Throne of
Grace."58 For a minister marrying for spiritual companionship, devotional courtship
established desired patterns for the future marriage. It not only set in place practices of
heterosocial piety, but also the husband's position as the spiritual superior within the
relationship, the man of knowledge teaching his wife, as Paul instructed, at home.59 The
pastoral visits paid by suitors such as Anthony Walker, the pastoral letters written by
suitors such as Isaac Basire, the sermons preached by suitors such as John Rastrick, all
worked to effect this. Such performances asserted a suitor's status as a minister. It
displayed his mastery of his pastoral craft. And it established a ministering relationship (and thus patriarchal power dynamic) to his bride. This patriarchal power relation, however, was often subtle. After all, the goal of devotional courtship was to acquire a woman sufficiently gifted in intellect and grace to be a genuine partner in piety, a near equal in Christian striving. Clerical suitors such as Oliver Heywood tempered their clerical authority with the more egalitarian dynamic of general Christian fellowship (and in Heywood's case, with the humility and amiability of his own temperament), partly positioning themselves with their future wives as first among two intimate Christian equals.

On the other hand, this patriarchal power relation, however subtle, was also real. The courtship letters written by the twenty-eight year old chaplain Isaac Basire in 1635 and 1636 to the Shropshire gentlewoman Frances Corbett demonstrate in detail how a clerical suitor asserted his spiritual authority via the language and rituals of devotional courtship. Basire's letters conveyed the fear and sense of powerlessness of a man caught up in courtship. Basire's insecurity did not stem from the ambiguity of Corbett's affection; she had apparently assured him of her love. But her more exalted social status and Basire's lack of benefice and property made her parents' approval uncertain. Basire filtered the couple's shared uncertainty through a devotional language of disinterested love, submission to divine will and commitment to Christian service. He used this language in the letters to reassure both himself and Frances. However, he also used it as part of the couple's larger dynamic of devotional courtship. This dynamic included gifts, prayer and a defined position for Basire as Frances's spiritual counselor and teacher.
Basire's language defined their relationship as a "covenant" for mutual Christian improvement and service. Their affection he defined as "tempered…perfumed, and refined…with such religious respects, and spirituall considerations." Basire justified their marriage by its potential to further the work of Christ in him, Corbett and the Church. Consequently, he repeatedly evoked acceptance of God's providence if "it be not his will" and Corbett's parents nixed the match. Basire's courtship of Corbett combined devotional language with devotional rituals. Even while apart—Corbett in Shropshire and Basire traveling abroad with the Bishop of Coventry—the couple used prayer to cement their attachment; Basire referred more than once to praying specifically for her and held her to her promise to "[j]oyne with mee in…prayer" (while apart) on specific topics. Though separated, the shared activity presumably strengthened a sense of togetherness, with both each other and with God. Basire also sent her devotional books as courtship tokens: Bishop Francis de Sales's *Introduction to a Devout Life* (according to Basire, "free from popery" despite Sales's Catholicism) and Nicholas Byfield's *The Marrow of the Oracles of God*, both in expensive bindings; the de Sales title sexily bound by continental "devout virgins… who knows but the prayers they might bestowe at the binding." Basire urged Corbett not to read them once and then admire them on a shelf, but to pore over them repeatedly. This repetition would no doubt benefit Corbett's soul; it would also, like the prayer-cushion given to Oliver Heywood by Elizabeth Angier, ritualistically keep Corbett continually in mind of her suitor.

Basire's identity as a minister was, at least in his view, central to the couple's dynamic of romantic piety. He stressed that Corbett claimed to love him foremost as a minister. His religious language, rituals and gifts all reinforced his pastoral position and
authority within their relationship. By the devotional terms of their relationship, Basire assumed the role of Corbett's spiritual advisor. He peppered his letters with exhortations and instructions. In March 1635 he "charge[d her]… to abound in the acts of devotion and true repentance…[to maintain] frequency in prayer, reading, &c." Their ritual of long-distance prayer gave him further opportunities to direct her. In 1636 he nagged her not "to slacke or be behind hand with mee" in the prayers they agreed upon. He also pressed her to "strive in your prayers." He also assigned her reading. In March 1636 he recommended that she read the Psalm 37 to help resign herself to God's will regarding their marriage. His courtship gifts enabled him to further assume the role of religious teacher. He enclosed instructions on how often to read the texts and on what mental disposition to approach them with. The De Sales text, titillating with its convent binding and whiff of popish danger, most acutely positioned Basire as Corbett's manly religious protector and guide. He assured her that he had "read it aforehand for your soule's saecke." He furthered annotated it with a "crosse at the margent" marking the religious errors in the text that she should avoid reading.

Like all clerical brides, Corbett had power in courtship: to accept or reject her clerical suitor's hand, to refuse or consent to be schooled in spiritual discipline and in this pastoral dynamic of marital power. Basire's success in establishing his clerical authority and his desired pattern of marital piety rested partly on the spiritual seductiveness of devotional courtship and on his deftness in deploying its language and rituals. It also rested partly on Corbett's desire to acknowledge his authority and participate. Both appeared to converge. The couple married in December, 1636. Frances Corbett Basire, writing to her husband in 1654 during their involuntary separation by the English
revolution[s], confirmed his joint spiritual and household authority: "faithfully abay[ing] you as my menester and husband."69

**Family holiness and family duties**

When clerical suitors like Isaac Basire styled themselves as intimate pastors to their prospective brides, they were in essence promising to be not only husbands, fathers, and masters, but also "menester[s]" to their dependents. As a husband and householder, the newly married minister had to complement the inward focus of personal holiness with an outward effort directed at family holiness. As Thomas Taylor had preached to his newlywed colleague in 1625, as a householder a minister had to do more than lead his parish "as a man of knowledge." He now had to "dwell as a man of knowledge," extending his role as spiritual leader from the public church into his private family. Conducting public worship was a minister's most fundamental responsibility when serving as a parish or congregation's resident man of knowledge. By preaching, praying and administering the sacraments, a minister provided his people with the minimum Christian essentials of community holiness. Similarly, "family duties"—the commonplace seventeenth-century term for a routine of family piety—were the minimum essentials of family holiness. Like public worship, the regular practice of family duties were expected to impart spiritual benefits both to the collective and to individual members of the family. Thus, by fostering family holiness, family duties enhanced personal holiness. And as in the performance of the solitary tasks of study, prayer and self-examination central to personal holiness, a minister's standard and self-expectations for performing family duties were higher than those of the average layman.
Less like public worship or the solitary arts of personal holiness, however, family duties meant the possibility of support and active participation from the minister's lay dependents in prayer, reading and exegesis. And much like lay households, the devotional schedules of clerical families were subject to interruption and interference from the demands of everyday life. Thus, family duties enabled a minister to reap spiritual or intellectual benefits from the religious performance of the women, children and servants of knowledge dwelling with him. And when it came to keeping what one minister's daughter exasperatedly called "House business" from disrupting his family's religious routine, a minister might rely heavily on that often indispensable woman of knowledge—his wife—to ensure that family prayer began on time. Like other aspects of family holiness, family duties demonstrated the minister's mental and religious interdependence on his wife and household.

Family duties, also termed "family prayer" or "family religion," was the conventional seventeenth-century form of family worship. Recommended to all households, whether clerical or lay, these family duties had a standard form and frequency throughout the seventeenth-century. From William Perkin's posthumously published domestic manual, *Christian Oeconomie* (1607) to popular post-Restoration texts such as the Presbyterian Richard Baxter's *Poor Man's Family Book* (1684) or the late Stuart Bishop Samuel Tillotson's "Of Family Religion," domestic authors advocated a twice-a-day routine, in which the household master or mistress assembled the family, prayed with them and read aloud a chapter of Scripture. Depending on the period and the ecclesiastical allegiance of author or householder, this basic form might be elaborated in various ways. For instance, late Stuart Anglicans might commend set readings and
prayer formulas from certain devotional manuals; somewhat more controversially, some families might read from the Book of Common Prayer. Presbyterians might place more emphasis on extemporaneous prayer, sermon repetition and a hearty round of Psalm-singing. However, regardless of these varied circumstances, the common and consistent minimum was a twice-a-day family ritual of prayer and Bible-reading.

Regular catechizing of children and servants was also a recommended domestic practice, as was daily marital prayer. Catechism was partly an expression of the in loco parentis spiritualis responsibility of the minister and his wife or housekeeper. Marital prayer on the other hand was a companionate exercise in personal holiness for both husband and wife. An intimate means to furthering the spiritual growth of both parties, it could also reinforce the couple's shared commitment to the household's larger pastoral responsibilities.

Diaries, memoirs and other documentary accounts contain two types of evidence regarding routines of family worship and catechism in clerical households. Many of these sources describe the practices of family piety that were performed in specific clerical households. This first type of evidence demonstrates some commonalities in domestic religious practice in a variety of seventeenth-century clerical households. The prayer and Scripture reading that usually comprised family duties were dutifully practiced in many households. When Denis Granville, archdeacon and pluralist rector in Restoration Durham, penned a set of rules for his parsonage, he stated in article three that "there shall be in my family always prayers in the morning between six and seven of the clock…as alsoe in the evening constantly between 8 and 9."72 Mary Hawkins, housekeeper for William Mompesson the rector of Eakring, Nottinghamshire, testified in
1697 that her employer "never misse[d] (if att home) to read prayers twice a Day in his family together with the proper lessons & psalms." The Restoration Presbyterian Oliver Heywood assiduously entered each session of family and marital prayer in his diary and noted when he considered it especially effective, with "pleadings, groanes, tears" from those present. Other Presbyterian ministers made note of what they read at family worship. The family of the ejected Cheshire nonconformist Philip Henry progressed methodically through the bible; Henry recorded the day in 1663 when "wee finisht y\textsuperscript{e} reading of y\textsuperscript{e} Old Testament in y\textsuperscript{e} family." Much later, Henry's daughter Sarah would sometimes note in her own journal what Scripture passage her father had read to the family that day. The Lancashire Presbyterian Henry Newcome admitted to occasionally substituting "a leaf or two in Mr. Shepherd" for the regular Bible chapter, "it being variety, and as it were a change of fare."

In Anthony Walker's Fyfield, Essex rectory, his children were reportedly given a private pastoral session each afternoon at five. "[T]he ignorant servants," on the other hand, were catechized separately after supper by Walker's wife Elizabeth. Catechism also appears to have been held almost daily in the household of nonconformist minister Samuel Bury. Both Anthony and Elizabeth Walker and Samuel and Elizabeth Bury engaged in regular or occasional marital prayer. In his diary for the years 1677-79, Oliver Heywood noted weekly at least two to four sessions of prayer in private with his wife. The Restoration church of England rector Walker and the interregnum and Restoration Presbyterian Henry Newcome both attributed their schedule of marital prayer to the same inspiration: the autobiographical *Four Last Things* written by the early Stuart minister Jeremy Bolton. In 1698, Walker recalled establishing his routine of household
piety after "reading the Life of holy Mr. Robert Bolton more than forty years ago."82

Henry Newcome recorded that, as a newlywed, he and his wife
took the custom of praying twice a day together, she and I; and I did the rather
desire it upon the example of Mr. Bolton (as I read of him,) that he prayed six
times every day, twice in secret, twice with his wife, and twice in his family.83

Thus, despite their different ecclesiastical allegiances, both Walker and Newcome
engaged in highly similar routines of marital and household piety, and they based those
routines on a common early Stuart source. Significantly, that source was the life-story of
an earlier seventeenth-century English churchman, whom both Walker and Newcome
were able to view as a common predecessor and role model. As such, Walker and
Newcome did not use Bolton's account of his own household simply as a model of family
holiness. They looked to it as a shared standard of family holiness set by an English
clergyman, for other English clergyman to follow.

As well as describing domestic religious routines, these sources also record
concern or self-criticism over momentary lapses or extended failures to maintain those
routines. This second type of evidence provides two different insights. First, this
evidence indicates the challenges that everyday domestic and economic life posed to the
practice of family piety. The archdeacon Denis Granville provided extra funds for hiring
additional servants "in case the worke and imployment of my house bee too much to be
dispatched in the forenoon or before Evening Prayers."84 However, few clerical
households outside the ecclesiastical elite to which Granville belonged possessed the
resources to dispense with all possible domestic distractions. In ordinary clerical families
housework, household conditions and human frailty all interfered with religious routines.
In the Newcome household, the newlyweds' ambitious schedule of twice-a-day marital
prayer had to be cut back once their children were born. One Saturday, "Having no Time for Catechizing 'till Nine at Night," Elizabeth Bury had to choose between two duties as a clerical wife: to instruct the servants or to appear alert and attentive at her husbands' sermon the next morning. She revealed her priorities by opting to skip the catechism. In October 1686, Philip Henry's daughter Sarah, already worrying repeatedly in her diary that she allowed what she aptly termed "House business" to distract her from piety, recorded her mortification that she was "at night at Fam.[ily] Prayer guilty of a gr. sin in sleeping." Anthony Walker confessed that after preaching on Sunday mornings, he was sometimes too overcome with "my weariness" afterwards to lead family duties at home.

But household tasks and tiredness were not the only obstacles to family worship. Household conditions such as noise or a general lack of privacy could also inhibit ministers from conducting family or marital prayer. For instance, Oliver and Abigail Heywood prayed together fairly frequently. However, Heywood noted in several diary entries that the couple seized any absence of their housemaid as an opportunity for additional marital prayer in private. The Suffolk vicar Isaac Archer's first home had been "so open that on mornings we could not be free from distractions…and so had no prayers," although Archer "had the word read and did pray every evening with his family." It was only in 1671, when the Archer's moved to the more secluded rectory of Great Whelnetham that he "putt in practise what I formerly resolved, viz. when I lived privately I would have prayers in the mornings."

These testimonies of failure in family piety further suggest that some ministers' families felt specially obligated to maintain not only a standard of personal holiness as
individuals, but also a standard of family holiness as a collective household. Even when sheltered from prying parish or congregant eyes, they felt a responsibility to God and the clerical vocation to practice an exemplary model of family piety. The sense of obligation was strong enough to motivate them to confess their omissions and inadequate performances in their journals. Such confessions were often weighted with guilt and regret. Sarah Henry termed her nodding off during prayer a "gr.[sic] sin." Likewise, Isaac Archer thought his pre-1671 schedule of once-a-day family prayer merited "reproach for Christ in my heart." Much like Anthony Walker's and Henry Newcome's efforts to emulate the rigorous household worship routine of a clerical hero, Isaac Archer held clerical households like his own to a higher standard of family holiness than he expected of the laity. Family duty only in the evening was sufficient and perhaps even commendable in the households of "other sober men," but for a minister like Archer it was "a shame of goodness."

Conscientious ministers like Walker, Newcome and Archer had internalized an ideal of clerical household worship. Yet for most clerical families, the necessities of house business and public business were in regular competition with household worship, drawing on the family's energy, attention and time. Ensuring that both house business and family holiness received due time and attention appears to have been a responsibility that ultimately fell to the minister's wife. Prescriptive depictions of clerical households promoted a gendered division of labor that assigned "sacred imployments" to the minister and the management of "earthly things" to the minister's wife. This division of labor made it the wife's responsibility to keep day-to-day affairs from disrupting the household's spiritual schedule.
Keeping both the sacred and profane concerns of the household on track was a time-consuming affair. Anthony Walker claimed that his wife Elizabeth had to start her day at four in the morning in order to complete all her domestic tasks and still have time for closet duties.\textsuperscript{95} If there was a conflict between house business and household religion, a minister's wife was expected to put her husband's and family's holiness before her own spiritual needs. When Henry and Elizabeth Newcome reduced their marital prayer schedule to once-a-day, the cut-back was caused by Elizabeth's increased responsibilities. Henry still had ample time available. The demands of the Newcomes' growing household, however, meant that Elizabeth's "rising and leisure was uncertain to join with me [Henry]," making morning prayers together unfeasible.\textsuperscript{96}

Teenaged and unmarried adult daughters of ministers often assumed a heavy share of household responsibilities and described themselves making similar spiritual sacrifices. Sarah Henry's repeated laments in 1686 of how the "hurry of business" that occupied her in her father's household "incroached on ye time I had devoted to duties of wor[shi]p" are a case in point.\textsuperscript{97} At the time, Sarah Henry's mother was still healthy and present to oversee the household. A young adult daughter of a widowed minister, however, might have to completely fill her mother's role as mistress of the parsonage. Rachel Speght, the daughter of the Jacobean rector James Speght, was a precocious post-adolescent who published a Scriptural defense of women in 1616, at the age of eighteen. Speght's mother died sometime in the five years following its publication. Speght's polemic against misogyny had optimistically proclaimed that "woman was made…to glorifie God…using her bodie, and all the parts, powers and faculties thereof, as instruments for his honour."\textsuperscript{98} However, Speght's second work, two poems printed after
her mother's death, intimated that the burden of housekeeping (perhaps in her mother's stead) had put an end to many of her previous spiritual and intellectual ambitions. She closed her verse meditation on the pleasures of learning with the discouraging conclusion that "I my time must other-wayes bestow." Her prediction appears to have been correct. After marrying the minister William Procter in 1621, she never published another work. The full-time job of clerical wife apparently consumed Rachel's Speght Procter's every bestow-able minute.

Many clerical wives possessed a dual responsibility for maintaining routines of family worship. Preventing house business from encroaching on family piety was one part. The other duty was to personally conduct certain parts of the household's religious schedule. The practically universal division of gendered labor in early modern England assigned the supervision of small children and domestic servants to the mistress of the household. In households that made catechizing or reading additional Scripture with the children and servants part of the daily routine—like Anthony Walker's Essex rectory or the household of the nonconformist minister Samuel Bury—the wife took exclusive charge of those tasks. In the absence or incapacitation of their husbands, wives also stepped in to lead family worship. In 1647 the English civil war forced royalist rector Isaac Basire into continental exile, leaving his family behind in England. In her letters to her exiled husband, Frances Corbet Basire frequently attested that she was leading their children in prayer. Samuel Bury claimed that his wife Elizabeth conducted exemplary sessions of household prayer "when the Family was left with her, as in the necessary Absence of others, as it often was." When Anthony Walker was away or indisposed,
his wife held family duties as scheduled, either inducing a curate to perform household worship or doing it herself.\textsuperscript{104}

Gender historians have utilized the concept of the 'deputy husband' to describe how early modern wives performed pressing legal, financial and business duties on behalf of their absent spouses.\textsuperscript{105} In these clerical households, a spiritual or pastoral model of deputy husbandry also operated. Ministers who wished to structure family life around a devotional routine had to rely on their wives to ensure the family's spiritual schedule ran smoothly, to take charge of 'lesser' spiritual activities like catechizing, and when necessary, to conduct family duties in the minister's absence. They did not only need wives who would cooperate with their devotional agenda for the household. They needed wives with the religious and intellectual competence to execute that agenda, with or on behalf of their husbands. They needed \textit{women} of knowledge. This necessity, among others, supplied the motivation of some courting ministers in the preceding section to marry what the Lincolnshire vicar and after-dissenter John Rastrick termed "excellent, serious and understanding Christians."\textsuperscript{106}

Presumeably, the desire to actively participate and preside as mistress over such a thoroughly spiritualized household also prompted some women to accept a minister's marriage proposal. Clerical family members claimed palpable personal enrichment and improvement gained from family worship. After Isaac Archer began holding family duties twice a day, his wife Anne confided to him "with teares how great good she had found within a yeare; and that she looked upon her selfe with another eye then she used to doe."\textsuperscript{107} Philip Henry's family referred to their home as "Sion," a household saturated with holiness.\textsuperscript{108} Sarah Henry recorded several instances of special gratification received
from family prayer and reading. Indeed, the prospect of leaving behind the abundant piety of her natal family made her reluctant to accept a good offer of marriage from a personable and godly yeoman. Although she consented to the proposal, she glumly viewed the marriage as being spiritually "transplanted into a more barren soyl." Sent away from her father's parsonage in 1619 to serve in a gentry household, Katherine Overton, the daughter of Warwickshire clergymen Valentine Overton, similarly pined for her family's devotional schedule. After a short time in service, she sank into a spiritual crisis and ultimately had to be sent home. Once returned to the Overton household's plentitude of family prayer and reading, she quickly recovered.

It may have been the ministers themselves who benefited from family duties most of all. In 1672, Isaac Archer wrote in his journal that he had "found much sweetnes, and comfort by practicing duties with my family." Around the same time, John Rastrick found "refreshment" and "comfort" in "Reading & Singing Psalms & Hymns" with his household. As a young father and husband, Philip Henry was surprised in 1661 to find himself spending more time reading Scripture with his wife and family than on his own. Ministers like Archer, Henry and Rastrick may have been partly invigorated by the domestic exercise of their skills as spiritual leaders. By conducting family duties they fulfilled their role and reinforced their identity as domestic men of knowledge. A minister's personal, family and public holiness often related symbiotically. What enhanced a minister's spiritual confidence in his family would probably extend to his sense of personal and public holiness as well.

But these men also wrote of the spiritual advantages that accrued from the gifted contributions of others in their household to family or marital duties. John Rastrick
treasured two of the housemaids at his Kirkton vicarage, Martha Wray and Alice Hargate. Martha's "good spiritual sense [and] Understanding" and Alice's mystical fits of "pray[ing] and discours[ing] so spiritually & fluently" greatly enriched family devotions for the Lincolnshire vicar.

Many more ministers singled out the benefits they drew from the spiritual and intellectual talent and support of their wives. Isaac Archer's wife "was hearty to mee" in their family and more private devotions. In his record of his sessions of family and marital prayer, Oliver Heywood frequently marveled at his second wife Abigail's fluency and passion in prayer. On June 16, 1678, he exclaimed of their prayers together: "oh wt a sweet frame she was in, I have seldom heard the like, blessed be god." Heywood held the gifts of women in high regard. He expressed strong admiration for the piety of both his wives, describing in various writings the contributions they made to his devotions and his understanding of Scripture. Heywood was not alone in his spousal admiration. Describing his wife reading aloud to the family, Anthony Walker wrote that "her Reading…would strangely facilitate the understanding of the Sense to low Capacities." He claimed "with shame, I could not doe it so well."

**Family Order and Family Holiness**

Ministers were occasionally reminded of the Pauline precept of 1 Timothy 3:4, that a pastor must "rule his own house honestlie, with all children under obedience with all honestie." In chapter one we have seen in the public impact of household disorder on clerical reputation. But household order also affected the private, spiritual welfare of the clerical family. In the patriarchal Protestantism of seventeenth-century England,
household order was an indispensable condition for the pursuit of family holiness. I use 
the terms household order and family order here to mean the three things they meant to 
early modern contemporaries: the gender, age and kinship hierarchy that structured 
household relations, the relatively dominant or submissive conduct of household 
members according to their 'place' in the household, and the household's explicit or 
unspoken rules of moral behavior. Household holiness depended on household order 
in part because family piety depended on a smoothly functioning household, where 
everyone generally behaved, issued orders or obeyed according to expectations. It was 
also because the most rigorous routine of family and personal devotions meant little if 
conducted in a domestic environment of moral laxity. And it was additionally due to the 
fact that family holiness treated the household as a mini-church. It required the 
observance of domestic hierarchy, because it superimposed the religious hierarchy of 
clergy and laity onto the household hierarchy of master and dependents.

On the one hand, this model of household holiness reinforced domestic hierarchy. 
On the other hand, it conditioned the exercise of household authority with spiritual 
expectations. And it endowed domestic relations with pastoral obligations well beyond 
the general duty to provide, protect and set a good enough example of English adult 
behavior for one's children and servants. Many studies of Protestant prescriptive 
literature have amply documented the prevalence of this model of patriarchal-pastoral 
authority in early modern domestic manuals directed at both clergy and laity. 
Jacqueline Eales has pointed out the unique resonance and relevancy this model of 
authority possessed for clergymen and their families. Eales has emphasized how this 
model reflected the stringent need for patriarchal authority in clerical households. But, 1
Timothy 3 also decreed that the clerical patriarch must be in his private life "apt to teach" and "gentle, no fighter." Family holiness not only required family order. It also offered clerical householders and their wives tools for cultivating family order that were suitably "gentle" and pastoral.

Thomas Taylor wrote that discipline in a clerical household should "prevail on the conscience and win obedience." In Taylor's vision, the clerical householder did not cow his dependents into domestic acquiescence, but rather converted his dependents into Christian cooperation. Clerical domestic and life-writing often conveyed a conceptual interdependence between domestic discipline, instruction and piety. It emerged in the conventions of clerical biography, where early Stuart ministers like John Carter and Samuel Crook were praised for living with their wives "as a man of knowledge...a Prudent, Faithfull and tender guide." Such rhetoric likened husbandly authority to teaching and wifely submission to scholarly obedience. In his household rules, the exacting Denis Granville declared that "I requiring [sic] that all persons in my family to bee either teachers or learners." Granville's declaration defined each relationship in the hierarchy of his household as a relationship of Christian improvement. Granville's declaration also accompanied a list of specific leisure activities permitted to servants on Sundays and Holidays: "reading, prayer...good conference, reading to or instructing" neighbors or family members. The descriptions of household interactions, relationships and routines found in clerical family papers suggest some interdependence in practice, as well as in theory, between discipline and devotion. These clerical families used devotion and instruction as tools to inculcate order, obedience and desirable comportment. These families also used them as tools to intervene when a family member transgressed family
rules and expectations. Thus, on the one hand, family holiness required family order. But on the other, the practices of family holiness were themselves tools for maintaining family order.

Every family subordinate, from the minister's wife to the most junior serving maid, was technically subject to the minister's "tender guid[ance]" and domestic discipline. However, some family members were more guided and disciplined than others. For obvious reasons, children and servants were subject to greater levels of instruction and supervision. The sources used here provide numerous descriptions of ministers' children being spiritually and generally educated. These range from Frances Basire's interregnum accounts of "do[ing] as much as in me lais to bring up our children in the feare and knowledge of God, and to keepe them from idlenes" during her husband's exile, to the failure of Oliver Heywood's young sons to do their Latin homework in 1669. They also describe some of the penances prescribed to clerical sons and daughters for their moral lapses.

However, it was servants who generally posed the most problems to clerical family order. They were generally the family members most subject to supervision, active discipline and remedial education. They were also the family members potentially most ill at ease in a hyper-pious domestic environment. For these reasons, the discipline and direction of servants offer a useful perspective on the devotional dynamics and practices of clerical family order. Of course some servants adapted brilliantly to their masters' religious and moral requirements. John Rastrick prized his two godly maidservants, Alice Hargate and Martha Wray, whose long-term service in his household was "through the gracious Providence of God." The Presbyterian Oliver Heywood
praised his maidservant's work "dressing the meeting-place" where Heywood preached. He likened her to the servant Rhoda in Acts 12, who watched the door as Christians gathered in her mistress's house to pray. However, not all clerical families managed to hire such religiously compatible help. More often the intellectual, cultural and spiritual gap between the minister's nuclear family and the youths and adults of varied backgrounds who served in the minister's household was quite acute. Anthony Walker's recollection of "hiring Servants out of places where there wanted opportunity to teach the poor Children and Catechize them; 'tis scarce to be believed how Ignorant many came" probably reflected the most common experience of seventeenth-century clerical householders.

Regular catechisms, family duties, reading lessons for illiterate servants, mandatory activities of personal devotion and restrictions on forms of entertainment together comprised a clerical household regime that cultivated family holiness and expressed the clerical family's identity. It also provided a structure of activities and a domestic discourse that, at best, could acculturate and convert "Ignorant servants" and other spiritual strangers residing in the clerical household. At worst, it could limit the expression and impact of their irreligious habits and attitudes. Thus, the practices of family holiness became a proactive method of family discipline. This method attempted to stop household transgressions before they started by socializing the most marginal and potentially disruptive family members. Denis Granville's household rules and Anthony Walker's account of his wife regulating their servants provide detailed examples of how these spiritualized household regimes targeted servants. They also show how these
regimes worked to socially and spiritually assimilate servants into the order and atmosphere of a clerical family.

Denis Granville addressed most of his quotidian household rules to his servants. Granville's servants, and even his day laborers, were to attend morning and evening prayers in church, with "their Bibles and Common Prayer-books" in hand. Granville's "domesticks" had family duties as well. Their leisure activities were also regulated. On weekdays the servants were instructed to spend some time in "private prayer and reading." On Sundays they should be reading or learning to read Scripture. Certainly no precisian, Granville had games in his house. But cards and dice were permitted only during the winter holiday season. The chessboard and bowles were "locked up on Thursday night till Monday morning." As fitting a clerical household, this left only sober diversions such as prayer, reading and self-examination for Friday through Sunday.133

In his account of his wife and their servants, Anthony Walker described almost identical rules and activities. Not just servants but "all day-laborers about the House [were] called in" for family duties.134 Like Granville, the Walker's expected their maidservants to perform daily closet-duties.135 Likewise, Elizabeth Walker gathered and shepherded all the servants to all church services, leaving none "at home, or by the way."136 Walker's narrative of his wife's housekeeping not only described their rules for servants, but also described Elizabeth Walker imposing these rules on their servants. These mistress-servant anecdotes reveal quite explicitly the socializing intent of mandatory piety. They also clearly express Walker's own perception of servants as spiritual savages, religious strangers within the clerical family. His servants were in a "House of Levi," but they were not yet of it. Thus, Walker did not only note that his wife
required their maidservants "to Pray alone" every day. He also implied that their maids had no habits of personal piety of their own; Elizabeth Walker had to "mind them of" their closet duties "till they were accustomed to it." Likewise, the Walkers enforced constant church attendance partly to prevent the servants' preferred activity of unsupervised and irreligious "loitering." Once Elizabeth Walker had herded her domestics into the pews, there was more socializing to be done. She had to monitor "the ruder youth" with reproachful looks, until she had effectively "awe[d]…[them] into becoming Carriage." Most of all, Elizabeth Walker had to use daily catechism and literacy training to instill these so-called "ignorant" and sometimes illiterate servants with the basics of Christian knowledge. Anthony Walker claimed a measure of household success in transforming "ignorant Servants" into literate, orthodox Anglicans: "I remember not any [servants] who stayed with us, who could not read competently well, and say both a [children's] Catechism…And also the Church Catechism." 

The aim was to give these "ruder youths" a limited social and spiritual make-over. Ostensibly this Christian education would forever improve their character and souls. As such, it was proof of the clerical household's family holiness, and a domestic demonstration of the minister's pastoral skills and commitment. John Rastrick recalled with pride "those in my own Family to whose conversion the Lord hath made me Instrumental." He was speaking primarily of the "servants [who] came…into my Family, strangers…unto God at their coming." But of course in the short-term, Christianizing the servants would also make them fit more easily into clerical household culture. For example, John Rastrick's personal comfort required high levels of formal family devotions and informal spiritual discourse in the family. He extolled the servants who
"became seriously religious" during their employment in his household, because they became assets to family holiness and "a great comfort to us." Furthermore, as Paul Griffiths has pointed out, catechizing the servants had the added benefit of drilling them in the Christian precept of unflagging obedience to one's minister, master and mistress. By christianizing the servants, a clerical family strove to inculcate godly values and comportment, increasing the likelihood that servants would abide by their household's habits of holiness and its standards of moral conduct. At the same time, they propounded the ideology of hierarchy and submission that permeated early modern Christianity, presumably hoping to encourage servants to meekly submit to their household's own hierarchy.

Sometimes, despite the full treatment of catechisms and family duties, servants transgressed moral bounds, stealing, fornicating, engaging in displays of drunkenness. Or they disordered the household with backbiting, furtive disobedience or direct insolence. Whether clerical or lay, dismissal was always a master's or mistress's recourse when a servant incorrigibly disrupted family discipline. But before that last resort, clerical families with a high investment in family holiness employed devotional methods of intervention. They utilized prayer, scripture and spiritual exhortation in an attempt to "win obedience" from wayward domestics. This style of discipline was encapsulated (actually or fictively) by an anecdote in Samuel Clarke's biography of the New England divine John Cotton, in which Cotton disciplined his children and servants by opening the bible and instructing them to read out loud a passage condemning their specific brand of misbehavior.
The scriptural-shaming method of discipline attributed to Cotton would presumably work only for small infractions. More severe breaches in family order would require more intensive devotional measures. When his servant David Phillips was caught drinking and swearing in 1669, Philip Henry tried to reform the youth through sessions of exhortation and reproachful prayers "in the Family." The wife of late Stuart Presbyterian minister Samuel Bury, Elizabeth Bury's struggles with her servants exemplified the problems they could pose to family order and holiness. Elizabeth Bury also assiduously applied the devotional approach to dealing with the "Perfidies of Servants."

Samuel Bury was her second husband, married in 1697 after a prolonged widowhood. They had no children in their Bristol household; the Bury's family consisted entirely of servants and occasional boarders. In the edition of her diary published by her husband, Elizabeth Bury expressed constant preoccupation with her servants' spiritual welfare and her servants spiritual impact on the household. Like Granville and the Walker's, Elizabeth Bury subjected her "poor, giddy, [and] vain" servants to a thorough course of religious socialization. Furthermore, the servants were a regular topic of her prayers, both alone in her closet and during intimate devotions with her husband. She was fearful, according to her husband, of the damage that rowdy and irreligious servants could inflict on "her own Spirit" and on the family's "Common Interest of Religion." She shopped for her servants with prayer and attention to character; of one maidservant, she recorded that she and her husband "seriously sought Divine Direction both together and apart" before deciding to hire her. But despite spiritually selective hiring and spurring her servants to see "who shall learn their Catechism soonest," Elizabeth Bury
complained repeatedly from 1699 to 1702 of "Domestick Discouragements" from "disobedient Servants." Elizabeth Bury compared this family insubordination to the Judas's betrayal of Jesus. She reproached her lack of tolerance and pastoral persistence with her servants, "when my dear Lord, with such Meekness and Patience, [did] bear the Treason of one he had Pray'd with and instructed, and indulged in his Family."151

In 1700, one maidservant was suspected of an unspecified act of "Wickedness" extreme enough to exhaust the Bury's collective "Meekness and Patience." As it ultimately resulted in the servant's expulsion, it was probably something fairly severe: theft, fornication, defamation of her mistress or perhaps a pattern of extreme insolence. Whatever the crime, the possibly innocent servant refused to "make [an] open and ingenuous Confession."

It is ambiguous whether a contrite admission of guilt or sinfulness would have saved the young woman's job. But before parting with the maid, Elizabeth Bury recorded that she and her husband attempted to pray and admonish the servant into a state of repentance and reformation: "With the most melting Entreaties we could, we renewed our Exhoutration…and begg'd earnestly of GOD to move her Heart thereto." However, the maid left their home in what Elizabeth Bury termed "willful Impenitency" (the servant may have viewed it as resolute maintenance of her innocence or honesty). Upon her exit, the Bury's pastoral concern for their fallen family member persisted. Elizabeth Bury wrote that "we continued our earnest prayer for her."

The story of Elizabeth Bury's "Domestick Discouragements" encapsulates the most crucial aspects of family order within the larger pursuit of clerical family holiness. Her preoccupation with "Family-Peace" reflects the mutual relationship family between
family order and family holiness. Her trouble keeping "Family-Peace" demonstrates how the more morally and spiritually stringent regimes of some clerical households depended on a common Christian education and commitment among family members. And it illustrates how servants, whose origins and education rarely matched that of their clerical employers, were frequently perceived as spiritual strangers within the family. Too "ignorant" (and perhaps unwilling) to be an integrated part of the culture of the clerical household, servants could thus disrupt both household order and household holiness. Thus the Burys, and the other clerical families examined here, attempted to maintain order by a program of Christian education and socialization, designed to transform these spiritual strangers into true clerical servants.

Elizabeth Bury also exemplifies the centrality of clerical identity to this devotional method of keeping household order, and the centrality of clerical wives to its successful application. Elizabeth Bury articulated her program of devotions with and for her servants as a pastoral duty. In a moment of telling priestly identification, she compared her clerical family of unruly servants, headed by one of God's Presbyterian "Ambassadors," with Christ's "Family" of unruly apostles. Significantly, when comparing those two priestly families and their heads, she did not distinguish between her husband, the ordained "Ambassado[r]" and herself. Because of their very gendered position as household mistresses, charged with day-to-day household operations and supervision of the servants, Elizabeth Walker and Elizabeth Bury were indispensable arbiters of order and agents of Christian socialization within their clerical families. But they discharged those duties not merely out of gendered obligation, but out of
identification and commitment with their husbands' vocation. They ordered and educated with confidence and dedication, as wives of Levi and women of knowledge.

**Family Holiness and Marital Harmony**

Ministers wanted their parishioners and congregants to worship with an attitude of Christian sincerity and charity. From the perspective of practical divinity, the word and sacraments worked best on those receptive, reverent and bearing good-will. From the standpoint of practical performance, congregations hostile to religion and to each other made for a discouraging and disorderly audience.

Similarly, ministers striving for family holiness sought to practice it in an atmosphere of family willingness and family harmony. Unlike public worship, family duties were profoundly intimate and involved much more interaction between the spiritual leader and the spiritually led. Ideally family holiness both promoted and emerged from the household's spiritual unity. But tensions and estrangement between family members—especially the 'spiritual natives' of the minister's nuclear family—could subtly poison the emotional and spiritual fruits of family duties. Or they could more overtly damage the family's ability to function devotionally. Along with family duties and family order, harmony in household relationships therefore comprised an essential element of family holiness.

Inevitably, the relationship between husband and wife was the focal household relationship. Marital discord often posed the most significant threat to family holiness. Many ministers relied heavily on their wives' efforts to manage routines of family devotion and maintain a high standard of family order. Family holiness thus depended
upon practical cooperation and spiritual consensus between the clerical household's man and woman of knowledge. Conflict between them could drastically undermine family discipline or breakdown the household's spiritual schedules. Furthermore, a minister's relationship with his wife frequently represented the most potent point of connection between his personal and family holiness. Probably more than any other group of men, ministers were thoroughly steeped in the conjugal language of eternal union that made each spouse the other's "second selfe," and made marriage an earthly model of the heavenly union between Christ and each Christian's soul. Some ministers were clearly conscious of influence that the conjugal bonds of sexual and emotional intimacy, of domestic and religious partnership, could exert on their conduct and mental state. Their relationship with their wives could enhance or completely shatter the concentration and self-regulation necessary to personal holiness.

Family discord, and especially marital conflict, struck at a principal part of the minister's vocational identity. Peacemaking was an elemental pastoral duty. An inability to resolve conflict within his home and with his closest partner bespoke a failure in a minister's calling. Confessions of family tensions and failings led Philip Henry to lament in 1661 "that things are not so amongst us as they should be amongst those that are the Relations of a minister."¹⁵³ In the power dynamic of courtship, the dual role of "menester" and suitor gave clergymen a slight patriarchal advantage over the women they courted. Once wed, however, the dual responsibilities of "menester and husband" placed certain burdens on clergymen in the arena of marital relationship and conflict. The clerical imperative to be a peacemaker specially obliged "menester[s] and husband[s]" to take immediate and effective steps to resolve spousal differences. Marital harmony
enhanced personal and family holiness. But the mental, emotional and practical requirements of both forms of piety could make discord between a minister and his "second selfe" nearly intolerable. Needing household peace for piety and under pressure to demonstrate their peacemaking adequacy, ministers turned to devotional solutions. They used personal and marital confession and prayer to promote harmony and intimacy with their wives. When conjugal relations broke down, they sometimes intensified these practices to patch up differences or repair relational damage.

In diaries and memoirs, ministers extolled the benefits of marital holiness and celebrated the contentment of family and marital harmony. They also discussed the emotional and spiritual distress caused by marital discord. Anthony Walker praised the "happy success" of marital prayer with his wife, averring he had "much cause to bless God" for the improvement it imparted to their souls and their relationship. During their marriage from 1668 to 1698, Isaac Archer and his sickly wife Anne prayed together every morning. In times of illness and pregnancy they also confessed their faith and spiritual fears to each other, "for the good of us both." Despite his constant worry for his wife's health, Archer treasured these ailment-related "occasion[s] of seeking god." Meanwhile, in 1650, the young minister Henry Newcome, "blessed God for comfort and quiet restored with my wife." In 1663, Philip Henry similarly "bless[ed] God for quietness in my house."154

Newcome and Henry wrote from experience. Henry's thanksgiving for family concord came with an observation on the cost of conflict to personal and household holiness: without harmony, no spiritual benefit could come from "a house full of sacrifices."156 A few months earlier, one "seeming hasty word" with his wife temporarily
destroyed Henry's spiritual focus; he recorded that "y\textsuperscript{o} Devil made use of [their argument] to distract me several times."\textsuperscript{157} During the early part of his marriage Newcome recorded at intervals his exasperation with his "wife's distemper" and their "falling[s] out."\textsuperscript{158} One Saturday, Newcome's spat with his wife Elizabeth interrupted his "studie[s] for Sunday with a great deal of distraction." Saturday was the day when most ministers' personal and professional needs for holiness merged, as the day they set aside to prepare their sermons. And in 1652 Newcome melodramatically mentioned the possibility that their quarreling would ruin his ability to preach and make him "fit for nothing."\textsuperscript{159}

Not all ministers blamed their wife's "passion" for their marital troubles.\textsuperscript{160} Isaac Archer fretted more than once over his "unkindnes to my wife," and recorded his gratitude that she bore "with mee…hiding my failings."\textsuperscript{161} Resolving to be "kinder…and not so angry" to his wife Anne, Isaac Archer tried to improve his spousal behavior by devotional means. He used prayer and self-examination to help moderate his "turbulent and unquiet temper." And he consulted works of practical divinity to better understand and control his moods and impulses.\textsuperscript{162}

Archer's devotional strategies were common. Ministers used routines of marital devotions to in part to maintain or foster harmony: Isaac Archer, Philip Henry, Henry Newcome and Anthony Walker all prayed or read Scripture with their wives, more or less fruitfully, at least once a day. Anthony Walker believed that marital piety was the key to his purportedly smooth spousal relations; he claimed that marital "Discontents, Jealousies, Brawlings, Weariness" all stemmed from "neglect of the fore intimated Practice and Duty."\textsuperscript{163} When attempting to fix marital difficulties, ministers might turn to either personal or family devotions. Attributing his marital problems to his own "masse
of inward sin," Isaac Archer focused on the practices of personal holiness to acquire greater "strength, wisdome, and Christ's meeknes." Philip Henry curbed impatience or irritation with his wife by reminding himself in prayer and devotional journaling that "my wife is much my helper…& my heart doth safely trust in her, lords most holy name bee blessed & prayed." Both Archer and Henry held themselves heavily responsible as ministers for keeping their households holy and harmonious. This self-critical sense of duty may have prompted them to look inward when angry or upset with their wives, and to discipline their own thoughts and emotions as part of the solution to the problem.

The ebullient Yorkshire Presbyterian Oliver Heywood and the discontented Lincolnshire vicar and later East Anglian Presbyterian John Rastrick both intensely pursued and richly documented their experiences of familial and marital holiness. Oliver Heywood's diary records of prayer and daily life with his second wife Abigail offer a detailed account of how one minister used personal and marital devotions to mediate intimacy and conflict with his wife. They also demonstrate how even minor marital difficulties could unbalance a minister's sense of mental and spiritual equilibrium. John Rastrick's confessional account of his tempestuous first marriage to the Lincolnshire rector's daughter Jane Wilson, on the other hand, describes just how spectacularly this clerical model of marital holiness and harmony could fail. It also reveals how Rastrick's clerical position and identity limited his marital options; even when family and marital duties were causing the main problems in his marriage, Rastrick could only devise devotional solutions.

Oliver Heywood prized the religious intimacy and spiritual give and take of both his marriages. Details of Heywood's devotional life with his first wife, Elizabeth Angier,
survive mainly in his autobiography and in his account of her life. During his second marriage to Abigail Crompton, Heywood made note of their emotional and religious highs and lows throughout his diaries and event-books for the years 1665 to 1702. Heywood described his second wife Abigail as an invaluable assistant and associate in his public work as a pastor; he termed her "a servant to the church, as phæbe of old was, Rom 16 1: a sister as well as a wife." But Heywood treasured equally, if not more, Abigail's role in tending to Heywood's "necessitys within"; she was a close and constant "help to me…in spirituals, in prayers, counceils." The couple seem to have made a point of praying together as frequently as possible. In Heywood's records of these prayers three defining characteristics stand out. First, the regularity of the couple's marital prayers: taking 1677-1678 diary as a sample, Heywood made note of his prayers alone with Abigail at least once a week. Second, the richly emotional and romantic language Heywood himself used when recounting specific sessions of marital prayer: Oliver and Abigail Heywood prayed together "sweetly," "affectionately" and with frequent "meltings of heart." Marital prayer gave Heywood a spiritually chivalrous opportunity to admire his wife: Heywood noted often "how sweetly" Abigail prayed with her "graces and gifts." Finally, the emphasis the couple placed on having private time to pray together: Heywood repeatedly described himself and his wife snatching at time alone to pray together, like a couple conducting secret spiritual trysts. Several mentions of conjugal prayer in Heywood's diary begin with the phrase "my maid being gone" or "my servant being absent."

For the Heywoods as a couple, marital prayer was thus a spiritualized structure for fostering and maintaining marital intimacy. It provided them with regular sessions of
intense emotional expression and time alone together. For Heywood as a minister, it also
sanitized spousal intimacy, channeling it productively into family and personal holiness.
Much like the rituals of devotional courtship, marital prayer and other aspects of marital
holiness translated Heywood's relationship with his wife into a comfortable Christian and
pastoral framework, a framework congruent with Heywood's clerical identity and
personal holiness. Marital prayer thus cemented the couple's attachment and
commitment to each other, and directed it to larger Christian goals of pastoral service and
family holiness.

Marital prayer also safely mediated the potential disorder and sin of marital
passion through the constant presence of God. The emotional language of "melting
hearts" was highly conventional; Heywood used it to describe his response to family,
personal and public prayer as well. However, Heywood's devotional affect of
"sweetness" and "melting" had a particular romantic nuance and potency in the context of
marital prayer. This added romantic nuance arose partly from his genuine closeness to
his wife Abigail, and to the relative privacy of their prayers together. But it was due even
more to Heywood's basic and very traditional understanding of prayer. Whether
performed alone or in public, prayer was a romantic act. As conceptualized in the long
Christian tradition of nuptial imagery and theology, prayer was a form of spiritual
intercourse between god and the soul. Emotions stirred up during prayer were romantic
emotions: love, longing, merging and release. Thus, depending on the degree of one's
sympathy or cynicism, marital prayer supplied Heywood with the means to cleanse or to
cloak his earthly love and desire for his wife with his heavenly love and desire for God.
Through marital prayer, the Heywoods quite self-consciously included the omnipresent
third member of their marriage, God, in their expression of affection and emotional intimacy. And for Heywood, God aided rather than inhibited emotional intimacy and expression. As he noted regularly in his records of closet, family and marital prayer, "God helpt" the outpouring of feeling and sense of holiness he sought during prayer with Abigail.171

As a divine marital counselor, God did not only assist Heywood in fostering marital intimacy and harmony. God also "helpt" Heywood resolve marital and family conflict. Probably due both to temperament and vocation, Heywood found interpersonal conflict profoundly upsetting. And though he thrived in the leadership roles of preacher, teacher and counselor, he appeared to dislike exercising his patriarchal or pastoral authority to correct and criticize. Thus, the occasional argument with his wife left him profoundly "afflicted" and in "grief" until they reconciled. Both Heywood and his wife dealt with these moments of discord with prayer. In 1676 the couple had an "unpleasing discourse" over resuming contact with a family acquaintance. Heywood believed that his wife was wrong for holding a grudge against the individual; after they argued, Heywood "went to my study and wept before the Lord on my face, pleading for her soul." God apparently took Oliver Heywood's side; that evening Abigail was no longer "troubled" over her husband's decision, but "much composed."172 Heywood also asked God to intervene when he had wronged his wife. When Oliver Heywood disregarded his wife's schedule and thoughtlessly made plans, he was utterly stricken by his wife's justifiable irritation. Taking a devotional time-out from their argument, Heywood and his wife both went to pray in their closets. Calmed by her meditations, Abigail forgave him for his insensitivity later that day.
Oliver Heywood's mental and spiritual equilibrium required marital peace. Conflict with his wife disordered him emotionally. When they argued he stopped all other forms of prayer and study; he focused all his devotional energy on mending marital relations. Personal and family holiness gave Heywood a peaceable and spiritual method for resolving conflict with his wife. It was Heywood's only method. Heywood's clerical standards of personal and family holiness required marital harmony. But his clerical identity and personal comfort made exercising the patriarchal but non-pastoral options of verbal and physical coercion against his wife almost impossible. Luckily, Heywood's devotional method worked well; with prayer and God's "assisting presence" he usually managed to settle his conjugal disputes within a day.

John Rastrick shared Heywood's vocational limitations, Heywood's need for spiritual intimacy and marital harmony, and Heywood's devotional method to managing his marriage. He did not, however, share Heywood's success. As part of a larger manuscript memoir, Rastrick wrote "An Account of my Conjugall Relations, Temptations, Sins, Afflictions &c." to examine the failure of personal and family holiness in his first marriage. Rastrick married his first wife Jane Wilson in 1673, shortly before taking a position as vicar of Kirkton, Lincolnshire. Rastrick claimed to have courted Wilson with his spiritual needs specifically in mind. He based his decision to marry Wilson on her clerical pedigree as the daughter of a Lincolnshire rector and her professed anguish and desire to "be Gods Child &c." However, he bitterly recorded that he had mistaken "her Melancholy for her Vertue." According to Rastrick, his wife's severe melancholy and intellect defects made her incapable of substantive participation in either marital or family piety. Rastrick responded by conveying his disappointment in her and
focusing his energy on devotional activities with their visitors, boarders and servants, giving noticeable attention to the pious women in their household. Under these conditions, Jane Rastrick's devotional incapacity developed into hostility and jealousy. She began to object to Rastrick's family prayer and reading; the couple quickly descended into a state of protracted marital war. Their conflict was resolved only by Jane Rastrick's death in 1684. Personal and family holiness not only failed to relieve John Rastrick's marital troubles; they partly caused them.

However, in his narrative of this "Conjugall Afflictio[n]," Rastrick articulated the same marital motivations and methods described by Oliver Heywood, Anthony Walker, Philip Henry and Henry Newcome. Rastrick needed marital harmony to sustain personal holiness. His "cross & unquiet…Relations" with his wife disturbed his "studies of Divinity of great intricacy" and "hind[ered]…me in my Ministeriall work."  He noted that their worst fights uncannily occurred on Saturdays, while he was preparing to preach the next day. His angry and "undue degree of passion" with his wife shattered his mastery of his thoughts and emotions. But Rastrick's marital problems did not only disrupt his serenity and concentration; they also upset his image of himself as a minister. Rastrick approvingly quoted his mother-in-law's assertion that a woman "canst never do amiss with a Religious man…their Spirit will not Suffer them to be long angry or out of the way but they are restless till they be reconcild." Rastrick wanted to consider himself a "Religious man," but his outbursts of anger, his unspoken wishes to be freed from his marriage and his failure to make peace in his family all undermined his clerical identity.
Rastrick's personal holiness and clerical identity did not suffer only from the constant presence of marital discord. They were also demoralized by the alienating absence of religious intimacy with his "second selfe." Without devotional partnership, Rastrick saw clerical marriage as mere material and sexual shell of a relationship. He lived with his wife in a painful "strangeness in Spiritual converse" that began on their wedding night. As a newlywed, Jane Rastrick failed to sanctify their marriage-bed with prayer before climbing under the covers; John Rastrick was so disturbed by this that "I made her rise again to prayer."181 Within a few years, the couple's lack of devotional relations led Rastrick to find himself "thinking O if I had but such as wife as she" about two of the literate and godly young spinsters that frequented Rastrick's sessions of family duties.182 He recalled thinking with despair that the "great Differences and unquietness" in his marriage worked too "exceedingly strongly agst a Holy Life" to effectively resist.183

Like other ministers, Rastrick found marital harmony and marital devotions essential to personal holiness, family holiness and the integrity of his clerical identity. And like other ministers, he resorted almost exclusively to a devotional method of resolving marital conflict, despite the fact that family devotions were a primary source of marital conflict. As the focus of his wife's unhappiness and their marital disagreements, family duties in the Rastrick household became so disruptive that they were stopped altogether for extended periods of time. Yet, aside from an attempt to treat his wife's melancholy with mineral water from a local spa, Rastrick's efforts to fix marriage consisted almost solely of fasting, prayer and reading recommendations from practical divinity books. To fix his marriage, Rastrick held days and hours of prayer, meditation and self-mortification alone and with intimates from his clerical circle. Rastrick sought
two kinds of help from these sessions. As Oliver Heywood did during his face-down prayers for marital peace, Rastrick rather nakedly solicited God's intervention in his wife's character and attitude: "[f]or my wife I prayed that God would free her from her Melancholy. Enlarge her capacity, suit & reconcile her with my desires."¹⁸⁴ But like Isaac Archer and Philip Henry, Rastrick also fasted and prayed to master his own feelings and to improve his own marital conduct, seeking to act with "contentment...[and] true Love to my own wife."¹⁸⁵

Despite these religious exercises, the Rastricks remained estranged until Jane Rastrick's death in 1684. With her death, John Rastrick acquired some of the self-awareness he had lacked during her life. A year later Rastrick married Mary Harrison, a young "Woman that read wrote and prayed much."¹³⁶ With Harrison he was able to have the devotional marriage and lifestyle he had wanted so badly. It came, however, with the guilty knowledge of his "Heinou[s]" treatment of his first wife and his secret prayers "that God would rather take her away by death."¹³⁷ The fulfillment of devotional wishes in his second marriage became a new obstacle to Rastrick's clerical holiness and identity. Preoccupied with his past sinfulness and "my miscarriages towards her [Jane]" he lost confidence in his own clerical skills, holiness and calling. As a result Rastrick "lost most of the awakening earnestness" he had applied in his pastoral work and personal relationships.¹³⁸ The sin and conflict of his first marriage cast a shadow over his second. Despite their active devotional partnership, Rastrick also failed his second wife as a "menester and husband."
Conclusion

For the ministers examined here, marriage and family life could enrich or disrupt clerical identity and personal holiness. In stages ranging from courtship up until widowhood, these clergymen used devotional strategies to control the emotional and mental sins and distractions often inherent marriage and householding. Through the practices of family holiness, they turned the fleshly temptations of marital and household relations into schools of spiritual exercises and religious resources to supply their "necessitys within." But they could not do it singlehandedly. To cultivate holiness in their families as men of knowledge, they needed the full support and spiritual skills of their wives. And while these ministers depended heavily upon such women of knowledge to manage devotional routines and exercise a degree of spiritual leadership, the ultimate burden of achieving family holiness still lay with them, as the heads of their households, as ministers, fathers, masters and husbands.
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CHAPTER 3
PRIVATE AND PUBLIC FATHERS: PATRIARCHY AND CLERICAL AUTHORITY
IN THE PARISH AND CONGREGATION

Introduction

When a neighbor's maidservant got "irreveren[t] and sauc[y]" with John Baker, the early Stuart rector of Bartlow, Cambridgeshire, Baker asked her "to tell me what the 5th commandment was." Requesting an explanation of the Old Testament injunction to "Honor thy Father and Mother," Baker had picked an apt rejoinder. An entire ideology of social and political relations, an ingrained system of everyday rituals of deference, a common catechetical language and experience and a claim of vocational dignity, local authority and professional power were condensed into Baker's seemingly simple Scriptural query. Baker had not merely reminded his parishioner of her biblical duty to reverence and obey her natural father. He had informed her that, regardless of her age or status, he possessed an analogous paternal power and authority as her spiritual father. He was asserting a paternal right to discipline her conduct and to elicit the obedience and deference of a daughter.

In Chapter one I examined how a minister's success or failure as a private householder could affect public work and reputation. In this chapter, I will look more closely at the gendered, patriarchal dimensions of the minister's public role, exploring
how it shaped relations between the minister and parishioners. Seventeenth-century clergymen conceptualized the pastor-parishioner relationship in hierarchical and paternal terms: they were "shepheards" of their "flocks," "stewards" and "overseers" of a religious "household," and "spirituall fathers" of "families," "children" and "babes." To describe this relationship ministers drew on a stock of Scriptural metaphors specific to the clergy. But the clergy's rhetoric of spiritual fatherhood invoked more than Scriptural precedent. It also invoked the everyday political economy of early modern English patriarchy, in which all public units of political and religious government, from the parish to the monarchical state, were treated as public households or "families" headed by father-like governors. In this understanding of social relations, magistrates and ministers were "Political Parents…[and] Ecclesiastical Parents," public "fathers of the Church, and of the common wealth." This model was popularly disseminated through homilies, sermons, domestic manuals and catechetical explanations of the fifth commandment, that asserted that "[a]ll Superiors [were] comprehended under the names of Father and Mother…[both] publicke or private." It was also embedded in the rituals of precedence and deference that were meant (not always successfully) to transparently structure day to day interactions between men and women, adults and children, masters and servants, gentry and commoners, public office-holders and private subjects. 'Private' and 'public' had specific political meanings in seventeenth-century England. 'Private' denoted all arenas of economic and personal life outside the institutions of church, state and university. In early modern England, the household was the basic 'private' social unit within which most economic production and physical and cultural reproduction occurred. 'Public' described those institutions, their personnel and
the functions they performed as agents of the church or state. The structure of English society tightly linked the private to the public, through the political model of patriarchal household government. Groups of private households comprised the larger administrative "families" of the parish, deaconry, county and nation; the social order personally and unofficially maintained at the levels of the private household and neighborhood made possible the official maintenance of order by local, regional and national institutions.

Through the language of spiritual fatherhood, the parish clergy claimed their place within English society's pyramid scheme of private and public patriarchal households, not only as heads of their private households, but as public fathers of their parish "families." As public fathers, the clergy defined their relationship to their parishioners as a paternal relationship of clerical authority and obligation on the one side, and parishioner deference and dependence on the other. All early modern English claims to exercise paternal or parental authority, including the clergy's, assumed the possession of at least two forms of power: the productive power that enabled patriarchal figures to provide material, spiritual or social necessities to their dependents or inferiors, and the disciplinary power of authority itself, which gave them the right to regulate the bodies, behavior and identities of the same. Both powers came with the obligation to exercise them properly for the welfare and well-being of dependents and inferiors. Both were open to abuse. In theory, early modern writers and public authorities generally defended the legitimate authority of even negligent and abusive fathers. In practice, neglectful and scandalous patriarchs of both the private and public variety could find
their authority diminished or challenged on the basis of their failure to perform their functions.

Yet, conscientiously providing his parish 'dependents' with all the spiritual necessities of worship, ritual, instruction and informal pastoral care did not guarantee that a minister's status and authority as a public father was universally accepted or secure. Unlike the sheep or infants to which they were so often compared in pastoral manuals and sermons *ad clerum*, parishioners were not homogenous in age, ability, status, gender, wealth or opinions. In an explicitly hierarchal society, not all parishioners were equal and not all parishioners received the fatherly direction of their minister with equal submissiveness. Few assertions of clerical-patriarchal authority were as florid (or as alienating) as one Civil War Cambridgeshire vicar's announcement to the Parliamentarian sympathizers in the pews "that all men must sumitt to yr F[a]thers meaning there Ministers & they had the sword in theire hands and the yoke put upon theire shoulders & it was fitt for them to hold it."\textsuperscript{11} But many ministers found their fifth commandment position as public fathers contested by youths unwilling to submit to an adult authority other than their parents and masters, by adults resistant to being directed and corrected—especially in a manner they deemed infantilizing, and by men, private and public patriarchs themselves, who viewed the disciplinary acts of their ministers as an encroachment on their own patriarchal authority over their dependents or over local society.

In this chapter I will argue that the power and authority held by ministers over their parishes or congregations was inherently and explicitly gendered. In the discourse of the clerical print subculture, in the rituals of catechism and in parish interactions,
ministers designated themselves as religious patriarchs, ruling and providing for their congregations according to a distinctively masculine and familial model of authority. In the first part of this chapter I will examine the language of spiritual fatherhood, as articulated by clergy in a range of printed and recorded contexts. I will look at how this rhetoric defined and gendered clerical power, clerical authority and the nature of pastor-parishioner relations. In the second half of the chapter, I will look at how ministers actually functioned as public fathers. Focusing on incidents of parish conflict or disorder, I will look at how ministers asserted paternal authority and how parishioners accepted or contested that authority. I will argue that the claims of ministers to act as public fathers could bring them into conflict with other private and public patriarchs, as their assertion of authority challenged the manhood of high-status parishioners or disrupted other patriarchal relationships of power and dependence in their parish or congregation.

Both the discourses of early modern patriarchal thought and the dynamics of lay-clerical conflict have been the subject of significant historical research. Gordon Schochet's early intellectual history of patriarchal political theory in England established the widespread presence of patriarchal models of both nation and household. He argued for a correspondence between printed theories and social and gender relations, heavily emphasizing the most authoritarian models of patriarchal power propounded by theorists such as Robert Filmer. Subsequent arguments by Margaret Ezell, Margaret Sommerville, Rachel Weil and Mary Beth Norton, while granting the commonplace presence of patriarchal ideas, have revised Schochet's conclusions regarding the degree of authoritarianism present in both patriarchal theories and actual families.
The language of spiritual fatherhood that this chapter addresses is both gendered and political, and emerges from the 'popular patriarchalism' originally noted by Schochet, that permeated the assumptions of writers, readers and hearers in a wide range of genres. Its specific source is not polemics and theories of the early modern state, but sermons, manuals and catechetical scripts prescribing clerical and lay conduct in practical terms. Both Susan Amussen's 1988 monograph on gender and class relations and Paul Griffith's 1996 monograph on English youth and the politics of age have analyzed the patriarchal content of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century sermons, advice-books and expositions of the fifth-commandment. They have respectively shown the widespread application of the fifth commandment in these texts to the relationships between husbands and wives and adolescents and authority figures. They have also shown the gap in those relationships between printed theory and personal practice. In this chapter I will import some of Amussen's and Griffith's questions and insights into the different relationship between pastors and their people.

In his recent monograph on the Restoration and Georgian clergy of Wiltshire, Donald Spaeth has focused on intraparish conflict between ministers and parishioners. David Cressy has also addressed the topic in a recent essay on Elizabethan and early Stuart parish relations. Spaeth and Cressy agree that open hostilities between ministers and parishioners were usually "attacks on individuals rather than…generalised anticlericalism." They also point to the same cluster of causes of conflicts between individual ministers and laypeople, including tithe disputes, pastoral neglect or the puritan tendencies of either party. Neither Spaeth nor Cressy performs any sustained analysis of the role of gender in shaping the causes, language and conduct of these
conflicts. Spaeth and Cressy are right that multiple local and personal factors come into play in these episodes. Below I will focus on the patriarchal role-playing of both minister and laymen in parish and congregation relations. However, I make no claim for early modern manhood as an exclusive determinant of these incidents. It is important to remember, that whether harmonious or violently estranged, the full dynamics of a pastoral relationship can never be reduced to a single component part.

The language of spiritual fatherhood

As I've noted in Chapter one, seventeenth-century ministers drew on a conventional body of biblical metaphors to represent themselves and their vocation. As Tom Webster has observed, a significant portion of these metaphors emphasized clerical manhood. Clerical authors liberally used the Bible's martial and magisterial language to associate their vocation with the potency and courage of soldiers and the authority of princes. But in the game of clerical self-fashioning, the language of spiritual fatherhood was uniquely powerful and plastic. Evoking the very core of physical and social manhood in early modern England, the language of fatherhood was intensely charged with masculine meaning. Encapsulating the many and diverse qualities associated with fathers and parents, it was also highly flexible. Ministers used the language of spiritual fatherhood to discuss the personal, homiletic, catechetical, administrative or disciplinary aspects of their work. Paternal rhetoric lended itself to a range of clerical self-characterizations, from generative to protective, from authoritarian and sternly corrective to tender and nurturing.
This rhetoric was also intrinsically relational. To use the language of spiritual fatherhood was to invoke and define a relationship, the relationship between ministers and those they ministered to. Ministers were not simply fathers, they were "fathers of faire families," as Thomas Oxley described his colleagues at his 1608 synodical sermon at Durham. The role of patriarch presupposed a set of dependents whom the patriarch protected, provided for and disciplined. Thus, through the language of fatherhood, seventeenth-century ministers not only defined themselves as spiritual providers and governors, they also defined their parishioners as spiritual dependents subject to clerical authority. In doing so, clergymen proposed their preferred terms for the pastor-parishioner relationship, acknowledging their vocational obligations but demanding maintenance and obedience from parishioners in return.

The same language styled the parish and church as a religious household. Of course, in that ecclesiastical household the parish minister was ultimately a proxy patriarch, acting in stead for God, the "holy householder" and divine ur-patriarch. Ministers described themselves as foster-fathers for "God's children" or as "steward[s]" for "this great Family of which Christ is the head." They were "overseers" and "watchmen" for "God's house" or the "House of Israel." But whether the mastery was direct or devolved, the rhetoric of household government was a political language that associated clergymen with roles of authority and administration. In his 1607 pastoral manual Richard Bernard iterated some of the paternal and managerial titles scripturally conferred on the clergy: "Cor. 5.19 Elders. Act 5.20. 1.Tim.6 Overseers. [and] Tit. 1. Fathers." Compiling a similar (but lengthier) list in 1661, Samuel Clarke concluded that "All...[these titles] imply superiority, rule and authority." But ministers did not
only draw on the terms of household management to extol their religious dominance. They also turned to household language when reminding colleagues of their duties or when discussing the practical problems of their job. Quoting Luke 16: 2, the late Stuart bishop of Sarum Gilbert Burnet exhorted his ministers to "Give an Account of thy Stewardship, for thou mayest no longer be a Steward." Charles Richardson used it to discuss the challenge of tailoring religious instruction to "the capacities of the hearers…[a]s a good Steward appointeth…food" according to individual needs.

Although the language of spiritual fatherhood was used to describe a range of clerical activities, the aspects of pastoral work articulated above by Clarke and Richardson predominated: the function of spiritual providing (and the procreative tropes often tied to providing) and the function of spiritual governing. Both of these functions implied a relationship between a spiritual superior exercising these functions upon or on behalf of a spiritual dependent. Evoking the supply of pastoral basics of such as homily, ritual and informal instruction and care—the essential staples in the layperson's basic spiritual diet—the language of feeding and providing was profoundly nurturing. Such language was maternal as well as paternal. Through the language of feeding, ministers depicted themselves as all-purpose parental figures, metaphorically assuming the functions of both genders. John Rawlinson informed his readers in 1607 that "In the family of Gods Church [ministers] are not only Patres, Fathers…but they are also Nutritis, nursing fathers." Nursing parishioners with the "sincere milk of the word" was a common trope for describing preaching and catechism. Both I.M. Green and Tom Webster have noted its prevalence in printed catechisms and sermons.
Although superficially feminizing, the language of nursing empowered ministers by emphasizing the spiritual helplessness and dependence of parishioners. Maternal language—even more than paternal language—was fundamentally infantalizing. Fatherhood was deployed to evoke a range of age relationships, from those with infants to those with adult offspring and household members. But clergymen used maternal language almost exclusively to depict the care of very small children and infants. It thus reduced parishioners (especially "the ruder sort") to "children," "little babes," or "Gods poore sucklings" who were "simple…ignorant" and afflicted with spiritual "weakness". Mothers (or wet-nurses) were the sole source of sustenance for infants. Fathers supposedly provided more globally for early modern households, apportioning to both "children and servants…meat and drink" and other necessities. The language of spiritual fatherhood encompassed and appropriated maternal imagery within a larger category of religious providing "milke for babes and meate for men," supplying the "care of the Souls of Young and Old, that they want not their proper food." This rhetoric of pan-gendered paternity allowed ministers to characterize the nurturing aspects of pastoral work using a range of power and age-relationships.

While potentially representing a continuum of parishioner dependence (or pastoral condescension), all depicted father-dependent relationships asserted the claim of custodial ownership associated with parenting. That custodial claim was intensified when ministers defined themselves as actual fathers, rather than proxy or foster-fathers. In some early modern theories of familial authority, the act of biologically fathering a child established an absolute claim of authority and custody over that child. This custodial claim was termed the "father-right." In reproductive practice, providing for a
child usually followed the making of that child. But in clerical writing, spiritual
procreation usually proceeded backwards from the act of spiritual providing. When
referring to the minister' s soteriological duty to save souls through preaching and
instruction, the language of spiritual feeding frequently mixed with the paternal language
of spiritual begetting. Though ultimately God was each Christian's father and saviour, a
minister could view himself, in his role as spiritual nurturer, as an instrument of
salvation.

Through his 'providing' of preaching and other spiritual sustenance, he could
prompt a parishioner to become aware of their sin and God's (strictly rationed Calvinist
or freely available Arminian) grace, and encourage them to reform themselves
accordingly. In the language of spiritual fatherhood, such prompting and encouraging
became a kind of pastoral procreation. Samuel Clarke informed his lay readers that
ministers were "Spirituall Parents…[who] beget you unto God." Preaching and teaching
were explained in this context as a practice of phallic penetration. Robert Pricke
explained the spiritual birds and bees as a process of "begett[ing]…men anew by the
effectuall preaching of the Gospell." Procreative rhetoric collapsed the distinction
between parishioners as children of God and charges of the ministers serving in God's
stead. Invoking tribal logic and Levitical law, Henry Hammond clarified how a
parishioner could have two spiritual dads. In his 1639 sermon ad clerum he explicated
that

This is our trade, my brethren, to beget children unto heaven, and according to
the Law of God in Deut. now our elder brother (Christ) is dead, we are the men,
who by right of propinquity are obliged to raise up seed to our elder brother. O
let it not be our reproach to go thus childless…to bereave our Saviour of that
seed.
Ministers were younger brothers, fathering spiritual children to continue the tribal patriline of Christ. Using the reproductive language of sex and seed, writers like Pricke and Hammond gave the concept of spiritual paternity a causal legitimacy. They argued that their pastoral care literally recreated their parishioners as regenerate Christians. Their procreative claims implied political ones: the custodial possession of their religious offspring, the spiritual "father-right" to rule their parishioners.

Thus, the joint languages of providing and procreation insinuated the custodial possessiveness of a parent-child relationship. This ownership was expressed in the terms ministers used to refer to their congregations, "the children who[m]," William Perkins declared, quoting Isaiah, "[God] hast given me."36 "Children" or "family" were not the most commonly used terms, but the two terms in constant usage—"My People" and "My Flock"—evoked an equally strong sense of closeness and custody. These terms saturated clerical discourse, both printed and private. Pastoral manuals and guides from 1600 to 1695 advised "Ministers [to] love their people," "not to be discouraged, though our people become our enemies," and "study to reform the Lives and Manners of their people." (italics mine)37 They similarly instructed ministers to "look to yourself and the whole flock, over which the holy Ghost has made you overseers," to "teach those of his flocke" and to guard against "Hereticke and corrupt men who (as ravening wolves) would prey upon & devour his flocke."38 These terms appeared with equal frequency in clerical diaries, reflecting the mindset and approach of practicing ministers. During the late 1640's the Essex rector Ralph Josselin wrote of the pleasures of a prayer meeting with "my people" and the problems of disciplining "my flocke."39 Serving a non-resident
cure in Cambridge in 1683, Isaac Archer lamented in his diary that "because I lived from my people … [I] could not doe them that good I might otherwise." However, he was encouraged by the size and attendance of his parish, noting that "my charge is increased" (italics mine).40.

The clergy's paternal claim of patriarch-style custody and authority implied a claim of patriarch-style responsibility. With the possession of a dependent "people" or "flock" came the obligation to spiritually safeguard and provide for the individuals encompassed within those umbrella terms. Ministers like Josselin and Archer used the terms when articulating their sense of pastoral duty, describing the nuts and bolts of providing for their parishioners, or expressing their fears that their attentions were insufficient or ineffective. When catechisms, sermons and pastoral treatises depicted clergymen as public fathers, they reiterated the responsibility and expectation to provide their spiritual dependents with "the immortall foode of Gods word" and all the other staples of Christian "welfare and happinesse"-- just as a father was expected to provide his dependents with the material necessities of food and shelter.41 Samuel Edgerton admonished ministers to "feed the flocke of God which depe[n]deth upo[n] them."42 In 1616 Charles Richardson charged ministers to provide simple religious instruction as "a Father should cut a loaf of bread in pieces to feed his children," and averred that ministers who neglected their responsibilities to preach were "more hard-hearted than the Dragons…more cruell than the Ostriches in the Wildernesse" who abandoned their young to starve.43 Underlying these declarations of paternal responsibility to provide was an assertion of power. Biological or spiritual fathers were specially obligated to provide for their respective dependents because they ultimately controlled the necessary material or
religious resources. Clerical control over essential spiritual commodities led to what Samuel Clarke in 1660 dubbed the "great and necessary dependence of People upon their Ministers for their Soules good." Patriarchal power and authority derived from the privileged access of patriarchs to social, cultural economic resources that their dependents required.

Expositions of the fifth commandment regularly suggested that the one of the necessities supplied by public and private fathers was discipline and order. In the clerical rhetoric of spiritual fatherhood, the procreative "father-right" and the power of providing supplied the justifications for the paternal function of spiritual governing. Yet the very assertions of paternal authority seemed to imply the contested legitimacy of that function, and parishioners' resistance to it. As I will explore further below, adult parishioners may not have welcomed being treated like children. Likewise, private householders may not have enjoyed seeing their prerogative to morally discipline their servants and children superceded by the local minister. The prescriptive discourses of catechisms and sermons ad clerum acknowledged the possibility of such resistance, but such acknowledgments were accompanied by a more forceful restatement of the same clerical paternalism. Parishioner resistance was often reframed in these texts as the disobedience of unruly children. Meanwhile, the imposition of clerical authority was represented as the benevolent correction of a patient public parent. In his 1693 sermon ad clerum, George Trosse likened "a great and numerous Family, wherein are too many unwise and headstong Persons" to a contentious parish of "weak and peevish ones…proud and self-conceited ones…unruly and extravagant ones…[needing] the Rule and Guidance of a Minister." Texts admonished parishioners to show filial-style
submission to the spiritual government of their ministers, while warning them of their
dependence on their ministers for the necessities of eternal life. [example] For some men
to be public fathers, others had to be children, regardless of the latter's perceptions of
themselves or their ostensible superiors.

The language of spiritual fatherhood exhibited these conventions throughout the
seventeenth-century. However, the texts which featured it most prominently—
catechisms, expositions of the ten commandments, pastoral manuals, sermons to or about
the clergy—were produced at different moments in the century, under changing political
and ecclesiastical conditions, and sometimes in response to specific perceived challenges
to clerical authority. This is an overview of the language of spiritual fatherhood; an in-
depth analysis of how shifting historical circumstances shaped the rhetoric of clerical
paternalism is beyond the scope of this chapter. However one significant example bears
mentioning: the rise after 1650 of treatises and guides on pastor-parishioner relations, as
exemplified in Samuel Clarke's 1660 *Minister's Dues and People's Duty*, George Trosse's
1692 *The Pastor's Care and Dignity and the People's Duty* or the anonymously authored
1684 *The Case of Peoples Duty in Living under a Scandalous Minister, Stated and
Resolved*. The majority of these texts were written by Presbyterian or Independent
ministers. All of them were written in response to the lasting, transforming impact that
Oliver Cromwell's policy of religious toleration had on the habits and attitudes of the
English laity. From 1650 to 1660, church affiliation and attendance—at least within the
parameters of Protestantism-- became largely a choice. During this period, beneficed
ministers were not guaranteed an audience on Sundays or compliance during the week.
They had no recourse to ecclesiastical courts to enforce parishioner deference and defend
clerical status and dignity. Clerical authority was without its institutional crutches. In the absence of institutional enforcement, interregnum ministers of beneficed and gathered congregations penned manuals to assert their parishioners' continued responsibilities to pay, reverence and mind their minister.

The institutional supports of episcopal courts and enforced Anglican communion were reinstated at the Restoration. However, both Anglican and dissenting clergymen continued to generate these texts during the final decades of the seventeenth-century. Presbyterian and Independent clergymen establishing congregations after the grant of limited toleration in 1687 had to draft new pastor-parishioner contracts of obligation and obedience, which could maintain clerical authority outside the disciplinary structures of the English church. Their Anglican counterparts, such as the anonymous author of *Peoples Duty Living under a Scandalous Minister*, had to counter the residual notions of parishioner choice that survived the English Restoration. These texts made frequent recourse to the language and logic of spiritual fatherhood, to assert clerical authority and to define pastor-parishioner relations. During different points in the seventeenth-century different challenges to clerical authority arose and the circumstances of lay-clerical relations shifted. The rhetorical impulse of English clergymen to respond to these challenges and changed conditions with a language of clerical fatherhood and lay dependency remained a constant.

Paternal language both reflected and shaped the reality of the minister's role as a supplier of necessary religious and social services. Ministers were the leaders and central spiritual providers for their parishes or congregations. Their exclusive access to office and their exclusive monopoly over liturgical and homiletic services endowed them with a
certain power and authority over those under their jurisdiction and in need of their services, just as the legal status and privileged control over financial resources of fathers and householders endowed them with authority and power over their dependents. Paternal language set clerical power and authority in terms familiar to both clergy and laity. The relationship with a biological, step or foster-father was generally a seventeenth-century English individual's first and most direct experience of patriarchal authority and government. That first form of patriarchal authority possessed a primal legitimacy grounded not in early modern theories of father-right, but in physical proximity, emotional attachment, and material dependence. Deploying the imagery and language of fatherhood allowed the clergy to naturalize their disciplinary authority and their parishioners' liturgical, homiletic and pastoral dependence. Paternal language conferred the lay-clerical power relationship with legitimacy and provided it with a ready-made set of expectations and a pre-existing repertoire of interaction rituals.

But in expositions of the fifth commandment, the texts where public and private parents were discussed together and where spiritual fathers were most explicitly compared with their biological and political counterparts, the rhetoric of patriarchal power and authority was a rhetoric of responsibility and mutuality. In these texts obedience and reverence were returns ideally merited by faithful fulfillment of the obligations of authority. Expositions of the fifth commandment explored both the implications of the neglect of patriarchal obligations and the abuse of patriarchal power and authority. The disobedience of dependents in response was never explicitly condoned, but its cause and effect possibility was implicitly evoked. As I will show below, outside the clean margins of printed catechisms and sermons ad clerum, in the
messy social arena of parish and congregation relations, the connection between clerical inadequacy and parishioner disobedience and disrespect was more overt and endowed with *de facto* justification. Likewise the political and theological rationales that positioned ministers as public fathers empowered to spiritually govern private householders did not always seem so natural to those householders, or their dependents.

**The paternal power of the spiritual provider**

The clergy propounded in print the laity's "great and necessary dependence" and their own instrumental power to spiritually sustain and govern them. But what actual power did ministers have as public fathers? Did the language of spiritual fatherhood translate into parish practice? This section explores how the theoretical descriptions of ministers' patriarchal resources and responsibilities may have matched up with some forms of power exercised by individual ministers in their parishes. Keith Wrightson has suggested that power in early modern England can be partly understood as a social practice, which dynamically constitutes and shapes a relationship between individuals or between two or more groups of people. This section looks at incidents of clerical privileges and practices, being actively asserted, actively performed or actively neglected. By providing or denying spiritual necessities, ministers created a patriarchal relationship of productive (or neglectful) power between themselves and their parishioners or congregants.

Ordained clergy possessed what was essentially a monopoly on the conduct of public worship and Christian ritual. As noted above, the effectiveness of the monopoly varied throughout the seventeenth-century. During the interregnum, the religious policies
of successive republican regimes effectively disestablished the English church and gave Englishmen and Englishwomen a range of Protestant choice in worship; after toleration was instituted by James II in 1687 a certain degree of that choice returned to English dissenters. However, whether Church of England, Presbyterian or Independent, for the majority of English laypeople a trained minister was the only viable provider of religious services. And when "no settled Minister" was available, laity such as those in early Stuart Towersey, Oxfordshire went "destitute often times of ordinary service in the Churche." These "ordinary services," such as preaching, praying and catechizing, baptizing the newborn and burying the dead, were the most basic necessities 'spiritual fathers' provided. And they were primarily performed within the metaphorical 'household' of the parish church.

Power relations in early modern society have often been most easily penetrated through documented incidents of conflict; records are rarely generated by the many moments where authority is respected or where elite responsibilities are benignly and productively fulfilled. Accounts which effectively demonstrate the positive power of seventeenth-century English ministers faithfully discharging their duties are comparatively thin on the ground. Although traces can be found, such as the successive complaints and presentments from the Oxfordshire parish of Banbury. In 1672, pastoral neglect (and perhaps conspiracy with local dissenters) had, in the eyes of one parishioner, left the church with "no more Esteeme for the place sett apart for God's worship than if it were a Barne." In 1685, the arrival of the minister John Knight had, by his "care & pains" in providing the essentials of worship, transformed the parish to one where "the parishioners for the most part doe resort to his ministry not only to hear sermons but
Though not explicitly chronicled in fatherly language, Banbury's fall and redemption was presented in terms of power, hierarchy and household: from a collapse of "Esteeme" and "reverence in the house of God," to a rise in obedience signaled by parishioners dutiful attendance of "his [the vicar's] ministery."

The power of spiritual providing, however, was more often and more vividly exposed in its breach. When ministers withheld—either negligently or punitively—basic spiritual provisions, they demonstrated the twinned facts of parishioner dependence and (be it however limited and problematic) clerical power. This section examines actual conflicts between ministers and parishioners. For evidence of such conflicts, it depends primarily on Church of England disciplinary records. As such, the section focuses on Church of England ministers. Legally and professionally obligated to provide at minimum the liturgical services specified in the canons, Church of England ministers could deprive parishioners of Christian essentials such as divine service, baptism, Lord's Supper and burial in two ways: through negligence or through their disciplinary prerogative to withhold sacraments from those morally unfit to receive them. Either could illustrate the vulnerability of laity to those public fathers who provided their spiritual and liturgical needs.

Negligence in a minister's duties to his spiritual dependents was an abuse of patriarchal power. And while failure to provide Christian service did little to enhance clerical authority, it could certainly underscore parishioner dependence. As scholars such as David Cressy has shown, the religious rites marking momentous and stressful life events, such as christening, churching, marriage and burial, provided people in early modern society with vital tools for making transitions, soothing grief and relieving
emotional pressure. Any deliberate neglect or withdrawal of ritual services was upsetting, but particularly in moments of physical emergency or death. A minister's refusal to do liturgical housecalls in crises could be especially devastating. Baptism was especially contentious, as some clergy denied dying infants an emergency baptism as an object lesson to the parents and parish in the Calvinist doctrine of predestination, by which souls stood or fell by divine decree, and not by sacramental intervention. Nonetheless, Church of England clergy were required to provide it whenever possible. A minister's refusal to do could cause tremendous trauma for the parents. When Henry Sybson, the parson of Bewcastle, Cumberland was prosecuted by the York Court of High Commission, one of the central charges was his refusal to baptize dangerously ill infants, a refusal attributed to his unseemly absorption in various business enterprises. Several parents came forward with complaints, the most poignant being the account of John Henderdon, whose child died unbaptized, reportedly while Sybson was attending to business at a local coal pit. Henderdon had left his wife and infant to fetch the minister from the parsonage house, unsuccessfully beseeching Sybson "for Godsake to goe with him to christen his childe."55

Parishioners of Bunbury, Cheshire were distressed not only by curate John Swan's callousness in denying sick infants emergency baptisms, but also by his refusal to "come and repayre to women that weare sicke and not able to come to church to be purified."56 Benjamin Shilletoe, the late Stuart vicar of Conisbrough, Yorkshire, denied dying parishioners the comfort of a last sacrament and grieving relatives the small blessing of a competent burial. Elizabeth Elam complained that when her mother "lay very sick & weake and was very desirous to receive the holy sacrament and this Dept sent for the sd
Mr Shillitoe there severall times to come and administer the Sacrament to her but he refused soe to doe." When his wife died, parishioner John Button sent for Shilletoe "being then at his owne house…[but he] would not come to read the Service." Button ultimately had to ask the local schoolmaster had to perform the burial.\textsuperscript{57} These parishioners had some recourse after the fact to episcopal authorities, but in the moment of ritual need they were all strikingly dependent on their public father to fulfill his public function.

When using the paternal language of feeding spiritual children, clerical authors typically emphasized preaching and catechism as the most essential nutriments. Such rhetoric criminalized the paternal irresponsibility of ministers who withheld the vital food of Gospel, and belabored the spiritual vulnerability of their neglected 'families'. Voicing their own view of their ministers' paternal obligations through the media of visitation presentments and church court proceedings, parishioners sometimes articulated a different hierarchy of spiritual necessities, one that prioritized crucial rituals of membership in the Christian community. But these parishioners' denunciation of clerical neglect communicated similar assessment of the acute dependence of parishioners on their spiritual providers. For a minister to forsake his responsibility to spiritually provide for his parishioners was an act of neglect and an abuse of power. The impact of such an abuse demonstrated the degree to which ministers' control over spiritual and ritual necessities was a form of power, and how that power could place laypeople in a relationship of spiritual dependence.

Punitive withholding of the sacrament of communion from those out of charity or impenitent in sin was not an abuse. It was a canonical, if sometimes hotly contested,
disciplinary right of ministers.\textsuperscript{58} However, a minister could abuse or unwisely exercise this right. Misused or disputed cases underscored that the right to refuse communion was perceived by both ministers and their people as the right of one to exercise power over the other.

Unlike liturgical and homiletic neglect, ministers argued that withholding communion from those unfit to receive was an act of pastoral care, rather than an abuse of pastoral power. Communicating while remaining in a state of "scandalous, open and notorious evil" put the unworthy receiver in a position of compounding their sin by desecrating the most holy of God's ordinances.\textsuperscript{59} Denying several people communion, including a local worthy, netted the late Stuart Lincolnshire vicar John Rastrick a generous helping of parish resentment. Rastrick however claimed only a disinterested concern in his congregants' spiritual welfare, reportedly loath to let "them think they took their Life, when they were in danger to take their Death" at the communion table.\textsuperscript{60} Ministers also represented the right to refuse communion to "evil Livers" as sometimes their only pastoral leverage in bringing a parishioner to personal reformation.\textsuperscript{61}

The ease by which a minister exercised his power to withhold the sacrament depended in part on the cooperation of his parish. As I have noted in Chapter one and will explore further below, barred communicants frequently disputed the minister's decision. But as listed in treatises on how to administer or receive communion, most of the "notorious" sins meriting sacramental deprivation had social impact: fornication, drunkenness, theft, barratry and scolding all disrupted community life.\textsuperscript{62} When neighbors agreed on the antisocial effects of a parishioner's sinful state, they looked to and supported their minister's power to withhold communion. When Anne Gerlangton of the
parish of Wivelingham, Cambridgeshire was presented in 1624 for scolding, the churchwardens noted approvingly that "being persuaded by our Minister for to [sic] reconcile herself, she refused for to do it, and soe she was put from the holy communion by the Minister." For the churchwardens of Wivelingham, their minister's power to deprive Gerlangton of the sacrament was a positive mechanism of social order. However, parishioners also feared that ministers could preferentially abuse that power. Collective resistance to the sacramental deprivation of a neighbor was sometimes rooted in the suspicion that a minister had denied communion out of personal enmity, rather than selfless pastoral concern. Parishioners in Arrington, Cambridgeshire complained in 1602 that "there is a controversy between Mr. Utley our Minister and Edward North and he [North] would have received the Communion and he [Utley] would not suffer him this last Easter."

Refusing communion was an expression of the power of the clerical provider, who controlled his spiritual dependents' access to liturgical resources. But it was also an expression of the authoritative power of the minister, whose right to spiritually discipline his parishioners gave him the power to define his parishioners' spiritual status and to control aspects of their conduct. Refusing communion was an act of judgment and discipline. It was a minister's assertion of his authority as a spiritual father. Religious office made ministers public patriarchs, entitled to preside in spiritual matters over the laity in their parish. But a minister was also a neighbor among neighbors, and a householder among other householders. Where did his status as a patriarch among patriarchs stop, and his authority as a patriarch over other patriarchs begin? Utley contended that he was a spiritual father, rightfully exercising discipline over Edward
North as a wayward parishioner. But the Arrington presentment effectively argued that Utley was a fellow householder, unlawfully using his religious power to win an earthly dispute.

Neighborly relations and everyday personal conduct were officially designated arenas of spiritual regulation. This perpetually blurred the jurisdictional line between the minister as public father and the minister as fellow householder. When could a minister legitimately assert spiritual authority in his informal relations with his neighbors? When did his economic or social interactions with other householders compromise his pastoral priorities? The unstable social rank of ministers in seventeenth-century England created additional confusion and contest over the extent and application of clerical authority. How did age, rank and the prerogative of private householders to discipline their own dependents clash with the disciplinary prerogatives of ministers as spiritual fathers? These are the questions I will explore in the next and final section, where I will examine ministers' attempts to exert authority, impose discipline and extract deference from parishioners, in episodes concerning communion, catechism, church order and personal conduct.

**Clerical Authority, Parish Discipline and Competing Patriarchies**

Ministers claimed a paternal authority to govern their parishioners. This in turn produced the patriarchal power to demand deference, define them morally and spiritually, and discipline their conduct. The Anglican writer Michael Altham characterized this authority in 1684 as a position of "Spiritual Guide[s]" and "Governours of the Church."[^65] "Submission is due to them [ministers]," the Presbyterian Samuel Clarke proclaimed, in...
perfect agreement with Altham on this point, "upon the account of that power they received from Christ, to call their people to account for their miscarriages…by censuring, judging or passing sentence." Clarke characterized clerical authority as both "compulsive, as well as directive," encompassing the rights to instruct, correct and command. To use Altham and Clarke's language, a minister guided or directed through his pedagogical function as a moral and spiritual instructor. He governed or compelled through his juridical functions, imposing church order, demanding moral behavior, and subjecting his parishioners to spiritual discipline by a range of interventions from sacramental deprivation to presentment to higher church authorities. In all of these contexts the minister ruled as a public father. As we have seen above, printed assertions of pastoral authority presented its patriarchal shape and exercise as theoretically unproblematic. But the task of instructing, admonishing and disciplining parishioners did not occur in the abstract and neatly hierarchical relations described in catechisms and pastoral treatises. Within any parish or congregation, age, wealth, rank, local reputation or household affiliations established a web of coexisting and potentially conflicting social hierarchies. To successfully reprove and regulate any person under his spiritual jurisdiction, a minister had to negotiate these alternate patriarchies. He had to persuasively assert that, at least in that context, that his office of spiritual father outranked other forms of paternal authority.

All these alternative source of patriarchal status could place clergymen at a disadvantage. Rank, wealth, age and local connections were all areas of potential vulnerability for ministers. As several historians have noted, seventeenth-century clergymen occupied an ambiguous position within the social hierarchy of rank, especially
in the early Stuart period, which saw a comparatively large percentage of sons of the trades- and husbandmen classes matriculating at university and taking orders. Additionally, despite the supposedly blanket dignity of the clerical office, not all positions were created equal. A curate did not have the same status as a rector. As I have examined in chapter two, the minister's economic position in the parish often combined limited financial resources with a strong degree of economic dependency on the tithes and stipends of parishioners. Taking a position fresh from university, a new minister was easily much younger than many of the men and women he was hired to instruct. Living among them, he was a neighbor, placed from elsewhere by self-promotion or preferment, he was also an outsider. His tenure, even if it lasted the length of his life, was ultimately transient, his freehold temporary, his position to be passed on to another stranger from Oxbridge. Over the course of their lifetime, parishioners in seventeenth-century English villages might see three, four, or even five successive ministers occupying the local pulpit. A minister had to position his claim to possess the authority of a public father against the contrasting claims of male parishioners who might be older, richer, better-born, and more deeply rooted in the residential community. He had to persuade these private fathers to recognize his authority as a public father over themselves and their dependents.

Seventeenth-century ministers were aware that their claim to act as public fathers could cut across competing male hierarchies of age, rank and wealth and the competing male prerogatives of individual household heads. Far from always confident and comfortable in their fatherly role, ministers recorded in their diaries and memoirs their intimidation and accumulated grievances at instructing adult parishioners and imposing
moral discipline. Even the most hierophantic pastoral manuals acknowledged the daunting problem of admonishing and disciplining men older or gentle in rank; pastoral how-to texts urged a combination of persistence and social delicacy. When it came to the squirearchy, letters were utilized as an especially private medium of reproof, and one that alleviated the face-to-face risk of receiving an all too possible verbal or physical thrashing from the reprimanded gentleman.

Ralph Josselin and Henry Newcome were young ministers serving civil war (1642-1649) and interregnum (1649-1660) parishes in Essex and Lancashire, where Presbyterian and Independent innovations in church government and sectarian resistance to clerical authority further complicated traditional problems of disciplining men of greater age, wealth and rank. Josselin made several diary entries in 1647, recording his struggle "to acquaint my people with the misteries about church order." As he labored to re-impose his religious leadership under new congregational conditions, Josselin resorted to potently patriarchal language and imagery for psychological and spiritual support. "[T]he lord my god make mee as a hee goate before my flocke in this worke," he prayed in one entry. In 1649 Newcome was twenty-two years old and had been installed at the chapel of Goosetree for only a year when he resolved to withhold communion from two "scandalous" high-status congregants, Captain Baskervyle and Mr. Kinsey. Considering himself "raw and ignorant," and noting that "men usually [were] flying off, or flying in their [ministers'] faces, that were dealt with in this capacity," Newcome cautiously informed each man by letter "in a mild and sincere manner." As Newcome had feared, Baskervyle first reacted with anger and affront. However, Newcome successfully barred him from the communion table, and brought Kinsey to a
full and public repentance. For Newcome, providence, grace and spiritual office
redeemed his youth, inexperience and lack of local status, endowing him with paternal
power: "this authority the Lord gave me when I was so weak and poor in my work."74

Certainly many parishioners and congregants submitted to the occasional
admonitions and disciplinary interventions of their ministers. Even John Rastrick
conceded that the majority of parishioners he warned away from communication "would
take my Advice, when I thought them unfit."75 But Captain Baskervyle's "storm[ing]" in
response to Newcome's spiritual censure was a response reenacted in parishes throughout
seventeenth-century England.76 When a minister admonished, instructed or corrected an
adult—and especially an adult male—parishioner, he subjected that parishioner to a
power relationship that starkly elevated the minister as a teaching or disciplining father
and explicitly reduced the parishioner to the status of spiritual dependent. For the
parishioner, that experience could be shaming and emasculating; a public act of
instruction or correction further intensified the potential dishonor. Thus, barred from
communication until he had reconciled with his neighbors in 1605, the Swaffham
Bulbeck, Cambridgeshire parishioner John Grange the elder angrily objected to
"depart[ing] with such disgrace."77 He termed the minister Edward Smith a "supposed
vicar," "Conicatcher," and "Notorious Lyer," then declared that he "had noe authoritie to
speak so unto him in that place."78 When the Church of England vicar reprimanded him
in 1672 for his non-conformity, the Flintham Yorkshire gentleman Richard Harker
resorted to violence to restore his status and honor. Harker "tooke hold of…[the] Coller"
of the vicar Edward Guy, "violently pulled him to the ground…tooke him by the haire of
his head and bunched and smote him with his foote."79 As a non-elite but elder resident
of the parish, Grange did not challenge the paternal authority of Smith’s position; he attacked Smith’s personal fitness to be a public father. He used the language of masculine insult to demean Smith’s integrity and deny the legitimacy of his ministry. Meanwhile, as a man of rank, Harker opposed Guy's nonviolent clerical authority with the physical force of gentry manhood, using kicks and blows to subordinate Guy's spiritual fatherhood to the worldly patriarchy of land and title.

Fury and fisticuffs represented a rejection of the minister's public fatherhood both by the presence of verbal and physical insult and by the utter absence of deference. A parishioner receiving pastoral correction was expected to respond with the display of physical and verbal deference or "reverence" conventional to relations between patriarchal authorities and inferiors. In church the physical performance of deference to both God and minister entailed sitting quietly, removing one's hat and alertly attending to the minister. In informal interactions it required respectful body language, proper use of clerical titles, courteous speech in ordinary conversation and sufficiently submissive speech when corrected. In such cases proper deference might have been "removinge his hatt [when walking past the minister] or speakinge to him [the minister] as befitted a p[ar]ishioner."80 Through deferential conduct, a parishioner acknowledged the minister's claim to spiritual authority and his right to discipline or define him or her. To answer a minister's instruction or admonition with irreverence rather than deference, was to reject his patriarchal authority. It was a refusal to submit as a spiritual dependent.

Such refusals abound in church courts and visitation presentments. In Swaffham Bulbeck, John Grange the elder was a textbook case of parishioner irreverence: during his conflict with the vicar Edward Smith, he persisted in "unreverently wear[ing] his hat in
the time of divine service" and upbraiding the Smith with "furious, intemperate and uncharitable speeches." 81 When Malcom Johnson, curate of Wisbeck St. Mary, Cambridgshire admonished John James for his tavern-frequenting in 1632, James "answered he cared not a Fart for me and he would never come to our chapel any more." 82 The same year, Thomas Harrison of Elvington, Yorkshire "abuse[d] the minister in speaches when he [the minister] reproved him." 83 Rebuked by the minister for disturbing divine service in 1634, Jonas Harker of Bagby Yorkshire retorted that his supposed spiritual father was a "a proud saucy rogue." 84 Meanwhile when Harker's neighbor, the weaver John Simonson, was "called to the minister to be catichised [sic]," Simonson announced that the minister "was a proud shitchill soe he would not come to be catichised." 85

Disrespect could be communicated bodily as well as verbally. In 1615 the Yorkshire farmer William Belwood greeted his minister with a parody of proper deference making "a low curtesy in derison and mockage wth his hat in his hande." 86 "Grinninge," "irreverent laughter," "carrying himselfe unreverently to his Minister," and throwing "two heavie lyme stones" were other seventeenth-century responses of adult male parishioners to clerical discipline. 87 In 1630, George Welbourne, the minister of Great Shelford, Cambridgshire, received both verbal and physical irreverence from the elder and younger members of the socially substantial Pattison family. When Welbourne admonished Robert Pattison the younger in church for jostling on the pew, Robert Pattison the elder "stood up and said...'What is that to you, Vicar, keep your own seat and be an honest man, you have nothing to do here'." 88
A reproach delivered in an alehouse or in church was a public reproach. John James and Jonas Harker were not only disciplined as spiritual dependents; they were disciplined and subordinated in the presence of their fellow householders, their fellow private fathers. Although adult catechism did occur in seventeenth-century England, public catechism was primarily associated with youths and children. To call an adult weaver like Simonson to catechism was to equate him with the "little babes," or "poore sucklings" who needed basic instruction.

Rebuking the son of a high-status parishioner in the presence of his father was to usurp Pattison the elder's prerogative as a private and high-status father to regulate his own dependents. Correcting the younger Pattison’s conduct during divine service in the church, George Welbourne was acting as the head of Great Shelford’s spiritual household, while inside its ritual and physical bounds. Pattison the elder saw things differently. For Pattison, Welbourne was not a public patriarch heading a spiritual house. Welbourne was just another householder, a mere "honest man," who was intruding in matters that did not concern him, the conduct of one of Pattison’s private dependents. Pattison claimed his jurisdiction as a private father superseded Welbourne’s as a spiritual father.

In early modern England, public patriarchy was premised on private patriarchy. A man's fitness to govern his household as a private father reflected on his ability to function as public leader. As I explored in Chapter One, a minister's failure to maintain visible order and obedience in his household could undermine his authority and damage his credibility as a religious leader. But not all threats to a minister's public fatherhood originated within the parsonage house. Private patriarchs could undermine their
minister's public authority by refusing to cede jurisdiction to the minister to teach and discipline within the church, as Pattison the elder did at Great Shelford. Or, as I will examine in Chapter Four, they could use the arena of interhousehold relations to humiliate a minister simultaneously as public and private father. Attacks on a minister's wife, children or servants during divine service, for instance, both demonstrated a minister's impotence to protect his private dependents and his inability to control his parishioners' conduct in church.

The 1623-1624 feud between the Bartlow, Cambridgeshire households of parishioner Henry Flack and Rector John Baker demonstrates how a householder and his dependents could do both. John Baker's interrogation of Flack's maid, Joan Guye, on the fifth commandment, noted above, was the first evidence of tensions between the two households to surface in ecclesiastical presentments. But Baker's account of his altercation with Guye indicates the possibility of an unfriendly history between the two households. Spotting Guye repeatedly crossing the churchyard, Baker's very first question was to ask if she served in Flack's household, "to which she answered 'I' [aye]."

Regardless of Baker's feelings towards Guye's master, Baker framed his exchange with Guye as a spiritual father disciplining an unruly parishioner, rather than a private householder questioning a neighbor's servant. Deeming Guye's behavior as "verie unfit for any maidservant to answer any minister," Baker first quizzed her on the scriptural justification for his authority. He then ordered her to attend catechism the following Sunday, where he proceeded to explain that, in the fifth commandment,

the word 'honor' did extend to magistrates and ministers especially the minister of her parish... and because she had behaved so irreverently to me and that in the churchyard, she had worthily deserved to doe penance.
Baker thus further situated his demand for deference and obedience within the physical boundaries of his public role. He described Guye's shortcuts through the churchyard "as it were braving near my door." He emphasized that Guye's impertinence was "being done in the churchyard" and "in the chancel."\(^91\)

Guye however, refused to honor Baker as a public father. Her body language bespoke disrespect rather than deference. She answered Baker's catechetical questions "with a bold face" and "in a laughing manner." She "scorn[ed] to turne her face towards me [Baker] but her backside" when he confronted her in the churchyard. Verbally she refused to recognize Baker's right to reprimand and instruct her. When asked the meaning of the fifth commandment, she told Baker "she would tell me when she saw cause."\(^92\)

Isolated from the context of her employers' household and intraparish relations, Joan Guye could have been a young woman independently flouting local hierarchies of gender, office and age. Her continued irreverence, rather than "submit[ing] herself and...[being] sorrie for her former misbehaviour", in her second encounter with Baker could have been personal intransigence.\(^93\) But acting as a member of the Flack household, under the supervision of her master Henry Flack and her mistress Elizabeth Flack, Joan Guye appears to have been selectively submitting to the patriarchal authorities around her. It is likely that the Flacks would have known of their maid's first exchange with Baker in the churchyard and of her Sunday detention he had handed out in response. Typically the Flacks would have been expected to take some responsibility for Guye's first outburst of insolence to the rector, directing her to show respect and
contrition when she attended catechism. But evidence suggests that the Flack's may have had no interest in encouraging their servants to show due deference to the rector. Guye's mistress, Elizabeth Flack, was presented the following year for disrupting worship by intruding onto the rector's pew. Mrs. Flack "usurp[ed]" the pew reserved for Baker's family in order to pester the rector's daughter, "in the time of divine service and sermon turning herself sidewaies or backwaies toward's Mr. Baker's daughter who she [Mrs. Flack] doth…keep at the low end of end of the seat." Thus, the Flack family struck back at Baker as both a spiritual and literal householder. Creating disorder during service, Mrs. Flack disrupted Baker's dominance over his ecclesiastical household. Jostling and displacing Baker's daughter on her pew, Flack insulted a member of his private household." Harassing Baker's private dependent in order to challenge his public authority, Mrs. Flack demonstrated the interdependent ties between private and public fatherhood.

Baker's position as a public father was defied and derided first by a neighbor's serving maid, and then by her mistress. The private householder responsible for the two women, Henry Flack, only enters the story obliquely, inquired after by Baker or read into the record as Elizabeth Flack's husband and head. I can only suggest, rather than prove, that these social skirmishes between members of the Flack and Baker households represented a clash of parish patriarchies. However, Baker energetically attempted to assert his authority as a spiritual father over dependent members of the Flack household. He propounded the version of the fifth commandment that equated him with Guye's "natural father," he used the formal instruction of catechism to underscore his point, and he subjected both women to ecclesiastical presentment, an institutional corrective
designed to uphold the dignity and authority of the minister. Meanwhile members of the Flack household retaliated in ways that assaulted his dignity as a spiritual patriarch and insulted Baker as an ordinary neighbor and private father. Unlike Robert Pattison the elder, Henry Flack does not (at least in the visitation record) take active steps to thwart the rector's authority. But nor did Flack support Baker's authority by restraining his wife and servant. In the logic of private and public patriarchy, social order depended on cooperation: ideally, private householders compelled their dependents to obey public authority; public officials likewise upheld the private dominance of household heads. Flack's passive encouragement of his dependents' disobedience may have been as pointed rejection of Baker's public authority as Pattison the elder's suggestion during service that the minister sit back down and mind his own business.

The Flack's may have been punishing what they perceived as Baker's abuse of his public position, using his authority as a public patriarch to harass Flack's servant as part of dispute between Flack and Baker's private households. Or their conduct may have stemmed from spiritual objections. Baker was a regular target of parishioner complaints; he himself was presented in 1624 for hedging on the Sabbath and failing to provide weekday preaching and prayers. Joan Guye and Elizabeth Flack may have decided that Baker had forfeited his position as a spiritual father when he neglected of his duties as a spiritual provider. Likewise, by permitting his private dependents to flout Baker's public authority, Henry Flack may have been contesting the general power of spiritual fatherhood. Or he may have more specifically rejected Baker's fitness to be a spiritual father, and Baker's discretion in using his spiritual power to instruct and discipline. If the latter, Flack may have viewed Baker as an unfit spiritual father due to lapses in his
spiritual duties, or due to Baker's lesser rank or questionable actions as a neighbor and fellow householder. Either way, the contested paternal authority of Rector John Baker raises provocative questions as to how ministers participated in the overlapping parish patriarchies of public fatherhood and private householding, how the two could come into conflict, and how ministers' status and conduct as public fathers could rebound upon their private households, and vice versa.

Conclusion

Current historiography reminds us repeatedly that early modern neighbors were constantly involved in the moral regulation of each others lives, through active interpersonal intervention, through gossip and rituals of shaming, through the economy of reputation, and through the active appeal to church and secular courts. What are we to make of these narratives of the unofficial early modern institution of neighborly intervention, when we set them alongside the above incidents of expressed resistance of seventeenth-century parishioners to the moral intervention of their ministers? Whether or not early modern individuals and families genuinely and peaceably accepted neighborly intrusion into their affairs, it seems that one potential problem with pastoral rebukes and interventions stemmed from the fact that they were not neighborly. Describing parish society as an association of patriarchal households unified by the principles and practices of neighborliness, Keith Wrightson has suggested that the dynamic and mutual bonds between neighbors of economic, social and moral interdependence meant that neighboring households functioned as "effective if not actual equals." In Wrightson's model, neighborly censure of conduct was the criticism of a relative equal—or a member
of a relatively equal household—regarding a breach of what was a common and implicitly agreed-upon code of neighborly and respectable behavior. Pastoral admonition and discipline, on the other hand, was an assertion of paternal authority, over fellow adults and their dependents. As I have explored above, a minister corrected his parishioners, not from the level stance of a fellow neighbor and householder, but from the nominally elevated position of an official authority figure, a spiritual father with moral jurisdiction over the entire parish.

I would not, however, assume that parishioners, and especially adult male parishioners, always viewed their ministers' authority as either illegitimate or even undesirable. Some private fathers rejected their ministers' moral and spiritual intercession and instruction. Making proclamations to rector, vicar or curate such as "I am as good a schollar, as thou arte, [a]nd as worthy to bee the p[ar]son, as thou art, and gett the[e] from me for thou stinke," such men may have viewed their ministers as neighborly equals falsely presuming to act as spiritual betters. But when parishioners claimed to be "as good a man" or "as worthy to bee the parson" as their minister, they may have been expressing an objection to the man, to that particular public father, rather than the office. A more impressive scholar, a more effective pastor might have won their willing deference. There were always latent tensions, potential conflicts between a minister's role as a public patriarch and his parishioners' role as private householders. But despite inherent points of conflict, public patriarchy and private patriarchy were expected to work mutually. I would suggest that private patriarchs were more than willing to support their ministers' authority when they perceived it operating in their common interest, suppressing disruptive and marginal elements in the parish. When they
objected to a minister's presumption to reprimand and discipline as a public father, they
typically did so for one of two reasons. They perceived that the minister was abusing his
power or authority, either by failing to be worthy of his position and fulfill his
responsibilities, or by misapplying his public power to private matters such as personal
disputes with his own neighbors. Or they perceived his public fatherhood as a threat to
their own manhood. In such cases, the minister may have refused to negotiate coexisting
parish hierarchies of rank, wealth and age, failing to shape his admonitions to fit the
status of the one being admonished. Alternately, the parishioner may have taken offense
at a minister's presumption to discipline him, regardless of how the minister's reproach
was couched. Either way, it points to the fact that any patriarchy, whatever place and
period, is never simply a system by which men seek to rule women. It is also always a
system by which men seek to rule other men.
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CHAPTER 4
PUBLIC HOUSEKEEPING AND PARISH CONFLICT: THE POLITICAL LIVES OF CLERICAL WIVES AND CHILDREN

Introduction

In 1678, the octogenarian clothier Roger Sheppard defended his testimony concerning the disputed ownership of a Wakefield, Yorkshire church pew. He did so by pointing to the alleged owner's high profile. Sheppard was certain of his knowledge of "the old pew where the viccars wives antiently sate" because he naturally "tooke more notice of the viccars wife then of others." Sheppard treated the special visibility of the minister's wife and family in the church and in the parish as a simple social fact.

In Chapter One, I examined the consequences of that high visibility for clerical manhood and clerical dignity. I argued that the presence of a wife and family made the maintenance of clerical dignity contingent on the maintenance of household honor, the collective honor that depended upon the obedience and good conduct of all a household's dependents. When household honor became an element of clerical dignity, clerical householders became subject to higher than normal standard of household order. Subjected to parish scrutiny and expected to reflect the holiness and morality of the minister's vocation, a minister's family had to conduct themselves in such a way "that he and they may be examples to the Flock of Christ[.]" Lapses in that conduct could potentially dishonor the clerical householder as both a man and minister; his dishonor as
an individual clergyman could in turn diminish the collective dignity of the clerical vocation. Thus, we saw in Chapter One how ministers, parishioners and church officials acted to regulate the conduct of clerical wives and families. And we saw how these formal and informal acts of prescription and policing worked to extend and impose a minister's vocational identity onto his family. It defined them as a clerical wife and children, and it incorporated them into the "Tribe of Levi."

In this chapter I will examine some different ways in which that identification affected ministers' wives and children. To ecclesiastical and state officials, clerical colleagues and the parish or congregation, the wife and children of a resident minister were never simply a neighbor's or householder's family. They were "the vicars wife," "the parsons wife" or the "Relations of a minister of J[esus].X."

They were "daughters of Levi," "the fruit of the body of a gospel-preacher" or a "pious & good churchwoman." In moments of tension, even in effectively Protestantized seventeenth-century England, they were "Priests bastard[s]" or a "pa[r]sons whore." They were positioned and indelibly marked by their relation to the local minister and to the ministry. This identification with the church and the local churchman placed them under scrutiny and made them unusually visible, in the eyes of the congregation, ecclesiastical hierarchy and the English state. This identity and visibility could endow clerical family members, wives in particular, with informal influence and power within their communities. This identity and visibility could also make them acutely vulnerable.

The spiritual status and charitable responsibilities of the entire clerical household allowed clerical wives and sometimes children to exercise unofficial but significant forms of local influence. This influence arose from what, in the early modern context, Sara
Mendelson and Patricia Crawford have termed "public housekeeping": the conventionally feminine labors of nurturing and domestic care performed by the wives, daughters and dependents of men in public positions, for a larger clientele or community outside their own private household. Acting as a domestic deputy of their husband or father, clerical wives and children could dispense charity, medicine, spiritual counsel, moral reproof and "example[s]...to live well and Christianly" to the women, youths and poor of the parish or congregation. They could also mediate between the minister and these groups of congregants, serving as a go-between for women, servants or other marginal parishioners who were afraid to approach the minister directly.

By practicing public housekeeping, a wife or child could use their husband's or father's ecclesiastical position as a platform from which they could exercise informal authority and lay claim to an informal pastoral role. When they were successful, both the clerical patriarch and clerical dependents benefited. The clerical wife or child drew informal authority from their relationship with the minister. Their exercise of that authority rarely undermined or subverted his own authority as pastor and household patriarch. Rather, their public housekeeping most likely enhanced his ministry and his status. Thus, the public housekeeping of clerical wives and children was generally a socially conservative phenomenon. Through public housekeeping, they wielded authority or influence in support of their patriarchal household head, expressing their investment in his social or spiritual status and their willing identification with his pastoral vocation.

For clerical wives and children, public housekeeping was the potential positive of their special visibility and their identification with the minister and the ministry. But just
as wives and children could share in the minister's "Crown of Righteousness" and Christian mission, they were, along with the minister, frequently fated to endure the "Affronts, Accusations, Contradictions, Evil Intreaties" and "Persecutions of Tongue, Hands, Sword, [and] Prison" that were an occupational hazard for the clergy. This dragged them into the middle of conflicts both local and national, as attacks on them were also attacks on the minister. But as dependents of the minister, they were in certain ways more accessible, less threatening, safer targets. And as social subordinates and "private people," they lacked the full range of institutional and patriarchal weapons and defenses available to the minister. Yet on the other hand, their lack of standing made other social tools available to them. And the identification with the minister projected upon them by parishioners and officials was often reciprocated with their own equal commitment to their father and husband's profession, reputation and religious principals. As much as we will see below wives and children were attacked on account of the profession, social position or religious politics of their husband and father or on account of the sheer visibility that came with it, we will also see wives and children stepping forward to defend their husband and father with the personal, private and domestic means at their disposal.

In the following sections, I will examine the public housekeeping of clerical wives and daughters, and the opportunities for social and spiritual leadership that that public housekeeping produced. Then I will examine the role of clerical wives and children in local conflicts and one national dispute, the English Civil War. I will show how their clerical family identity and their visibility positioned them as targets for parishioner and Parliamentarian hostility. And I will also explore how they expressed
their commitment to their family and the ministry by stepping forward in these conflicts to defend their husband or father.

**Pastoral Duties and Public Housekeeping**

By the time charges were finally filed against their minister in 1691, the parishioners of Knaresborough, Cumberland had a store of complaints. Prominent among their many grievances was the parson's choice of habitation. He had dismantled the original parsonage house, which had "adjoyn[ed]…the church there." Worst of all, he had reused the timber to rebuild a house distant from the church and "on the other side of River" from the main part of the parish. Between the distance and the fact that flooding often made the river impassible, the parson's new dwelling "hindered" parishioners' access to their minister. And for the people of Knaresborough, this was a serious problem.

In many rural parishes, there were typically at least two households that had special paternalist obligations to keep order and care for the welfare of the entire community. One was the local manor. The resident gentry family often exercised authority over local affairs and, ideally, offered the community other forms of aid. Spatially, however, a manor was usually built at a distance from the rest of the parish, set off from the central clump of cottages. And socially, the manor's residents were decidedly set apart from the majority of tenants and freeholders residing in a parish.

The other household was the parsonage. And as the Knaresborough parishioners pointed out in 1691, it was a different story. As they did with residents of the manor, parishioners sometimes turned to the parson to exercise authority. They also might go to him seeking all sorts of help, from basic legal services to medical care to cash charity.
But unlike the manor, parishioners expected to have the parsonage and its inhabitants nearby. Furthermore, ministers were classed as middling-to-better sort. In rank and authority, they stood a bump above the average congregant. But only a bump: socially, their pastoral charges expected to find them highly approachable. Unlike the local gentry, a minister had a pastoral duty to be available to congregants in need. This was in part for crises that had liturgical aspects. Parishioners wanted their clergyman on hand to perform emergency baptisms or attend a dying adult. But they also wanted him around for more everyday matters: to settle a fight, draw up a will, tide over the poorer sort with alms, offer a spot of hospitality or simply give advice. This obligation to be available thus applied to his actual physical dwelling. It should be accessible and centrally located, putting a minister at reach of any parishioner who needed him.

This pastoral duty to be available did not only take in the location of the minister's house. It often extended to the minister's household. It particularly fell upon the clerical wife. When the minister had secluded himself in his study or had left the parsonage on business, parishioners looked to her to make the minister available. She thus often served as the parsonage receptionist, calling the minister down for visitors or fetching him from elsewhere when needed. In cases of liturgical necessity, a responsible clerical wife would even hire a stand-in minister if her own husband was unreachable. For instance: when Lemuel Tuke, the vicar of Gresly, Yorkshire was in London in 1637, a man came to the parsonage and told the vicar's wife that "he had a child to baptize." In her husband's absence, Mrs. Tuke thus "did procure one Mr Holland a minister to come to the Church at Gresley…to baptize the said Child."
When it came to sacraments and public worship, her gender and her lay status prevented Mrs. Tuke herself from filling in for her husband. She had to bring in someone with the right professional and gendered qualifications, both clergy and a man. However, she could step in to fulfill some of the more informal pastoral duties, including some of those that often brought parishioners to the parsonage. In fact, certain clerical duties, especially hospitality, charitable giving and attending the sick, were nurturing activities culturally associated with women. Clerical wives and daughters were often encouraged to take on these pastoral duties. They were encouraged to perform conventionally feminine labors of nurturing and domestic care for people whom were not part of their private household, but whom were under their husband's or father's care in his capacity as a public office-holder. In short, they were encouraged to perform "public housekeeping."

The "public" part of public housekeeping meant that clerical wives and daughters dispensed charity or nursed the sick on behalf of the minister and his office. At times this meant accompanying and assisting the minister in his pastoral or charitable rounds. At other times it meant acting alone, especially in primarily feminine contexts. This included preparing meals for the minister's guests or attending parishioners while ill, grieving or in childbirth. The public housekeeping of clerical wives and daughters reflected the fact that ministers' informal pastoral obligations implicated the rest of his household. Ministers usually benefited from the public housekeeping of their wives and daughters, which lightened ministers' pastoral load or extended their pastoral reach.

But not all ministers' wives adapted well to the "public" demands of public housekeeping. Jane Blackwell, the wife of an interregnum London minister, shunned the social and pastoral duty of calling when parishioners christened children or buried
relatives. Her aversion to visiting resulted in parish grumbling that she "did it out of…sullen retiredness and affected privacy." Thus, when a clerical wife shirked the call of public housekeeping, the consequences rebounded on her and even potentially her husband. Clerical family members had to take the demands of public housekeeping seriously. As the wife of a post-1688 Presbyterian minister, Elizabeth Bury did not shoulder the same burden as an Anglican wife. She had only to worry about her husband's voluntary congregants rather than an entire, geographically-defined community. Nonetheless, when Bury first proposed marriage to her, the onus of public housekeeping made her seriously consider declining his offer. She hesitated to leave the restful state of widowhood "for the Duties…and the Troubles" that would accompany her marriage to a minister. Only after many days of prayer did she accept Bury's hand. She then resolved in her diary to "spend my Health and Strength" in clerical marriage and pastoral housekeeping. This meant, for her, living "a more active Life, to the glory of GOD and good of Man."15

Elizabeth Bury viewed public housekeeping in two different lights. It could cause "Troubles," making demands on her body and her time. But by involving her in Samuel Bury's ministry, it also offered an opportunity to serve her God and her neighbors. Elizabeth Bury's was not alone in seeing the altruistic upside to public housekeeping. Many clerical wives seemed willing to take on the social and pastoral tasks made mandatory by their position. Anne Petter, the wife of an interregnum London pastor, gamely dispensed charity and hospitality, even though "almost frighted when she saw" some of London's seedier Christians who "came within her doors."16
By tradition and canon, vicarages and rectories served as centers of hospitality and charity. As pastoral duties that primarily involved domestic tasks, hospitality and charity were prominent parts of a clerical wife's public housekeeping. The housework involved in feeding and entertaining ministers' guests appears to have been so taken for granted that its performance was rarely recorded. However, at least two clerical husbands, Samuel Clarke and Oliver Heywood, did note their wives' culinary good works, supplying visiting colleagues and congregants with tasty meals and pleasant hospitality.

Charitable work drew somewhat more attention. Every seventeenth-century parish also had official welfare disbursements, termed "parish relief," funded by a household tax called the poor rate and by deceased parishioners' charitable bequests of money or property. In general, ministers did not solely or principally administer parish relief. Depending on the parish, this fell to the parish clerk, churchwardens and the overseerers of the poor. But when it came to extra handouts and unofficial alms, the parsonage bore a special pastoral responsibility to succor the needy. And as with other Christian duties, the clerical family also had a responsibility to model a heightened and exemplary level of almsgiving to the lay households around them.

As J.A. Sharpe has noted, women's authority over food preparation and household goods made them the primary dispensers of personal charity and charity in kind. It was usually the household mistress who gave hungry or cold neighbors leftover food, worn clothes, or extra coal or kindling. The household mistress also typically handled giving small sums to beggars; some middling and elite households simply budgeted these alms into the mistress's housekeeping allowance.
Thus, in almost every clerical family, wives or daughters were probably involved in pastoral almsgiving. Richard Blackerby reportedly required one of his three daughters to take turns distributing his family's weekly alms. In other clerical families, the minister delegated all household charity to his wife. John Shawe claimed that he allotted his wife a regular "grant and allowance for all such works of charity" separate from her household allowance. Elizabeth Walker's husband calculated that his wife had set aside around £13 (an impressive sum, considering that some curate stipends still fell in the £10-15 range) a year from her gentry-level housekeeping budget for their household's cash alms.

Spiritually-inclined gentlewomen often assumed active roles as local welfare providers, making it a mission to dispense food, clothes or free medical care to needy neighbors. Clerical wives and daughters, however, belonged to a household already endowed with a special charitable role. In some clerical families, this charitable role was amplified by the minister's fame or by the particulars of his job. For example, in interregnum Kingston-on-Hull, Dorothy Shawe's husband John was not only lecturer at Trinity Church, but the Master of Charterhouse hospital. Typically headed by ministers, seventeenth-century hospitals were multipurpose institutions for aiding and controlling the indigent. While often providing medical care to the ailing poor, hospitals also functioned as homeless shelters, workhouses and schools. Thus, Dorothy Shawe's extensive public housekeeping included feeding and nursing hospital residents.

For Margaret Baxter, her husband's fame expanded her charitable duties. From 1662 to 1681, she was married to Richard Baxter, the widely read devotional author and celebrated spokesman of moderate nonconformity. Ejected from his parsonage, Baxter
had no formal parish. But because of his fame, the Baxters were constantly sought and
solicited by dissenters and evangelical conformists from all areas of England. This
brought a stream of distressed dissenters to Margaret Baxter's door, and a pile of petitions
to her letterbox. Believing "we ought to give more or less to every one that asketh, if we
have it," she spent extensive sums on needy coreligionists, especially ejected ministers,
"them in prison for debt...[and] poor widows."²⁵

Elizabeth Walker's charitable efforts were based, more conventionally, from her
husband's Essex rectory. In the years 1689 and 1690 she paid out a hefty £26.3.4 in cash
alms. But she also donated charity in kind. She commissioned a local tailor to sew coats
for disadvantaged children in the parish; she also donated used linens and a new blanket
to any needy woman parishioner on the verge of giving birth. Finally, she distributed
"Primmers, Psalters, Testaments, Bibles...and other good books...to poor Children and
Families."²⁶

Medical care was one final form of charity that both ministers and accomplished
housewives took part in. Ministers were often exposed to the academic study of
medicine at University; knowledgeable matrons learned recipes for medical remedies as
part of the culinary art of herbs and cookery. Both ministers and high-ranking matrons
could put these skills to use treating congregants or tenants who could not afford the
costly care of a physician.²⁷ A clerical housewife who could add the practice of
"Physick" or "chirurgy" to her other duties as a public housekeeper brought a definite
boon to her husband's pastorate. So much so that George Herbert's pastoral manual
recommended that a clerical bride should either come with medical skills or quickly
acquire them after the marriage.²⁸ Clerical husbands expressed pride in wives who
practiced charitable medicine. The Interregnum and Restoration Presbyterian Samuel Clarke noted that his wife's "Closet was never empty" of medical remedies to administer to the indigent and ailing. Restoration rector Anthony Walker marveled at his wife's "store of Vomits, Purges, Sudorificks, Cordials, Pectorals…Chyrurgery Ointments, Oils, Salves, Sear-cloths, &c.," and her "obliging Charity" to use these substances "in assisting the Sick and Infirm" of all ranks, even "the meanest Neighbour."

Some kinds of public housekeeping, such as dispensing charitable food and cordials, fell to clerical wives and daughters because they were domestic chores. But some public housekeeping tasks devolved to clerical wives and daughters because of the gender or age of the clientele. Elizabeth Cotton and Elizabeth Martindale served as conduits to their husbands for women parishioners who were uncomfortable with approaching the minister themselves. When it came to charitable giving, Margaret Baxter and Elizabeth Walker gave special attention to widows or pregnant women and children. Public housekeeping thus addressed the needs of more marginal parishioners, as some women and children found the minister's wife or daughter to be a more accessible or appropriate pastoral resource. It also helped the minister, extending pastoral care to people or places he might not otherwise reach.

One person and place that was definitely out of a minister's reach was any woman in childbed. Labor and the four weeks that followed—termed the "lying-in"—were gender segregated events. During labor, all men were banned from the birthing room. During the lying-in, the new father and other male relatives were granted short visits with the mother and child. Meanwhile, for the duration, the mother and child were attended by women, including a midwife, female relatives and female neighbors.
Sometimes clerical wives or daughters simply attended these events as a feminine neighbor and friend. But as a feminine neighbor and friend, they still retained their identity as members of the minister's family. In a profoundly gendered area where the minister himself could not enter, clerical wives and daughters had the potential to act as his proxies. They could provide charitable and medical support on behalf of the minister, and the minister's household.

As early modern diaries by mistresses of gentry households such as Lady Grace Mildmay illustrate, ministers' wives were not the only women who played the role of charitable care-giver to their parish, village or neighborhood. Certainly many gentlewomen took some responsibility for supplying the material and medical needs of poor tenants. The distinctiveness of the public housekeeping of ministers' wives and daughters lay not in the activities themselves, but in how their performance of those activities intersected with their husband's or father's professional practice and with their own identity as clerical wives and daughters. While contemporary funeral sermons commended gentry-women's charitable activities as part noblesse obligé and part Christian good works, ministers and parishioners alike associated the public housekeeping of clerical wives and daughters with the clergyman's own pastoral duties. Clerical wives' and daughters' almsgiving, social calls and medical care were thus subsumed within the general scope of the minister's vocational obligations.

This did not so much elide the presence of clerical wives and daughters as public housekeepers, as incorporate them into early modern English pastoral practice. Public housekeeping made the social welfare elements of the English ministry a family affair, tended to by all dutiful members of the local "House of Levi." In the process, it
reinforced the identification of clerical wives and children with the English ministry, an identification sometimes willingly (if at first reluctantly) embraced by wives like Elizabeth Bury, other times externally enforced by grumbling congregants and expectant husbands and fathers. Protected by the privilege and distance of rank, gentry and noble women had a degree of choice in how they did or did not discharge their Christian duty to the poor. Ultimately the effect of public housekeeping cut two ways: it placed pastoral expectations and obligations onto clerical dependents, burdening retiring wives like Jane Blackwell; it also made ministers like Anthony Walker or John Shawe professionally interdependent with their wives, relying on their wives' public housekeeping as a critical element of their pastoral success.

**Spiritual Leadership and Religious Autonomy**

Following Catholic precedent, early modern Protestants extracted a patriarchal doctrine from 1 Corinthians 14: 35, "Let your women keepe silence in the Churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speake…They ought to be subject…And if they will learne any thing, let them aske their husbands at home." With their Catholic brethren, they banned women as a gender from formal spiritual leadership. And whether Presbyterian or Church of England, ordained ministers expressed horror at the few but famous incidents of women preaching during the Interregnum. The Yorkshire Presbyterian John Shawe declared that his first wife Dorothy shared his distaste, writing in 1659 that she "never like[d] of women preaching."

Ordained ministers zealously fended off all encroachments on their religious authority, whether from laymen or women. When it came to preaching or public
worship, the boundaries of such authority were well-defined. These were formal acts, performed in a public venue, by the minister as an authorized official. When it came to the more personal aspects of pastoral care, the minister's spiritual authority was less formal. In those contexts, he drew some authority from his office. But that authority had to be supplemented by his personal charisma, personal reputation and personal relationships with the other individuals present.

In early modern England, a minister who handed the pulpit over to his wife or farmed out the reading of morning prayers to his daughter would be courting a quick ejection. By allowing a woman to perform a public office and exercise formal religious authority, such a minister would, in the eyes of his contemporaries, be defying both Scripture and society. However, as we saw in the last section, a minister could share some of his more informal pastoral responsibilities with his wife and children—especially the material, domestic or gendered duties that constituted "public housekeeping." By delegating some informal pastoral tasks to his wife or daughter, a minister devolved to them some small share of spiritual authority. This spiritual authority was limited and second-hand. Wives and daughters derived it largely from the minister; they retained it only so long as they exercised it for the good of him and his pastorate. This spiritual authority was also informal. Clerical wives and daughters could exercise it only in personal and neighborly contexts. They could wield it, for the most part, over women, youths or parishioners palpably of the "mealer sort". For instance, John Cotton's first wife Elizabeth possessed a certain authority over "the people of her own sex" in Cotton's Jacobean Lancashire parish. Likewise, Adam Martindale's eldest daughter Elizabeth won spiritual popularity "among the young women of the parish."
At times, this manifested itself when a clerical wife or daughter acted as a direct representative of the minister's moral authority, such as when a vicar's wife in Berkshire played on her position to silence a woman spreading slanderous rumors about a neighbor. Other times clerical wives or daughters were acting as conduits to the minister's spiritual or social resources, for women too intimidated to approach the minister directly. While he was a minister in Lincolnshire, John Cotton depended on his wife to relay to him the needs of women parishioners. And when a child was being molested in interregnum Rosthern, the child's mother asked Elizabeth Martindale, the wife of the rector for help. Mrs. Martindale then arranged to have her husband interview the little girl and help procure a warrant. It is impossible to discern from the sources whether it was the sexual and disturbing character of the crime or some other factor that kept the victim's parents from approaching the minister directly. Either way, for the victim's mother, Elizabeth Martindale functioned critically as both a confidante and a conduit to the local minister.

This spiritual authority was thus linked to clerical wives' and daughters' visibility and identification with the minister. It was also influenced by increasing expectations from parishioners that a ministers' family would provide an image of "godly livinge…for his parishioners & others to followe." But spiritual authority was not generated passively. Emanating from the relationships and reputations developed while performing public housekeeping, it required active cultivation by the minister's wife or daughter herself. It emanated most often from the relationships and reputations ministers' wives and daughters developed while performing public housekeeping.
After all, those tasks of material caregiving that they performed on behalf of the minister were closely connected to tasks of spiritual caregiving. As pastoral manuals made clear, ministers should nourish the bodies of parishioners through clerical hospitality and almsgiving in hope of an opportunity to nourish their souls as well. Likewise, the pastoral line between nursing and doctoring a sick parishioner and visiting the same sick parishioner to spiritually comfort and counsel them—between cura corporum et cura animarum—was a very blurred one. When clerical wives or daughters took on the tasks of pastoral charity or medical care, the opportunity to spiritually teach, forbidden to them "in church," became available to them in the private venues of cottages, hospitals or the parsonage doorstep and parlor. The ambition to exercise spiritual authority often went hand in hand with the urge to public housekeep. Clerical wives and daughters who overachieved in charitable works frequently professed the Gospel with equal fervor to the recipients of their charity. When beggars came to the door of her husband's London parsonage, Anne Petter gave "alms double for the soul as well as the body." A lecture on piety reportedly came with every coin Mrs. Petter dispensed. While tending to the physical needs of the poor at Charterhouse Hospital, Dorothy Shawe's husband often saw her spiritually "conferring with and advising…them." Such spiritual advising, when directed at parishioners or congregants of the right gender, age or status, appears to have been welcomed by many ministers themselves. It is important to note, however, that these women advised only social equals or subordinates. They did not presume to offer spiritual assistance or moral admonition to male householders. Elizabeth Cotton questioned only her husband's women parishioners
about their spiritual troubles and doubts. The elder and younger Elizabeth Martindales were leaders among matrons and maids. Dorothy Shawe and Anne Petter may have offered religious guidance or admonition to some adult men, but only men so poor that their patriarchal superiority was effectively lost, ceded to women of relative status like a minister's wife. Meanwhile, their husbands and fathers did not at all object to their wives presuming to give spiritual guidance to women, children and the "meanest" sort. These husbands and fathers did not see such religious leadership as encroaching on that sphere of sacred clerical authority and activity reserved solely for ordained men. They did not see it breaching the Pauline ban on women exercising public religious leadership.

Additionally, informal and private spiritual conversation and exhortation offered to social equals or subordinates not the exclusive purview of ministers' wives. Laywomen were just as free as Anne Petter to donate some godly advice along with their alms. But when Anne Petter did so, onlookers perceived her helping her husband's pastorate. Just as the material work of public housekeeping helped to lighten a minister's pastoral load, the informal religious leadership and activism of these wives and daughters was viewed as a benefit to their husbands' or father's Christian mission. This spiritual authority exercised by ministers' wives and daughters was conservative, not subversive. It supported, rather than undermined, the identity and profession of the patriarchal heads of their families. Thus, these women were only doing their part, as daughters and wives of the "Tribe of Levi."

But how far could a clerical wife or daughter go? Elizabeth Walker, wife of the Restoration rector Anthony Walker, and Margaret Baxter, wife of the Restoration Presbyterian minister and leader Richard Baxter, pushed the limits of their informal
religious authority in intriguing ways. Through public housekeeping and informal spiritual leadership, these two clerical wives crafted pastoral roles that netted them notable levels of religious authority and autonomy. This authority and autonomy enabled them to set pastoral policies that extended well beyond their husbands' practice or overrode their husbands' opinion.

As described by her husband in his memoir of her life, Elizabeth Walker's charitable and spiritual activities were extensive. However, her spiritual, medical and charitable ministrations to "Women Labouring with Child" brought her special renown in her husband's parish. Her approach in the birthing room combined the roles of physical nurse and spiritual counselor and comforter. Her husband claimed that parishioners called on the parsonage to request not only her "Advice and Medicines…[but also] her Presence, which was always very acceptable and comfortable to the distressed Woman."47

Mrs. Walker made herself sought by pregnant parishioners by advertising her medical skills and willingness to help. Visits and generous gifts to women who had just given birth further established her reputation and role in the parish. In particular, Mrs. Walker started a tradition of presenting the poor women of the parish "not only old Linnen, but a good new Blanket" to celebrate each birth. This was a significant gift. For newly expanded families of little means, linens were desperately needed commodities and a new blanket a rare luxury.48

The needs of pregnant women, the birthing room and the postnatal period of "lying-in" were all areas largely closed to men, and thus inaccessible to ministers. And yet labor and lying-in would seem to be events crying out for a pastoral presence. Physically arduous and carrying a real—though significantly overstated—danger of
dying, labor was perceived and experienced as a state of emotional and spiritual extremity, a state "between life and death."\textsuperscript{49} The "lying-in" period following the birth was also physically demanding and emotionally fraught time, especially when the infant was sickly or the mother inexperienced.\textsuperscript{50}

Elizabeth Walker made these areas her pastoral domain. She brought medicines to ease the pains of childbirth and her "Presence" to soothe its emotional and spiritual pangs. She created a custom of providing essential linens for the neediest pregnant women in the parish. Her efforts had a powerful pastoral effect; they drew women parishioners to the parsonage to seek her aid and led the poor women of the parish to depend on her as their special patron. These women counted on their new blankets, viewing them "claimable as a due Debt."\textsuperscript{51}

These women counted on Mrs. Walker herself. The Reverend Walker recorded that shortly after his wife's death, a pregnant parishioner informed him that "Now that her Mistress is dead she must come to me." Anthony Walker resolved to continue supplying new blankets during his tenure as rector. But his wife had created more than a custom. She had answered the material and spiritual needs of a distinctive group of parishioners. In the process, she had constructed a vital and well-defined pastoral role, a role her husband lacked the gender and knowledge to fill.

Although married to a Presbyterian, not an Anglican, minister, Margaret Baxter née Charlton had much in common with Elizabeth Walker. Like Mistress Walker, Mistress Baxter came from a wealthy and prominent family. Marrying a minister was a social and financial step downward for Mistress Walker, and for the wealthier Mistress Baxter. Also like Mistress Walker, some of Margaret Baxter's impetus to marry a
minister came from the distressing experiences of melancholy and spiritual crisis, and the alleviating experiences of clerical counsel.\textsuperscript{52}

Being literally manor-born, Margaret Baxter reportedly came to her marriage with the habits and training of a gentry-woman and not a clerical wife. As both her husband and her spiritual teacher, the Presbyterian minister Richard Baxter initially had to instruct her in her charitable public housekeeping. Mistress Baxter had approached charity like a dutiful laywoman, giving "but the tenth of her incomes to the poor." Her husband, however, rearranged her priorities. He informed her that "God must not be stinted," and especially not by "his Stewards," the clergy (and, by association, the families of clergymen). He told his wife to allot all household resources not needed for their or their relatives' basic necessities to promoting religion and relieving the poor.\textsuperscript{53}

Mistress Baxter first adapted to, then exceeded, her husband's standards of charity and public housekeeping. With her Presbyterian husband unable to take a Church of England position, she became his and his hearers' de facto agent and patron. She rented spaces for him to preach in; when that was lawfully or financially impossible, she opened whatever house or rooms they were renting to all Christians interested in her husband "informal" religious talks, bearing whatever expenses were required to host her husband's congregants or large numbers of spiritual "guests."\textsuperscript{54} In his account of her public housekeeping, her husband appeared to fully support her energetic promotion of their brand of English Protestantism and her enabling of his ministry outside the bounds of the Church of England parish system. He lauded her labor, her financial contributions and her informal pastoral activity. He particularly praised her cultivating and recruiting neighbors as spiritual clients, a task made much more difficult by the fact that the Baxters
spent much of their Restoration-period marriage constantly moving and re-establishing themselves in new towns or neighborhoods in order to avoid prosecution for religious Dissent.55

When it came to succoring "the godly poor…[and] the common poor's necessities," Margaret Baxter eventually parted ways with her husband. She was no longer shirking from her husband's stringent charitable demands; rather, her charitable activities had taken on such a scope that he was shirking from hers. Their disagreement centered on two issues: who comprised the deserving poor, and the budgetary constraints of their household's charity. Her husband reported that while he wished to "exercise prudence in degrees of need and worth," Mistress Baxter believed in ministering to a broader constituency. She "blamed me if I denied any one," her husband complained.56

Secondly, her charitable budget had evolved far beyond one-tenth of their household income. It had, in some circumstances, evolved beyond their entire household income. Mistress Baxter had become such an advocate of the poor that she began to seek additional funds to give recipients she had identified as needy. In some cases, she solicited acquaintances and neighbors to donate; just before she died, her husband recorded that she had collected "£8 and somewhat over it" to aid "one of known name and worth."57 In other cases, Margaret Baxter went into debt. While her husband thought I was to give but all my income, and not to borrow to give…she thought otherwise, that while she could give security, she ought to borrow money to relieve the poor, especially the most worthy.58

Flying in the face of seventeenth-century English common law and conventional wisdom that decreed that a husband solely owned all family property and retained ultimate control over its use, Margaret Baxter used their possessions to "give security," and took out
multiple loans, despite her husband's principled opposition. And she did this to pursue her own vision and practice of public housekeeping, a vision and practice that made her pastoral force within the fraught and fractured Presbyterian community in Restoration England. At the beginning of her marriage, Mistress Baxter studied to serve God by helping her husband. However, her convictions and her approach evolved over time, until she was serving God both with her husband, and on her own.

Identity, Visibility and the Clerical Family in Parish Pew Disputes

Roger Sheppard and other Wakefield parishioners claimed they could remember exactly where the vicar's wife sat, because they "tooke more notice" of the vicar's wife than other women. The memories of Roger Sheppard and his neighbors, connecting the "viccar's wife" to the "the viccars wifes seate" where she sat, point to a telling interrelationship between family identity and ecclesiastical space. It suggests the place where the household identity of a minister's family member was most visible and most intense may not have been in the household. Instead, for many watchful congregants and parishioners, clerical wives, children and servants were most obviously clerical in their family identity when they were sitting in church for the rest of the congregation to see. And where, ideally, they did credit to the minister by modeling a proper posture of worship for everyone else to follow.

The clerical family's acutely visible position in the church could also be a position of acute vulnerability. As clerical family members sat in church, parishioners and congregants "took notice" of everything: whether they were present, where they sat, how they dressed, how they behaved. If any clerical family member deviated from Sunday-
best behavior, parishioners and congregants could and did interpret it as a black mark against the minister. To have his own family, his most intimate spiritual dependents, misbehave in church (or even worse, fail to turn up altogether), indicted a minister's Christian leadership, as public minister and a private householder.

This fact gave many ministers and their families highly sensitive to their appearance during worship. This heightened sensitivity manifested itself in a range of vigilant behaviors. Fearing disapproving gossip among their husbands' flocks, some clerical wives ruthlessly monitored their children and servants while at public worship. Elizabeth Walker and Elizabeth Bedell, wife of William Bedell, intervened verbally or physically at the first sign of inattention from one of their children or servants.61 Margaret Corbet, wife of the interregnum pastor Dr. Edward Corbet, motivated her children and servants to sit seriously and attentively by administering a quiz on the content of each week's sermon.62 Afraid of how their absence at worship might appear, clerical wives sometimes forced themselves to come to church even when disabled or extremely ill. Martha Brooks, wife of Restoration nonconformist minister Thomas Brooks, strained to attend services during the severe three-year illness that preceded her death.63 Suffering from a vaguely defined "lameness," Margaret Corbet reportedly had a servant or other household member carry her to her husband's services on the days when her legs gave way.64 After she lost her eyesight, Mistress Anne Archer had her husband Isaac, vicar of several successive Cambridge parishes, lead her by the hand to church.65 Once at church, some clerical wives resorted to various tricks to keep their own conduct during worship unimpeachable. This included the popular puritan tactic of standing during long sermons to stay awake, purportedly a favorite strategy of Anne Petter.66
The visibility of clerical families not only worried ministers with how their families might look and behave once seated in church; it also concerned them with where their families actually sat. In early modern England, pews were a form of property. Local households possessed titles, confirmed through the local church or archdeaconry, to a specific seat in church. Both the placement and the quality of pews varied with the status of the owner. Laymen and women enacted their social status by where and on what they and their families sat in church. Wealthy families purchased pews that put them in the best position to see the minister and be seen by their poorer neighbors. They spent money to improve their pews, building larger or longer seats, enclosing screens and decorative woodwork. As scholarship on pew disputes has indicated, significantly high status was conveyed by a posh, well-placed pew. And there were very high social stakes for many early modern households in possessing one.67

For ministers leading worship in the church, performing the most public and most central aspect of their religious office and vocation, the physical placement of their families inevitably mattered. Ministers complained at ecclesiastical visitations and in church courts when their wives and families lacked what they deemed sufficient or appropriate seating. The vicar of Huxton, Cambridgshire, protested at the 1623 Visitation that his daughter and maidservant were pewless.68 Trying to protect the rector's pew from the competing claims of a landowner, Matthew Crouch, minister of Middleton, Yorkshire, decried the dismal possibility of "wanting a convenient seate, stall or pew for his wife and Children to sit stand kneele pray and heare divine service."69 To his dismay, Robert Constable, the Restoration rector of Thwing, Yorkshire, found that the "rectors wives seate" had been dismantled by opportunist parishioners during the
During the years 1668 and 1668, he filed a series of documents with the church courts of York, protesting that "his s[ai]d wife hath no[ve]nien[ent] seate in the Ch[urch]."70 "[D]estitute" of a pew, Mistress Constable had to beg a "seate in the said church to sitt…by the permission of others."71 To own a seat in the church was to have a place in the community. Leaving Mistress Constable seatless, like an indigent cottager or vagrant, the situation subtly denied the claims of the rector and his wife to a position in the parish. Forcing Mistress Constable to rely on the kindness of other pew-owners even as her husband processed to the pulpit, the situation demeaned Robert Constable's clerical authority, during the period and in the place where his ministry was most publicly enacted.

But even when a minister could settle his family in the right kind of pew in the right kind of place, they remained potentially vulnerable. Their identity and visibility made them irresistible targets for angry or frustrated congregants and parishioners. Sometimes it was the disputed ownership of the parson's pew or "viccars wifes seate" that prompted an at-worship attack on the minister's family. The Wakefield gentleman Thomas Pease did not stop at the church courts when fending off the vicar Obediah Lee's 1677 suit to reclaim the "viccars wifes seate." Using a "violent & p[re]sumptuous manner [Pease] intruded" on the seated Mistress Lee and her children during "Sundayes and holy dayes in time of divine service and sermons and alsoe upon the weeke dayes" in the Wakefield church. For months Pease thus succeeded in publicly harassing the vicar's family and disrupting worship before "the whole congrecacon then assembled to the great p[re]judice of the said Mr Lee."72 Pease recognized that he was at an official disadvantage in their respective pew disputes. He was battling a minister and supportive
church bureaucrats, all comfortably at home in the ecclesiastical-court machine. A layman of status in Wakefield, he opted to redeem his frustration in a pound of clerical family flesh. Harassing or assaulting Lee's family during church, Pease humiliated Lee on two levels at once. Pease shamed the parson as a private householder who could not protect his dependents, and as a public pastor who could not tend to his spiritual flock without enduring insolence and disruption.

Seating disputes were not the only controversies that incited in-church attacks on clerical families. In some cases, those contesting the minister's pew made common cause with other hostile congregants. Contesting the vicar Richard Bubwith's right to a nave-adjoining stall in 1626, Abraham and Robert Nutter enlisted the help of fellow Rodwell, Yorkshire parishioner Gamyliel Goodayle in "molest[ing]" Bubwith's wife and children during services.73 Plain, nonpew-related disaffection with the minister was itself sufficient to justify clerical-family-molestation during church. For the early Stuart Cambridgeshire matron Elizabeth Flack, her family's feud with the vicar John [?] Baker was enough to spur her to "usur[p]" the vicar's pew and jostle Baker's daughter.74 Meanwhile, it may have been confessional objections to episcopacy or personal hostility towards the Bishop of Chester that motivated Joseph Rigby, a parishioner at the Bishop's rectory of Wigan. At one time, he expressed his disrespect by intruding upon the aisle pew where "Curates friends or familiars have sitten or huddled."75 Another time he invaded the bishop's own pew and menaced the bishop's "Chaplains, Ministers, Sonns, Servants, friends and familiars" with a "Crabtree Cudgell."76

Of course, ministers themselves received their share of worship-related injuries from parishioners. There were the clergymen who stickled with parishioners over their
fitness to receive the Lord's Supper, and who were "knocked" at the communion table for their trouble.77 The lectern and pulpit were not always safer places, if congregants were fueled on a potent enough dose of outrage or ale. A minister in Caroline Cheshire was forcibly hauled out of his chapel by a pair of puritan parishioners while reading prayers from the Common Prayer Book.78 Hearing in a Yorkshire alehouse that the vicar Thomas Grindislay had scolded and sent away a few neighbors for strewing rushes around the church, Robert Grotson alias Rodes "hiered a gonne" for two pence, went to the church, and "so sone as ever ye minister had ended his sermone…the foresayd Robt Grotson discharged his gonne, amyng directly over the minister."79

But in general, only the parishioners most maddened with anger or drink dared to invade those priestly spaces, and molest a minister in the midst of leading worship. Most early modern laypeople could not so completely override their internalized rules of religious deference and decorum. Belligerent congregants were on far more comfortable ground flinging fists, stones and insults at a minister outside of church, in the profane and informal spaces of roads, fields and neighbors' homes. If irrepressibly compelled to vent their hostility towards the minister during church, more often parishioners did so from their own pew, using passively-aggressive gestures of disrespect, such as "grininge," "laughing," or "grumble[ing] and murmur[ing]."80

Physically disturbing the minister's family made a sharper statement than gesturing or giggling in one's own pew. It stopped short of an open and transgressive incursion into clerical space and a direct violation of the minister at worship. And it targeted women and children whose gender, age and position made them intrinsically easier to attack, lacking the defense that adhered to adult male status—defenses that
doubled with public office—in England's early modern patriarchal society. But by treating the minister's household dependents as his vulnerable, lesser proxies, it effectively served as an open and potent attack on the minister. By molesting the clergymen's private, personal dependents in full view of his public, spiritual dependents, the congregation, such an attack assailed his competence and authority as both man and minister. It simultaneously demonstrated his fallibility as the patriarchal protector of his private family, while disrupting an attempt to discipline and provide for his spiritual charges. The minister's congregants were familiar (pun somewhat intended) with the political logic of early modern English society, where parish, diocese, county and nation were religious and political households writ large and larger. They understood that public officers functioned as macro-patriarchal heads of those macro-households; they understood that orderly and honorable private householding was a prerequisite for public householding. Witnessing an attack on the minister's private family as he performed his public office, they would not need help connecting the implicatory dots between the two.

**Insults, Rumors and the Vulnerability of Clerical Family Reputation**

Thus, the power and polysemy of an attack on the minister's family during services made clerical wives, children and servants provocative targets when in their pews. Church, however, was not the only place where clerical family members could draw fire from ministers' local opponents. Outside of church, clerical wives and children found themselves insulted, sued or stalked by enemies of their husband or father. When a local enemy jostled, pinched or shoved the minister's family in their pew, she or he was hitting specifically at the minister's honor as the protector and patron of his family and
property. The bumps, bruises and embarrassment inflicted on Obediah Lee's wife or John Baker's daughter were no doubt painful and real. But probably for Thomas Pease or Elizabeth Flack, the role of Mistress Lee or the young Mistress Baker as victims was predominantly figurative. As dependents, Mistresses Lee and Baker represented the power of their respective husband and father to protect and provide; by hurting them, Pease and Flack impugned Masters Lee's and Baker's ability to exercise that power.

Lawsuits, insults, slanderous rumors and sexual abuse directed at clerical wives and children worked differently. On one level, by damaging the emotional or physical wellbeing of a clerical wife or child, these types of aggression also affronted the minister who bore ultimate responsibility for their safety and welfare. But most often, the primary aim of these attacks was to damage the identity and parish reputation of the clerical wife or child. Using insults, suits, rumors and worse to defame the minister's wife or child, such attacks exploited the collective nature of household honor. To tarnish the reputation of any household member was to tarnish the reputation of the household as a whole. The reputation of the household head, who was held responsible by his neighbors for governing the conduct and improving the character of everyone living under his roof, was often injured most of all. For instance, in 1607 the Dewsberry, Yorkshire parishioner Margaret Turpin hyperbolically implied in the outburst "the devill mynd thee, the devill brush thee, and the devill goe with thee, queen," that Margaret Ackeroid, wife of the vicar, was an intimate of Satan. It is unlikely that Margaret Turpin's outrageous slight was widely believed by neighbors. Speaking in the heat of the moment and "w[i]th an angrie and malitious minde," Margaret Turpin may not have believed it herself. But to assault the vicar's wife—and thus the vicar's household and the vicar himself—with
words reeking of damnation and witchcraft was sufficiently scandalous that the Ackeroids brought a defamation suit against Turpin.81

Everyone in the household (except the occasional oblivious boarder or irresponsible servant) suffered when the honor of a family member, and thus the honor of the family, was slighted. Every family member's social standing and identity partly depended on the good name of their household; most family members continually collaborated in keeping it spotless. Wives were especially invested: they wielded significant authority, and thus bore significant culpability, in day-to-day household government.

When a minister's parish opponent subjected the minister's family to an in-pew assault, that opponent was playing particularly upon the wife, child or servant's relationship of dependence on the minister. That relationship of dependence structured the meaning of these in-church attacks. Although the body being pushed and pestered belonged to the minister's wife or child, the identity and honor under attack belonged primarily to the minister. However, when a minister's opponent attacked the honor of the minister's wife or child, that opponent was playing upon the interdependent dynamic of individual and household reputation, and the resulting interdependence of every member of the minister's family, including the minister, when it came to preserving both. Thus, in such defamatory incidents, the clerical wife or child was more than just a body, more than just the physical delivery system for a symbolic assault on the minister's identity. These acts of slander and defamation struck simultaneously at the personal identity of the clergyman, the personal identity of the clerical wife or child and their common identity as a clerical household. The slandered wives or children themselves took a symbolic hit in
an area of profound personal involvement, concerning: their own name and standing among their neighbors, their own identification with the minister as a clergymen and their household head, and their investment in being members of both a respectable and clerical family.

The congregants doing the alleged slandering knew this. Members of households themselves, they were just as deeply involved in the interdependency and collaboration that maintained their own familial identity and honor. These congregants lashed out verbally at the minister's wife or child not only because they identified the wife or child with the minister and his ministry. These congregants did so in part because they recognized the minister's wife or child as an active agent in supporting and maintaining the minister's identity and clerical family honor.

The most briefly reported incidents of verbal confrontation between congregants and clerical family members primarily emphasize how congregants identified the minister's wife or family with the minister-householder and his religious or social role in the parish. Sometimes the insults conveyed the insulter's confessional grievances. In the early Stuart period, those grievances stemmed most often from lingering medieval memories or contemporary Jesuit examples of the Catholic celibate priesthood. Committed Catholic neighbors or—more often—opportunistic and vaguely unreformed Church papists expressed their disaffection with their English Protestant minister by invoking the old epithets of "priest's whore" and "priest's bastard." In King's Sutton, Northamptonshire Hugo Holland's refusal to take communion in 1610 may have stemmed
from recusant\textsuperscript{§} tendencies that similarly fueled his and his wife Deanes's assertion that
Mistress Smith, wife of the vicar, "the first night she was married...gave herself to the
divell."\textsuperscript{82} The Hollands also purportedly averred that "the World was never merrie since
priests wear married"; it was most likely this same unreformed nostalgia for the medieval
culture of church ales and Sunday gaming, rather than doctrinal exceptions with the
Church of England, that prompted the Helmsley, Yorkshire matron Ciriham Hewling to
verbally pummel the minister's daughter "with the reproachfull name of Priests bastard
and other uncivill terms" in 1634.\textsuperscript{83} Goodwife Hewling's husband, a local
alehousekeeper, had been cited for "suffering unlawfull games in his house in time of
divinse service," and she herself had been reprimanded over a bout of Sabbath-day
intoxication.\textsuperscript{84}

In other incidents, disputes with minister over his administrative work or
disciplinary authority, spilled over in verbal aggression against a minister's wife or child.
In 1602, the Barton Yorkshire minister Edward Otbie had a disagreement with John
Hunter over the farming of the rectory's tithes. The disagreement apparently divided
neighbors; Jane Walker, one of Hunter's supporters, chose to voice her opinion to Otbie's
son Francis. She informed young Master Otbie that his father was "auld fornicator."\textsuperscript{85} In
1699, the vicar of Thorpe-Arch, George Wright, refused to accommodate the Sunday
visits of a York convict, Hannah Dickinson (who will appear again shortly), to see her
excommunicate husband who lived in Wright's parish. Hannah Dickinson took out her
frustration verbally on the vicar's wife. This netted Dickinson a presentment for
defamation in 1699.\textsuperscript{86}

\textsuperscript{§} Post-reformation term for English Catholics who continued to practice their faith—in essence, "recusing"
themselves from the faith of the Church of England.
Church court papers contain no record of the specific origin of the Thwinge, Yorkshire householder Robert Constable's ‡ "malitious grudge conceaved against" his minister John Bossall during the first decade of the seventeenth century. But Constable's pursuit of his grudge through the church courts demonstrates in detail how an aggrieved congregant could involve both the minister's family and his own in an assault against his rector's vocational and household honor. In 1608, Constable filed with the diocesan court, charging Bossall's daughter Susan with defamation. Constable kept the execution of his suit in the family; the only deposing witnesses to the alleged incident were his financially dependent granddaughters, Dyna Farthing and Betha Burley. The content of Susan Bossall's purported slur explicitly addressed the state of war between the Constable and Bossall households: "wish[ing]…for he had troubl ed her father and mother wrongefully…that the Devill should fetche him…and that the firste penny the sayde Roberte Constable should retayne… should buy a penny halter to hange him in." While disputing Constable's claim that Susan "dyd curse and damne the sayd Robte Constable," the Bossall family heartily agreed that Constable habored "a malitious hatred against Mr Bossall…& doth seeke by all meanes possible to detracte from his good name, & to bring him, & his life unto obloquie & contempte wth his pshioners at Thweinge." In the Bossall household's version of events, Constable's enmity towards Master Bossall and his religious leadership had found first expression in "untowardly" acts against the minister, such as disseminating a rumor that Bossall had fathered a bastard on a local young widow. But, according to the Bossall family, Constable's agitations against Master Bossall did not sufficiently undermine the rector's leadership.

‡ Not the Restoration (1660-1688) rector of Thwing, Robert Constable, but probably a relation.
Constable then extended his alleged "malitious hatred" past Master Bossall and "towards his [Bossall's] children." "Rayse[ing] suites…[and] molest[ing]" John Bossall's children became for Constable a way to continue his campaign against the rector by other, familial means. At that point, according to the Bossalls and the final court decision, Betha Burley and Dyna Farthing decided to please their grandfather by concocting their report of Susan Bossall's "scandalous wordes."  

The Constable and Bossall family narratives diverged significantly on their account of actual events. But they agreed on other things: how the dynamics of household identity and honor played out in the politics of neighborly conflict; how wives, children and other family relations functioned at once as objects of hostility properly aimed at the householder and as actors taking their own part in these conflicts; and how words and rumors served in these conflicts as choice weapons that simultaneously strike at personal and family reputation and self-regard. Statements submitted to and by the diocesan court reiterated that attacking the reputation of Bossall's children was an effective means to damage Bossall's own good name. In their versions of events and in the very fact of their participation in this parish controversy, Farthing, Burley and Susan Bossall all affirmed their identification with their family patriarch, and their willingness to take their father or grandfather's side in this conflict between a minister and lay householder.

The case complaints, depositions and decisions also acknowledged the specific familial vulnerabilities of a clerical family exploited in this conflict. Explicitly, they stated that by damaging Susan Bossall's reputation and by extension John Bossall's household honor, Constable and his granddaughters would damage Bossall's religious
leadership and pastoral work. Implicitly, they demonstrated why the visibility of the rector's family as models of Christian conduct made Susan Bossall an attractive target for allegations of malicious gossip. A rector like Master Bossall was supposed to rear a daughter who would act as a spiritual and moral leader among other maidens in the parish. Constable's complaint worked by portraying the minister's daughter as the exact opposite: an unchristian young woman who would utter an angry and impious stream of invective against a parishioner, rather than docilely turning the other cheek. It further suggested that far from exercising moral leadership, Mistress Bossall was a bad influence on other young women; the articles of libel emphasized that Mistress Bossall "incorriged" another local girl to join her in maligning Constable.94 Constable's allegation that Mistress Bossall corrupted neighboring youths was a devastating blow against her and her father. It struck at her own local identity and influence as a minister's daughter, because she was supposed to be a visible "exampl[e] to the Flock of Christ."95 And it undermined her father's effectiveness as a religious leader and teacher; how could he preach against unneighborly and sinful conduct to his parish if it appeared that he tolerated or "incorriged" it in his own daughter?

Anger, scandalous speech and the incitement of others to slander and spite were all appalling sins to attribute to a clerical daughter. And they were especially pertinent accusations to make in the midst of a parish conflict. They called attention to her father's professional obligation to promote peace and charity among his parishioners. They invoked the expectation that she, as a minister's daughter, should at best assist her father in his peacemaking duties, through her relations with local youths and young women, and at the very least not hinder peace in the parish by spreading malicious gossip herself.
But these allegations were not the worst blows an opponent could deliver against the reputation of a minister's family member. Nothing undid the honor of an early modern Englishwoman, her household and her household head than an accusation of unchastity, especially when the accusation was aimed at a wife. When a local opponent spread rumors of a clerical wife's unchastity, they ruined wife, husband, household and pastorate. Such an accusation labeled the clerical wife a whore, destroying her credit and influence among her neighbors. Such an accusation branded the minister a cuckold, obliterating his claims to exercise both public and private patriarchal authority, as householder and a pastor. And by undoing the honor and authority of both the master and mistress of the parsonage, such accusations disrupted the functioning of their household and his congregation. The well-supported case of adultery brought against Dorothy Stafford, wife of a late Stuart Northumberland rector, exemplifies the disturbance created by the actual unchastity of a clerical wife. Unable to function as an effective authority figure while his cuckoldry was widely known, the rector abandoned his parish and fled to London. Meanwhile, given the expectation that Mistress Stafford should provide a model of wifely conduct for neighboring matrons, the notoriety of her liaison with a local landowner outraged the entire parish. 96

Evidence of financial provisions made by her alleged lover for Mistress Stafford's second child and detailed testimony from several parsonage servants suggest that Mistress Stafford's illicit relationship was no fiction. 97 An unfounded but persistent and well-disseminated rumor, however, could do almost the same amount of damage. When their wives were in fact cuckolding them, ministers had few good options for recovering their honor as men and their effectiveness as spiritual leaders. But if a minister knew or
believed the rumors of his wife's unchastity to be untrue, he could take aggressive action through the church disciplinary system. He could present the gossiping parties at Visitations, and bring cases against them for defamation in the church courts. Thus, when a hostile parishioner began reporting to neighbors that Mistress Heacocke, wife of the minister of Harkonby, Lincolnshire, "and Peter Tillie, late schooleM' of harkonbie were found in an upper chamber together eyther in bed or upon the bed in the sayd preachers house," the "sayd preacher" Master Heacocke lodged a complaint with the diocesan court against the parishioner and the parishioner's purportedly false and "slanderous charges."98

As scholars of early modern English society have demonstrated, gossip was viewed by contemporaries as serving legitimate and illegitimate purposes. When the gossip was regarded as true, it provided a legitimate, though informal, means of checking antisocial conduct. It did so by dishonoring perpetrators and, when necessary, subjecting them to direct punishment through community rituals of shaming or presentations to formal authority.99 The costs of these punishments could be high; one young man bringing suit in early Stuart Yorkshire testified that he had lost a prospective marriage partner when defamatory gossip damaged his reputation.100 Because dishonor could have such devastating effects, gossip's illegitimate use as a weapon was as loathed and feared as its legitimate policing function was respected. Thus, as Bernard Capp has recently observed, the illegitimate use of gossip was not without risk. Neighbors tested the rumors they heard, weighing the supporting evidence, the creditability of those being gossiped about, and the creditability of those doing the gossiping. When a man or woman wielded an unfounded rumor as a weapon, the damage they intended could
rebound back upon themselves. They could find themselves in court for defamation, and their reputation much worse for wear, as neighbors now saw them as "carrier[rs] of newes [and] sowers of discord."101

The informal allegation of sexual misconduct was an especially explosive form of gossip. Untrue imprecations of unchastity or cuckoldry carried extra risk, especially when directed at a public office-holder and his spouse, such as a pastor and his wife. Two rare cases of stalking and sexual assault inflicted by disaffected parishioners against ministers' wives in Lincolnshire and Cheshire demonstrate the occasional efforts by disgruntled male parishioners to make the whisper of a clerical wife's unchastity a personal reality. In these cases, confessional objections or personal differences with the minister seemed to blend with a hostilely sexual fascination with the minister's wife. This fascination appears to have been fed by the high local profile of the minister's wife as the minister's wife, and the male parishioner's identification of the minister's wife with the minister, both as the minister's domestic and spiritual partner and as his sexual property.

In Congleton, Cheshire in the early 1620's, a parishioner of Pott Chapel purportedly stalked the minister's wife, Margaret Ffletcher. Like the defamation suit brought by Robert Constable in Thwing against his rector's daughter, the stalking incidents were alleged to be part a larger program of harassment directed against the Pott Chapel minister, Joseph Ffletcher. Like many of those who abused ministers' wives and children with the terms "priest's whore" or "priest's bastard," the program's perpetrators seem to have had religious objections against Master Ffletcher. Although, unlike the vaguely papist parishioners who favored slurs against clerical marriage, Master
Fletcher's opponents appeared to have taken a firmly reformed, if not puritan, dislike to the parson. Three parishioners, Richard Meyer, Richard Starkie and Edward Morton joined together in the opinion that Master Ffletcher was a "paltrie…lowsey priest" and a "woolfe in sheepes Clothing" who posed a threat to the spiritual well-being of local Christians. The trio's intensely Protestant rhetorical of clerical insult, which used the terms "priest" and "woolfe" to derisively evoke the allegedly illiterate, incompetent and exploitative medieval Catholic clergy, suggest that they may have found Ffletcher lacking a sufficiently reformed style of preaching or sufficiently reformed opinions on church discipline and ceremony.102

As a result, the three men had allegedly mounted a prolonged assault against Ffletcher's authority and honor, both in and outside of church, with a barrage of irreverent gestures and gossip. These included blowing raspberries at Fletcher while preaching and lampooning Fletcher's "gesture countenance and behaviour" in private company. But their most devastating attempt to "disgrace and scandalize…[Ffletcher's] doctrine and ministerie" was by smearing him "with the ignominious name of a Cuckolde."103

This critical attack required smearing the good name of Ffletcher's wife, Margaret. After Mistress Ffletcher died in 1624, the group satisfied themselves with simply spreading posthumous tales of her purported adulterous liaisons. Her death removed some of the risk of sexual insult; she was no longer present to challenge the

---

* Puritan critiques of the English church in this period had two general modes: 1.) positive propounding of a sermon-centric model of English Protestantism that encouraged frequent preaching, free prayer and voluntary religious activities that were heavy on bible reading and sermon review and discussion; 2. a negative attack on elements of the Elizabethan compromise liturgy and episcopacy, with a special rejection of "popish remnants" such as kneeling for prayer and communion, making the sign of the cross at baptisms, or wearing certain clerical robes, such as the surplice. Joseph Ffletcher could have been a competent but by-the-book minister, and still been found wanting in any of those areas by some parishioners critical of the current church settlement.
charges either by court or simply by the proof of good conduct. But when she was still living in 1623, one of Ffletcher's enemies took a more proactive approach. Edward Morton attempted to entrap her in actual act of adultery or corner her into conduct that would give the appearance of an affair. Goodman Morton allegedly subjected Margaret Ffletcher to his sexual solicitations. He pestered Mistress Ffletcher to "drinke secretly" with him. And when Mistress Ffletcher went alone to the Congleton corn market, Morton "followed ye said Margaret." As he accosted her, Goodman Morton reportedly pressured her to "goe wth [him] to a secret place," or better yet for begetting rumors, a "Chamber in ye usual hostes house [the local inn] in Congleton," where servants and congregating neighbors could witness them taking a room.104

When alive, Mistress Ffletcher's visibility as the minister's wife appeared to both invite and confound sexual insult from her husband's vociferous opponents. Her profile in the parish made her tempting tool for undermining her husband's authority through aspersions of cuckoldry. But her visibility could also make it harder to successfully spread rumors of adulterous behavior. Every show of respectable conduct she made before the eyes of Pott Chapel parishioners presented a challenge to Meyer's, Starkie's and Morton's charges. In this context, gaining actual sexual use of Mistress Ffletcher's body would have offered Goodman Morton several benefits. It would give substance to any slandering he and his allies wished to do. But it also would have been a degrading attack on Mistress Ffletcher's identity as a minister's wife, leading her to act in ways directly against her own obligations to model exemplary behavior, and against her husband's moral teachings. Cuckolding Master Ffletcher personally, Goodman Morton would have delivered a profoundly personal assault on the minister's private and public
dignity, transgressing the most intimate and physical arena of Master Ffletcher's honor as a householder. As it was, this harassment, at least momentarily disturbed Margaret Ffletcher's everyday activity and persona in the parish. And quite audaciously expressed Goodman Morton's contempt for both Master and Mistress Ffletcher.

Meanwhile, the more sketchily documented case against the Lincolnshire parishioner John Smith combined charges of "wilfully and contemptuously" refusing to attend his parish church for the months of March through October 1662, and attempting to sexually assault Elizabeth Dawson, the pregnant wife of the minister of the nearby parish of Abingham, during the same period. Following the 1661 and 1662 ejections of non-Episcopal ministers from English parishes, a number of laity absented themselves from their parish churches, either from attachment to their old ministers or aversion towards the reinstatement of the English Prayer Book liturgy. The articles against Goodman Smith do not make clear whether he "neglected" to attend his own parish because of Presbyterian, Congregationalist, Baptist or Quaker scruples, or because of an obsession with Mistress Dawson. However, the case articles did link Goodman Smith's scorning to worship in the English church and his "violent and uncivill" trespass upon the body of a wife of a Church of England minister. For the diocesan court, both stemmed from Smith's contempt for the church and clergy; both amounted to assaults against the dignity and authority of the English ministry.

John Smith's boycotting of "divine service…[and] a sermon or sermons" at his parish church represented a passive-aggressive challenge to his minister's authority to discipline him spiritually and compel him to worship. Smith's "endeavour to have the carnall use" of Elizabeth Dawson, on the other hand, was a direct attack on the integrity
and honor of a minister and his wife. Like Edward Morton's subtler solicitations of Margaret Ffletcher, Smith's assault attempted to reduce Elizabeth Dawson from a chaste and respectable minister's wife to a mere whore. In the process, Smith's assault also attempted to puncture one of the most basic sources of Master Dawson's patriarchal authority: the chastity of his wife. And although Smith did not succeed in raping Mistress Dawson, he did plenty of damage to her, her husband, their identity and their household. Elizabeth Dawson's injuries, sustained defending herself "in the meane tyme whilst her sayd husband could come to her," left her "very sicke and ill."¹⁰⁷ For Master Dawson, the attempted rape had humiliatingly required him to drop his clerical dignity, with its eschewal of physical fighting, in order to bodily (and, it appears, rather ineptly) "rescue" his wife from Smith's attack.¹⁰⁸ And while Smith had not managed to take Mistress Dawson's chastity, he had claimed a humiliating and emotionally devastating trophy. He forced Elizabeth Dawson to miscarry. As a patriarch Pastor Dawson had defended his wife's honor, but it was in many ways a pyrrhic victory. Coming to her defense compromised Dawson’s clerical persona, and ultimately he still failed to save the child they both were expecting.¹⁰⁹

Of course, clerical households were not the only households to find themselves enmeshed in local disputes. The wives and children of laymen also got shoved and jostled in their pews, or subjected to harassment or slander from their husbands’ or fathers’ enemies. For example, in the early Stuart Oxfordshire parish of Claydon, Goodwife Frances Carter widely dispensed her ill will toward Goodman Thomas Page, his household and his relations. In the village, Goodwife Carter called Page’s wife a "brasen face queen," kept Page's mother "violentlye out of her seate upon Easter day" and
on Whitsunday "did distrouble" Page by similarly blocking access to his pew.110 Meanwhile, Agnes Chapman, of the early Stuart parish of Kings Sutton, went from "Railing and scoulding with on" a local householder, to wishing the same householder's "wiff beinge now with child maye never be delivered of the said child."111 These examples illustrate that the interfamilial dynamic of parish conflict was far from unique to clerical households. Yet the status of the two families targeted by Carter and Chapman is also telling. Thomas Page was a churchwarden, a parish officer charged with assisting the minister in church administration and discipline. Goodwife Carter's pew assaults against Page and his mother thus occurred while he was on duty in the church. The householder on the receiving end of Agnes Chapman's ire was a sidesman, another parish officer with similar functions. Much like ministers, churchwardens and sidesmen often elicited enmity from puritan, recusant or irreligious neighbors in the course "persoeinge...[their] office."112 Much like ministers, these parish officers sometimes found that the hostility they garnered in the line of duty fell as much upon their families as upon themselves.

Arguably, the records of these incidents might simply bespeak the privileged access of ministers and parish officers to the disciplinary machinery of visitations and the church courts. But as scholars such as Bernard Capp, Laura Gowing and Martin Ingram have demonstrated, early modern English laymen and laywomen frequently and quite capably used these same ecclesiastical forums to pursue their own grievances against fellow laypeople and church personnel. Ministers' (not to mention churchwardens' and sidesmens') wives and children were not the only household dependents subjected to abuse from enemies of the householder. But the public office and vocation of the
minister-householder attracted greater attention, and thus sometimes greater controversy and hostility, than other householders. That status and vocation also drew special attention to his family. Identified with the minister and his vocation, the minister's wife and children were inevitably extra visible and in some ways extra vulnerable to certain kinds of attacks, especially attacks on their reputation for being charitable or chaste. In short, because of the central position of a minister in his community, clerical families were very likely to be embroiled in local conflicts. When these conflicts occurred and clerical wives and children were targeted, they were targeted in particular ways that emphasized the religious and professional identity of the minister, and the entire household.

**Clerical Wives and Children as Actors and Aggressors in Local Conflicts**

In early modern England, churchwardens and sidesmen bore the responsibility of policing parishioner conduct during church. Much like high-school hall-monitors charged with stopping running and horseplay, these parish officers were supposed to suppress giggling, jostling and other disruptive or "unseemlie" behavior during church services. But as we have seen, these officers sometimes failed to prevent parishioner misbehavior. So one Sunday in August 1699, Mistress Catherine Wright, the wife of the vicar of Thorpe-Arch, Yorkshire, took matters into her own hands. As parishioner Hannah Dickinson approached the church reading desk where Master Wright "was reading one of the lessons," Mistress Wright grabbed Dickinson "by the head Cloths" and "pushed and thrusted her" around.¹¹³
Witnesses disputed the necessity and the degree of violence, "wrath heate and passion" involved in Mistress Wright's apprehension of Hannah Dickinson. But everyone describing the events of that Sunday recognized Mistress Wright's primary purpose: to protect her husband and his religious leadership. In the two previous sections I examined how the dynamics of household honor and vocational identity made clerical wives and children targets of parishioner resentment. The corporate and collaborative nature of household honor meant that wives' and children's reputations affected the reputation of their husband or father; the masculine character of householder honor meant that it rested partly on the householder's success in providing for and protecting his dependents. Thus, individuals with personal or religious objections against a minister could injure him by injuring his wife or children, in their persons or their reputations. But the same collaborative dynamic of household honor and identity that made clerical wives and children vulnerable to attack could also prompt them to come to the aid of their husband's or father's reputation and ministry. When Betha Burley and Dyna Farthing spread the rumor that Susan Bossall, daughter of the minister John Bossall, had defamed one of her father's parish enemies, it was this common pull of loyalty to the clerical householder and to his vocation as a whole that made the rumor plausible.

When clerical wives and children stepped forward to defend the honor and ministry of their husband or father, they did so for a range of interrelated reasons. Their personal loyalty to the clerical householder and their shared stake in their collective household honor could impel them to respond to insults and enmity aimed at the minister. Beyond a common investment in household honor, many clerical wives and children also felt a sense of identification with and commitment to the clergy's vocation and mission.
Additionally, their practical involvement in the minister's informal pastoral responsibilities gave them a personal stake in the success or failure of his ministry. That cumulative sense of ownership in the family's spiritual "trade" provided motivation to act when others appeared to sabotage their husband's or father's ministry.

When a minister came into conflict with neighbors or congregants, he drew advantages and disadvantages from his clerical office. A minister's status as public office-holder presumably afforded him a small amount of protection, intimidating and dissuading some of the lower sort of laypeople from offering irreverence or attack. And a minister's ecclesiastical resources gave him the ability to deal with certain enemies using the official mechanisms of church-discipline, such as the local churchwardens or the diocesan church courts. But a minister's public position and vocational code of conduct also limited his repertoire of legitimate responses when challenged or wronged. The rules of clerical comportment forbade ministers from resorting to physical violence and strongly discouraged even verbal expressions of rage. Visitation presentments and church court cases indicate that ministers did not always abide by these restrictions. But losing his clerical temper was usually costly for a minister. It diminished his local reputation and clerical dignity. It invited disciplinary action. And because the minister was a public figure, any outbursts or questionable behavior would attract extra attention.

Beset by such constraints, could a minister enmeshed in a local conflict turn to other members of his household to speak or act in ways that he could not? When examining cases of early modern political protest by tradespeople or the peasantry, historians have found generic male householders comparably constrained. English common law differentiated between householders and their dependents. Householders
were classified as independent individuals. They possessed full legal rights and status; they also bore full legal responsibility for their actions. As dependents, women, children and youths were granted little standing in the early modern English legal system. Their rights and status as persons were "covered" or subsumed by that of their head of household. But their legal culpability for criminal or otherwise actionable conduct was likewise partially reduced.

Historians have observed that this gender and age differential in legal responsibility gave women and youths (particularly urban apprentices) a critical role in early modern political protest. They could express community complaints through rioting or vandalism with far less risk of legal consequence than their husbands, fathers or masters. Additionally, historians such as Laura Gowing, Bernard Capp, and Martin Ingram have explored how verbal aggression was part of women's economic and moral work in early modern English and Scottish villages and neighborhoods. These historians have shown how women's family and community roles as buyers, sellers and neighbors required verbal assertiveness in their daily activities and transactions. Ingram has argued that when early modern women's verbal aggressiveness was exercised within understood parameters, contemporaries of both genders viewed it as necessary and acceptable.116

Like ordinary youths and women, could clerical wives and children capitalize on their reduced culpability as dependents? Could they intervene in local conflicts, taking action in ways that their clerical husband or father dare not do? Could clerical wives speak up for their husbands, deploying the same verbal aggressiveness they might use legitimately to barter corn or chastise neighboring children? Evidence from church courts and clerical memoirs gives an equivocal answer. Clerical dependents possessed
the same diminished level of legal culpability as lay dependents. But as I have shown here and in Chapter One, they also possessed a heightened level of social and spiritual responsibility. As the wife, children or even servants of the local minister, they were held to a higher standard of behavior. Though not public officers, as the dependents of a man in a very public position, they were subjected to higher levels of scrutiny. This meant that forms of conduct unacceptable in a minister were usually unacceptable for members of his household as well.

However clerical family members, especially wives, did have access to different, informal sorts of influence than their husbands. Clerical wives also had recourse to different, gendered arenas of speech and social action. Examples culled from church court records and clerical life-writing show clerical wives defending their husbands from slights to his honor. They also show clerical wives working with their husbands to neutralize perceived threats to the success of their husbands' ministry or to the spiritual health of his congregation. In these local conflicts, clerical wives had to choose their battles and their weapons carefully; those who resorted to insults or unseemly behavior invariably did as much damage as good to their husbands' cause. However, as one minister's personal account of his wife's role in a local religious dispute attests, it was equally possible for a clerical wife to offer her husband critical support by strategically exploiting her informal authority and gendered position in the parish.

The rare cases of defamation brought by or against clerical family members suggest that when a minister's wife or child chose to speak up for their husband or father "in a passionate and angry manner," the choice was usually costly.\textsuperscript{117} As I discussed above, Susan Bossall and her family vehemently denied that she would "curse and
Just as ministers were expected to refrain from expressing anger and aggression in their words or deeds, so were ministers' daughters. If the charges of defamation had been upheld, it would have been damaging for Susan, her family and her father's ministry.

When a minister endured abuse from a congregant or became enmeshed in a local controversy, clerical wives and children were often better off standing by while their husband or father turned the other cheek. Mistress Margaret Sweet, wife of the Restoration minister of Welbury, Yorkshire, made the mistake of getting involved when her husband Luke mildly endured "some wrangling discourse" from Goodman Thomas Kirton. mistress Sweet heatedly responded by attacking the character of Kirton and his family. Mistress Sweet declared that Kirton was a "bastard" and that "the Kirtons generation was nothing but whores rouges and theeves." Afterwards, she shared her assessment of Kirton and his lineage at a gathering at a neighbor's house.

The fact that Mistress Sweet's character assassination succeeded in dissuading eligible maids or widows from considering Goodman Kirton's marriage suits may attest to the local influence Mistress Sweet exerted as a clerical wife. But her wrath and words ultimately rebounded on her and her husband. Kirton brought suit for defamation against Mistress Sweet. Embarrassingly, several high-status local householders gave depositions against the minister's wife; she was summoned to the episcopal courts accused of swearing and speaking especially unbecomingly for a woman married to a churchman.

Mistress Anna Griffiths was understandably provoked when the parishioner Thomas Bainton declared her husband Thomas, rector of Rowther, Yorkshire, "as evell as evell could be for" his parish and that "none was worse than he." After all, Goodman
Bainton had attacked her husband's honor as a man and minister. He denigrated her husband's pastoral efforts—and perhaps implicitly, her own informal pastoral work as well. When Mistress Griffiths heard "her said husband wronged" she responded with greater discretion than Mistress Sweet. Rather than succumbing to oaths or slander, she weakly objected on the spot that "Ther is traytors and murderers and is my husband as evell as they[?]" Mistress Griffiths kept her words within limits. She did not discredit her husband's ministry with sinful speech. When Bainton jeered back that she was a "filthy scabby lowely Queane," she resorted to the church courts.

But when, on the face of it, Bainton could not turn Mistress Griffiths's defense of her husband against her husband's ministry, he turned it against her husband's manhood. When she spoke up for her husband, Bainton "willed her to go put on her husbands bretches for[,] he said[,] he [her husband] had worne the long enoughe." Bainton implied that if Rector Griffiths needed his wife to stand up for his honor and competence as a churchman, then Rector Griffiths should cede the headship of their household to her as well. For a minister, maintaining his manhood was essential to maintaining his authority as a minister. Mistress Griffiths's words had not breeched the code of clerical family conduct. Yet simply by speaking at all, she gave her husband's opponent an opportunity to question her husband's manhood, thus diminishing his pastoral authority. In this parish conflict, it seems that no matter what, the minister's wife could not win.

Mistress Griffiths resorted to assertive words to defend her husband's honor and ministry; Mistress Catherine Wright resorted to physical aggression. Griffiths's and Wright's different modes of response derived from the different modes of insult aimed at their respective husbands. Rector Griffiths was verbally derided by a parishioner. Vicar
Wright's reading of the Sunday lesson was disrupted by the physical approach and mocking gestures of his parishioner Hannah Dickinson. "Laughing [and] scoffing," Hannah Dickinson had "pull[ed] a Letter out of her Busome in the p[a]r[i]sh church…and in an inde[cent] manner carried it to the reading Deske to the arte Mr Wright." Mistress Wright responded by physically hauling Hannah Dickinson away, before Dickinson could further interrupt Vicar Wright's performance of divine service.

Examined as an isolated incident, Mistress Wright's manhandling and mishandling of the problem of Hannah Dickinson offers another example of how stooping to answer insults with insults or to quash disorderly conduct with an undignified act of force could backfire on any member of a clerical family. By intercepting Hannah Dickinson, Mistress Wright presumed to do a job reserved for churchwardens and sidesmen. By wrestling with Dickinson, she became equally guilty of disturbing divine service and profaning sacred space with improper behavior. As a result, she made herself vulnerable to ecclesiastical prosecution; she ultimately found herself the defendant in a church-court suit brought by Hannah Dickinson. Although acting in the moment to protect her husband, in the long term her inappropriate conduct could have easily damaged her husband's reputation.

When viewed in the light of a history of hostile encounters between Hannah Dickinson and Vicar and Mistress Wright, this incident illustrates how a clergyman and his wife could act jointly to handle something or someone they viewed as a threat to parish order. In fact, the vicar of Thorpe-Arch and his wife did more than collaborate on maintaining parish order. They colluded in exploiting, and perhaps even abusing,
authority, influence and access to institutional resources in an attempt to expel an undesirable parishioner.

Hannah Dickinson was a prisoner in the York gaol. Her husband Bernard, a resident of Thorpe-Arch, was excommunicate. While in prison, the authorities had granted Hannah Dickinson Sunday furloughs to Thorpe-Arch to visit her husband. But Vicar and Mistress Wright appeared to have decided that Hannah Dickinson was an unwanted presence in their parish. Master Wright had Dickinson placed in the village stocks to keep her from attending his church. Mistress Wright had Dickinson presented for defamation and sentenced to do penance.

The sentence itself was an exercise in subordinating Dickinson to the parish authority of the Wright family. A ritual of public humiliation, Dickinson had to perform penance in the church under the supervision of the vicar. She also had to personally humble herself before Mistress Wright, who was the victim of Dickinson's defamatory words. But the vicar further exploited Dickinson's punishment. When ecclesiastical authorities ordered a parishioner to do penance for an ecclesiastical crime such as defamation, profaning the Sabbath or abusing a minister, the parishioner was suspended from worship until she performed the ordered act of penance. Her performance of penance was confirmed by a Declaration of Penance, signed by the local minister and sent to the church court or official who ordered the penance. Master Wright refused to sign and return Hannah Dickinson's Declaration of Penance. By withholding confirmation that Dickinson had performed her sentence, the vicar could continue to obstruct her church attendance.
Thus, the "Letter," that Hannah Dickinson "pulled out of her Busome" and delivered to Master Wright, the same "Letter" whose delivery Mistress Wright desperately attempted to prevent, was a letter from John Sharpe, the Archbishop of York. The letter instructed the vicar to send in Hannah Dickinson's Declaration of Penance, and to allow Dickinson to enjoy all the privileges of a parishioner in good standing. Dickinson turned the delivery of the letter into a public performance of penance in reverse. She processed boldly into the church, tossed the letter at Master Wright and announced "lowl[y]…there's a Letter for you from the Ld Archbishop."127

This was a calculated display designed to humiliate the vicar, and perhaps the vicar's wife as well. Mistress Wright certainly treated Hannah Dickinson's "indec[ent]" performance as an assault on her husband's honor and by extension, her own. But Mistress Wright's response was as problematic as the Wright's other efforts to control Hannah Dickinson. The Wright's shared perception of Hannah Dickinson as potential threat to parish order was not entirely without reason; she was, after all, a jailed criminal married to an excommunicate. But each time George Wright or his wife abused their position or overstepped the bounds of clerical family conduct, they seemed to offer Hannah Dickinson another opportunity to attack the vicar's public authority and his wife's informal influence.

The Wright's collective campaign against Hannah Dickinson provides an example of how ministers and family members could make parish discipline a family project, acting in tandem and using different social roles or social tools to suppress moral disorder or resolve a church-related conflict. Unfortunately, the Wrights also offer a case of how a minister and his family could collectively misjudge a parish problem and jointly
employ corrupt and counterproductive measures. As I have already explored in the preceding chapter, clerical authority had a contingent and even tenuous character. To exercise their public authority effectively, clergymen had to successfully negotiate local hierarchies of age, wealth and rank, earn the reverence of their parishioners by living up to common expectations of clerical character and conduct, and use their punitive and corrective powers sparingly and carefully. As I have examined in previous sections of this chapter, the informal status and authority of clerical wives was even more tenuous. In the seventeenth-century, the parish status of clerical wives lacked the supports of land, title or tradition; their position and influence among parishioners depended profoundly on the extent of their public housekeeping and their personal appeal. When a minister and his wife, like George and Catherine Wright, attempted to win a parish conflict by the abuse of power and unclergylike acts of hostility and aggression, they risked reducing, rather than reinforcing, their status and authority among parishioners.

A incident in the Caroline parish of Gorton offers an alternative case where a minister's wife worked with her husband to handle a parish conflict successfully. Much like George and Catherine Wright, the vicar Adam Martindale and his wife Elizabeth perceived a threat to discipline and spiritual well-being of their parish. For the Martindales, the threat took not the form of a person, but a Maypole. Typically festooned with flowers or other decorations, maypoles were a central part of the traditional folk celebration of spring. Along with Morris Dancing and Sabbath soccer matches, maypoles were among the popular recreations formally authorized by the King's Book of Sports in 1633. For early Protestant reformers, however, such folk recreations stank dangerously of religious ignorance and Catholic superstition. Throughout the late sixteenth and
seventeenth-centuries, English puritan ministers and laity retained those reservations about Sunday amusements and pre-reformation seasonal rituals.\textsuperscript{129}

Martindale's puritan opinions regarding Sunday sports and "woefully profane...musick and dancing" were well-known among his parishioners. Thus, when a local band of "prophane youths" wanted to offend and outrage their vicar's spiritual sensibilities, they decided to plant a maypole right in Master Martindale's path from the parsonage to the church. It was a cheeky and ingenious prank; for a few weeks, each time the vicar went to lead worship, he was forced to process past this highly objectionable "relique" of pre-reformation popular culture and religion. The maypole was clearly a byproduct of youthful rebelliousness. But it was also a bold swipe at Master Martindale's religious leadership and pastoral policies. Martindale believed that these young people purposely put up the maypole to provoke and mock him [quote]. Inconveniently, the royal regulations in the Book of Sports gave them the legal protection to do so. This placed the vicar in a tricky position. As long as the maypole stood, it would remain a potential "harme to people's soules" and a silent critique of his authority and teachings. But an angry and authoritarian confrontation with the maypole mischief-makers could easily leave him the loser in this conflict. Displaying his temper would damage his clerical dignity; it would also call attention to his legal impotence to suppress a spiritually offensive practice in his own parish. Making the youths—or other parishioners—take down the maypole would be even worse. As an illegitimate use of his authority, that tactic would probably cost him the good opinion of his congregants.

To dismantle both the maypole and the challenge to his authority that it represented, Master Martindale took a soft tack with his wayward parishioners and turned
to his wife and a colleague for help. The vicar did not comment on the maypole immediately, but waited until his parishioners' "youthfull rage had somewhat cooled and there was no colour to say what I spoke proceeded from passion." Martindale then played the part of the disappointed and gently disapproving "spirituall father." He simply preached his concern that while the maypole "was a thing that never did, nor could do good," it possessed the potential to do real religious harm. Then he allowed a neighboring minister popular among his parishioners to preach a visiting sermon. His colleague had an outraged response to the maypole, publicly "calling them [the maypole makers] by most opprobrious names, as the scumme, rabble, rife-rafe (or such like) of the parish." By playing this "good clerk/bad clerk" routine with his colleague, Master Martindale both shamed the guilty parties and at the same time made his own response seem mild and moderate, "like oyle in comparison of his [the neighboring minister's]…salt and vinegar."

Master Martindale then deferred to his wife, Elizabeth, to deliver the killing blow to this parish controversy. A few days after the visiting minister's sermon, Mistress Martindale recruited three spiritually sympathetic young women to join her in an undercover vandalism operation. Mistress Martindale and her helpers "whipt it [the maypole] downe in the night with a framing-saw, cutting it brest-high." Some members of the maypole party attempted to repair the damage by "piecing it with another fowle pole." But the patched-up pole was "an ugly thing, so rough and crooked." Demoralized, the maypole party surrendered; they consented that "it should be taken downe."130

For Vicar Martindale, the maypole controversy had presented a double-threat to his ministry. From Martindale's puritan perspective, the maypole itself posed an
insidious danger to his parishioners' souls, luring them towards subtle errors or unthinking acts of blasphemy. Erected by parishioners who were well aware of his position on maypoles and other pre-reformation recreations, it also stood as an open challenge to his spiritual authority. But Master Martindale emerged a winner from this parish conflict. The offending pole was ultimately removed. His teachings on such "relique[s] of the shamefull worship of the Strumpet Flora in Rome†" were reinforced. And the members of the maypole party who had tried to "affront…their spirtuall father" ultimately bowed to Martindale's clerical authority.

Master Martindale's success depended on his colleague and his wife. His colleague's blistering condemnation of the maypole makers allowed Martindale to criticize them while keeping his clerical cool. And when the two ministers' joint reproofs failed to fully effect the maypole's removal, Mistress Martindale stepped in. A public official, her husband could not dismantle or damage the technically lawful maypole and still retain the moral and legal high ground. But as a household dependent and "private person," Mistress Martindale had more maneuvering room. An attempt by her husband to force or demand the dismantling of the maypole would have been a dour and counter-productive abuse of power. Mistress Martindale's high-minded vandalism, on the other hand, was very effective. As a puritan counter-prank performed with the help of other young women, it defeated the maypole party at their own game.

Elizabeth Martindale made herself a useful ally when youthful parishioners challenged his religious authority and opinions. She succeeded where clerical wives like Margaret Sweet and Catherine Wright failed for a number of reasons. She picked her

† A colorful synonym for pre-reformation Catholicism.
parish conflict carefully. She did not meddle in an affair of honor between her husband and another man, since such a move was as likely to emasculate her husband as help him. Nor did she subject any person to angry acts or unseemly speech, behaviors that, because they transgressed the bounds of proper clerical family conduct, tended to backfire on the aggressing clerical wife or child. Instead, Mistress Martindale defaced a spiritually offensive object, performing a pious high-jinx. She took care to commit this righteous act of vandalism clandestinely. She thereby avoided the appearance of impropriety or the risk of alienating partisan parishioners. Clerical wives generally aided their husbands by building additional, and often gender-specific, bridges between the parsonage and parishioners, by cultivating influence and clientele among women, children and the "lower sort." Elizabeth Martindale was effective in assisting her husband in resolving the parish problem of the maypole because she did use her influence among young women in her husband's parish, generating support and inciting action for her husband's position. But also because she did not exacerbate the conflict by directly provoking husband's opponents.

Elizabeth Martindale's interventions were informal and (quite deliberately) unseen. But however stealthily she carried out the castration of this pole of local, social, Sabbatarian and soteriological contention, she was nonetheless expressing herself politically. Her actions unquestionably supported her husband, who stood at the center of the conflict. But organizing the covert mauling of a maypole smacks of more than simple spousal loyalty. It suggests that she not only dutifully supported but personally shared her husband's religious objections.
For most individuals in early modern England, household and other identities and allegiances—local, vocational, religious or political—blended and blurred in complex ways. This was especially true for the wives and dependents of public men. The public position and responsibilities of their households meant that their domestic duties could have political functions and that their family fortunes could be tied, sometimes quite tightly, to fluctuating political winds. For the wives and children of these men, their own political opinions and actions could be simultaneously and inextricably tied up in their mandatory duty to support and obey their head of household in things public and private, their personal identification with their head of household and his public office or vocation, their self-interested investment in the wealth, well-being and standing of their household, and in their own reasoned and impassioned sympathies and beliefs. The next and final section of this chapter explores how the national politics of church and state could affect or involve ministers' wives and children on all those different levels, and how the intrinsically public and political character of clerical households and clerical housekeeping could provide those women and children with gendered and domestic modes of political response.

The Parsonage and National Politics: Royalist Clerical Wives and Children in the English Civil War

Seventeenth-century England was a society where religious doctrines and liturgical practices were matters of state and issues of impassioned debate. It was a society where the marriage of a Protestant prince to a Catholic princess could spark violent riots, a society where public preachers could be silenced and jailed for the content
of their sermons, and where conducting mass constituted treason. As decades of post-revisionist historiography has shown, it was a society where religion and politics were profoundly overdetermined and overlapping categories of belief and action, policy and practice.\textsuperscript{131}

An arm of the state as well as instrument of salvation, the English church was a political as well as a religious institution. And the ministry was, to varying degrees for varying men, a politicized vocation. For many parish clergy, church and state politics made only minor intrusions on their everyday ministry, surfacing when they received the occasional royal proclamation, to be read from the pulpit. But for a substantial minority (perhaps at any time consisting of somewhere between 2,000-4,000 university trained and formally ordained clergymen), service in the ministry was permeated with politics. Motivated by competing Protestant theologies of grace, the priesthood and the church, these clergy came into intermittent conflict with each other and with the state.\textsuperscript{132} Historians have cautioned against viewing these clerical clashes as dualistic contests between clearly defined and coherent groups of early Stuart puritans and ceremonialists, or late Stuart dissenters and Anglicans; they have pointed to the heterogeneity within and fluidity between such categories.\textsuperscript{133} Nonetheless, whether heterogeneously and fluidly puritan, ceremonialist, dissenter or Anglican, these clergymen expressed their theological and political commitments in their preaching, pastoral care and ecclesiastical administration or activism. They also endured the consequences of those commitments: informal harassment, official reprimands, church court or county committee prosecution, ejection, jail.
Their families endured the consequences as well. Just as in local conflicts, wives and children were opportunistic targets for their husbands' or fathers' religious and political opponents. Some suffered direct verbal and physical abuse from officials, pursuivants, soldiers, partisan neighbors and onlookers. Many more felt the emotional, social and economic fallout from the ejection or imprisonment of their husbands and fathers. The collegial communities of these different groups of ministers noted and propagandistically exploited the impact of these punishments on the clergyman's wife and children. They also celebrated examples of clerical wives who bore up under the extreme inconveniences of jailed husbands and homelessness with cheerful Christian stoicism. In his printed Breviate of his wife Margaret's life, the dissenter Richard Baxter extolled her unflappable reaction to his imprisonment for unlicensed preaching in Acton: "she cheerfully went with me into prison, and brought her best bed hither."134 In his funeral sermon for Ellen Asty, the widow of colleague, the Restoration non-conformist preacher Owen Stockton reported that when her husband was ejected from his swank rectory for non-conformity, Mistress Asty rejoiced at the opportunity to suffer "for Christ."135

As Richard Baxter observed, a husband who lost his job or landed himself in jail subjected his wife to poverty and shame.136 The seventeenth-century prescriptive norm of wifely obedience nonetheless decreed that women should uncomplainingly endure whatever social or material privations their husbands might cause them. But in seventeenth-century practice, few people expected women to rapturously embrace their husband's failure to provide and their family's social degradation. When Margaret Baxter and Ellen Asty made a show of welcoming such calamities, they were expressing more
than dutiful support of their husband. They were expressing defiant support of their husband's Christian and political cause. They were also claiming that cause as their own.

Mistresses Baxter and Asty, however, gave voice to their politics in ways that were quite specific to their gender and status. As mistress of the rectory, Ellen Asty had special dominion over its housekeeping. This made cheerfully relinquishing "such a house," a particularly gendered sacrifice for the cause of nonconformity. Mistress Baxter similarly used her role as housekeeper to articulate defiance against the suppression of non-conformist preachers like her husband. In her case: by quite ostentatiously setting up housekeeping with her husband in jail.

The anthropologist James Scott has suggested a dual model of political opposition: public opposition, which comprises formal or open action in a public or official arena, and infrapolitical resistance which comprises everyday forms of resistance in the unofficial arenas of labour, domestic life and local relations. Scott's concept of infrapolitics extends political expression into areas such as housekeeping, gossip and play. For clerical wives and daughters, public housekeeping was the extension of their domestic roles into the community, as an expression of power and influence. Infrapolitics constituted the opposite side of public housekeeping; it was the use of their domestic work and roles as an expression of political resistance.

Scott has also argued that people often seize on infrapolitical strategies when the dominant regime mixes political repression, or political punishment, with material exploitation. Under those conditions, infrapolitical resistance does double duty as both a strategy of material subsistence and expression of political, or confessional, dissent. The political punishment of clergymen in seventeenth-century generally involved
ejection from the family home, loss of income, and sometimes seizure of the family's moveable property. It thus politicized the parsonage-house, and the domestic activities that occurred within it. Because political punishment combined an assault on the clerical family's ecclesio-political convictions with an attack on the family's honor and the confiscation of the family's means of subsistence, clerical wives and children's political responses to it combined conservative loyalty to their household and head of household with personal commitment to political or religious beliefs.

Political punishment fell on different groups of clerical families at different times. During the Elizabethan and Caroline periods, there were episodic crackdowns on puritan ministers. In the seventeenth-century, there were two waves of mass clerical ejections. During the English Civil Wars and Interregnum (1642-1660), the Parliamentarian regime ejected hundreds of Royalist clergymen for their ceremonalist liturgical practices and their support of the ousted King Charles I. During the Restoration of Charles II, hundreds of Presbyterian and Independent (Congregationalist) ministers were ejected during the 1660's for refusing to conform. These ejections included non-conformists such as the Baxters and Asty's. In the rest of this section, however, I will examine the political responses of Royalist clerical wives and children during the Civil War and Interregnum ejections of their husbands and fathers. The wartime of these ejections allows a unique opportunity to examine clerical families engaging in both public and infrapolitical resistance.

During the first English Civil War, a Parliamentary ordinance passed in January 1644 authorized the Earl of Manchester to establish committees in the seven associated counties of Cambridge, Essex, Hertford, Huntingdon, Lincoln, Norfolk and Suffolk, to
identify clergy suspected of pastoral insufficiencies, ceremonialist sympathies or opposition to Parliament. The ordinance authorized the Earl of Manchester to remove such ‘scandalous’ ministers from their posts, sequester their benefices and personal estates, and replace them with ministers —popularly termed ‘intruders’— approved by the Westminster Assembly. It also gave him discretionary power to grant as maintenance a fifth of the income from any such sequestered living to the petitioning wife or children of the ejected clergyman. As the ejections commenced, Parliament’s existing Committee for Plundered Ministers assumed responsibility for complaints and appeals from both ejected families and stymied sequestrators. Petitions and paperwork swelled as further areas fell under Parliamentarian control and greater numbers of Royalist ministers were ejected. A subsequent ordinance passed in 1654 by the first Protectorate Parliament established a committee for scandalous ministers in each county of the Commonwealth, with uniform procedures for ejection and the maintenance of the evicted wives and children.\footnote{140}

Clerical ejection and sequestration combined a program of religious reform with a policy of military pacification. Ejection allegedly cleansed parish churches of ineffectual preaching and prayer–book ceremony. Ejection also silenced articulate opponents of Parliament, whose subversive pronouncements from the pulpit could sway the sympathies of their parish. The meagre and irregular ‘fifth’ of sequestered clerical income granted to wives and children served as an economic method of suppressing Royalist resistance. Petitions for fifths were granted on condition that the clerical wife and her husband swear to ‘yiel[d] all due obedience to the…sequestracon [sic]’ and offer no opposition to the sequestrators or intruder.\footnote{141}
The economic element of clerical ejection and sequestration was essential, in its conception and its effect. And it was this element that most effectively implicated clerical wives and children. Evicting the clergyman from his house and life–interest freehold, it subjected the entire clerical family to ecclesiopolitical punishment. The sins of Laudian fathers were visited upon school age sons. The impact of ejection on families was explicitly integrated into County Committee proceedings, which appended to each inquiry the number of offspring and marital status of the scandalous minister under investigation. It was acknowledged in the ordinances that authorized the institution of the wife’s fifth, and continually enacted in the petitioning process that resulted.

Punishment of the family through dispossession and dishonour reflected a policy and a mental attitude that associated the clerical family with the confessional and political stance of the clerical household head. This made clerical wives and children passive objects of ecclesiopolitical retribution, but it also made them potential political actors. Ejection prompted clerical wives, and to a lesser degree clerical children, to resist the retribution of sequestration by official and unofficial means.

The process of petitioning for her fifth did not enfold the clerical wife into the fluidly enfranchised 'political nation' of seventeenth–century England. But it did endow the clerical wife with an official political status. The process recognized her as a subject of political sequestration and engaged her as a potential opponent of the regime by requiring her to swear her obedience. The orders and acts of these Parliamentarian committees against clerical wives suggests the potential political influence they held in their parishes, and the potential problems it posed for the government. Mrs. Rachel Procter, wife of the ejected Rector of Stradishall, Suffolk, was instructed by the
Committee for Compounding that her fifth was conditional on her residing outside the parish and avoiding contact with parishioners. Mrs. Hester Manby, wife of the ejected Rector John Manby, organized a highly successful tithe strike in the parish of Cottenham. In response, the Committee for Plundered Ministers issued orders for the arrest of Mrs. Manby as a ‘malignant’—an official opponent of Parliament.

As official petitioners, clerical wives were constrained by a rhetoric of deference; even the troublesome Mrs. Procter declared her humility when petitioning the Committee for Plundered Ministers. Yet within the tight rhetorical formulas of maintenance petitions, some clerical wives found an official opportunity to express confessional disapproval. Martha Bentham, wife of the ejected Rector of Broughton, called into question the pastoral superiority of some Westminster replacements when appealing to the Northamptonshire County Committee. She archly noted that the intruder Mr. Bazely had ‘preached not one sermon…nor tooke care for any’.

Scott also argues that people often seize on infrapolitical strategies when the dominant regime mixes political repression, or in this case political punishment, with material exploitation. Under those conditions, infrapolitical resistance does double duty as both a strategy of material subsistence and expression of political, and in this case confessional, dissent. Thus, in the process of securing food or finances or charitable support for their family, clerical wives could express resistance to their family’s sequestration and the regime that imposed it. When the intruder Richard Herring of Drewsteignton, Devonshire, refused to pay the ordered fifth to Jane Short, wife of the ejected Rector, his tithe corn was ‘violently taken away by her’ and effectively held for cash ransom. Mrs. Peckham, wife of the ejected Rector of Fostead Parva in Sussex,
was found guilty of resisting sequestration by the Committee for Plundered Ministers. She ‘contemned the said sequestration by keeping possession of the house till she was from there expelled’. She further articulated her contempt by subjecting the parsonage to ‘much willful spoyle’.

For some clerical wives, attempting to preserve their husband’s library was an attempt to save a valuable piece of family property and a politicized and confessionally charged effort to defend their family’s honour as a clerical family. Judith Whitford, wife of the rector of Ashford, Northamptonshire, helped hide her husband’s books. And Royalist legend recounted that Mrs. Willington, widow of the ejected Vicar of Ospringe, Kent, braved Parliamentarian pistols as she attempted to block their way to her deceased husband’s study. Both materially valuable and professionally meaningful, clerical libraries represented both a family repository of monetary investment (for some clerical families, the library was probably financially on a par with plate) and a material symbol of the minister’s special status and profession. In accounts of sequestration, both widows and children referred repeatedly and specifically to the trauma of watching sequestrators seize their husbands’ or fathers’ books. The sting with which wives and children recalled that loss revealed the degree to which the family possessed a shared investment in the patriarch’s clerical honour and clerical identity.

In a significantly lesser fashion, both adult and younger children of Royalist clergy were also politicized in their household roles, generally by assisting their father or mother. Older children such as Thomas Couckson, son of the ejected parson of Marston, Bedfordshire, assisted his father in going door–to–door to organize a tithe strike against the intruder. Typically, young children might perform small household chores while
also being themselves an object of substantial household labour and care. When petitioning, begging and negotiating with sequestrators, clerical wives sometimes invoked the needs and number of their young children when protesting against eviction or financial deprivation. However sometimes the children themselves participated in these engagements, as their parents put their youth and vulnerability to use. The wife of Joseph Barnes, ejected Rector of East Isly, reportedly ‘sent her little daughter’ to entreat the intruding minister to pay his arrears of fifths, ‘hoping her innocens might move him’. 

Although their status as household dependents excluded them from most forms of public politics, clerical wives and children were subordinate members of what we might term a ‘public household’ with a privileged political status and a unique spiritual standing. ‘Public housekeeping’ and infrapolitical resistance represented two sides of the political life of women, children and dependents within such households. Both were modes of material and nurturing labour and action conventional to women and household subordinates. Both employed these conventional forms to either produce and exercise neighbourly influence from an uncontested position of household power, or engage in resistance and opposition from a contested position of household weakness. Both were ultimately conservative expressions of support for the patriarchal household, by subordinate members of that household.

Clerical wives and children were well aware that they derived their political resources and religious status from the clergyman who headed their family. When Royalist clerical wives and children sabotaged parsonage barns, organized tithe strikes and incited parish discontent, they did so in defence of their husband or father and his professional position, expressing support for the Episcopal cause from which he drew his
status and authority. Thus, the ecclesio–political identity expressed by Royalist clerical 
wives and children was a dependent identity, in which identification with the 
Royalist/Episcopal cause and identification with the Royalist husband or father was one 
and the same. As Mrs. Sharpe, late of Bathealston, defiantly claimed of her minister 
husband during another neighbourly exchange: ‘he was a Cavalier, he is a Cavalier & 
will live & dy a Cavalier.’

Conclusion

For wives, daughters and sons, belonging to the "Tribe of Levi" had both benefits 
and costs. The families of ministers were uniquely visible in their communities. They 
were branded with vocational identity of the clergy, subjected to special expectations of 
spiritual and moral conduct and to special levels of scrutiny. As I have shown in my 
examination of public housekeeping, some clerical wives made use of their visibility and 
their association with their husbands’ vocation, parlaying pastoral labor and moral 
expectations into informal spiritual authority. However, the extra visibility and familial-vocational identity of clerical family members was never fully under their own control. 
The same visibility that enabled clerical wives and children to act as informal spiritual 
leaders also made them targets for opponents of their husband or father. This pulled 
clerical wives and children into both parish and national conflicts, as victims of spiritual 
or interpersonal hostility and as political actors in local and national disputes.
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CONCLUSION

In 1700, a London printer published a humorous pamphlet entitled "Mrs. Abigail, Or a Female Skirmish between the Wife of a Country Squire and the Wife of a Doctor in Divinity." The pamphlet regaled its readers with a fictional account of "Mrs. Abigail's" dinner party debate with the local lady of the manor. The argument was prompted by the question of who took precedence in seating at the dinner table: the landed hostess or the wife of a highly degreed and highly placed minister? The fictional fight was hardly a fair one. From the first word, the gentleman narrator sided with the squire's wife, proclaiming her right to preside over the table.¹

The practical problem of a seating arrangement served to illustrate the larger problem of where professional men like clergymen should fit in the social hierarchy of eighteenth-century England. At the end of the seventeenth century, ministers in the Church of England were making more money and marrying women from higher ranks in society. Ministers were forming voluntary intellectual and charitable societies, that raised their social profile and enhanced the level of vocational self-consciousness and organization. Unlike the significant number of early Stuart university students with artisanal backgrounds, late Stuart students matriculating at Oxford or Cambridge to take a degree and then holy orders generally came from yeoman, gentry or clerical families.²
Furthermore, one of the primary markers of clerical identity, education, was becoming a general marker of gentility. The publication of this pamphlet in 1700 testifies to these changes in the clergy's social position. The gentry were far from being displaced by the emerging professional classes on the eve of the eighteenth-century. But the existence of this pamphlet nonetheless bespeaks the discomfort of lower members of the landed classes regarding this rise in the clergy's material wealth, cultural capital and social standing.

"Mrs. Abigail" does more than demonstrate improvements in position of the clergy. She does even more than illustrate the cultural jostling and elbowing occurring within the middling elite of late Stuart England. Uppity and very much identified with her husband's educational achievements and vocation, "Mrs. Abigail" also demonstrates the essential and active role that wives and families played in the social performance of the clergy's vocational identity and status. The pamphlet makes it quite clear: a minister's wife was acting always as a representative of her husband and his vocation. The respect accorded to "Mrs. Abigail" by others reflected the respect accorded to her husband and to the clergy.

Additionally, by focusing on ministers' and gentlemens' wives as central actors in the negotiation of social status, this pamphlet also illustrates the omnipresence of gender in these transactions. Although, their wives enacted this "skirmish", it was the squire's land and title being challenged by the clergyman's education and preferment. But the presence and performance of their wives in this conflict between them calls attention to the squire's and minister's common masculine role as husbands, charged with protecting their wives' honor and controlling their wives' conduct. In the process, it implicitly points
to the fact that what was ultimately being contested between the gentleman and the minister is the comparative value of their different forms of public male authority and power.

Finally, the pamphlet's lampooning of the social rituals of a dinner party shows the robust relevance of households as sites where vocational identity and status were produced. The squire's household served at the stage for the dinner party, where social relations were transacted by the family and visitors. As an estate, it also comprised the core of the squire's material wealth and political power.

In this dissertation I have examined the interplay between gender, family identity and household relationships, and clerical authority, pastoral work and clerical identity and dignity. Chapters One, Two and Four have focused on the participation and presence of clerical family members. In Chapter One, I looked at the components of early modern clerical dignity and the components of early modern household honor. I observed how clerical dignity comprised a problematic form of manhood. This vocational manhood subjected ministers to a stringent, vocationally-specific standard of behavior and reputation; at the same time, it withheld from ministers many of the conventional tools for expressing and defending manhood. I also noted that although household reputation was based on the good or bad conduct of every member of that household, the male household head bore the ultimate responsibility for the behavior of his dependents and for the honor of his household.

Thus, the introduction of clerical marriage and clerical families added to the burden of clerical dignity by making the conduct of clerical family members and the maintenance of clerical household honor a component part of clerical manhood. In the
process, this change from clerical celibates to clerical husbands and fathers made ministers dependent on the collaborative good conduct of their wives, children and servants to preserve both their ordinary manhood as householders and their vocational manhood as clergymen. As a result of this dependence, the clergy took formal and informal steps to incorporate clerical family members into the structures of clerical discipline and pastoral practice. They also extended to wives and children a kind of affiliate membership in the clergy, endowing wives and children with their own vocational identity as "ministers' wives" and "ministers' children."

In Chapter Two, I examined how wives, children and servants participated in the mental, emotional and relational reproduction of clerical identity. I demonstrated how sexuality, intimate relationships, household rituals and household harmony all influenced ministers' vocational self-perception and vocational confidence. The dependence of ministers' vocational self-perception on specific kinds of family life and specific kinds of family and spousal relationships elicited creative and collaborative responses from ministers, ministers' wives and ministers' children. Clergymen spiritualized the rituals of courtship to render them congruent with clerical identity. Clergymen also used prayer and their pastoral persona to resolve spousal conflict and mediate their intimacy with their wives. Clerical husbands and wives worked together to impose schedules of piety and rules of Christian conduct on their households, in order to focus family life around spiritual and scholarly development and discipline. Finally, clerical wives assumed pastoral responsibilities of their own within the household. Primarily responsible for governing the day to day conduct of children and servants, clerical wives took on the work of Christianizing these younger members of the household, with the goal of
rendering them suitable participants in the spiritual life of the family, and suitable reflections on the spiritual reputation of the family.

In Chapter Four, I stepped outside the household to look at the roles that clerical wives and children played in parish life. Looking at the phenomenon of "public housekeeping," I examined how ministers' wives and daughters extended their gendered duties of charity and medical care into the parish or congregation. I then explored how some clerical wives and daughters parlayed their charitable activities into their own form of religious authority. For clerical family members, public housekeeping represented the positive and peaceful side of participation in the life of the parish or congregation. On the other hand, parish conflict represented the problematic and sometimes dangerous side of parish and congregational life. The ministers' public role made clerical family members especially visible in their communities. Because they were so visible to other local families and because they were so closely identified with the minister in the minds of parishioners and congregants, clerical wives and children often suffered anger and abuse from neighbors engaged in personal or religious conflicts with the minister. However, clerical wives and children were far more than passive targets for opponents of the clergyman. Clerical family members were often quick to aid and defend their husband or father; in the process they confirmed the degree to which they identified with the minister and the ministry and the degree to which they were invested in their honor and standing as a clerical family.

Chapters One, Two and Four all reveal the pervasive presence and the pervasive influence of family honor and family members on clerical identity and pastoral practice. These chapters also demonstrate that the parsonage house was a very active and involved
site in the practice of pastoral care and the production of a minister's vocational honor and spiritual identity. These chapters contribute to our growing understanding that the post-reformation English ministry needs to be viewed from a broader lens, one with sufficient scope to see the ways in which the ministry was composed of more than ordained men, and the places of clerical practice that lay beyond the pulpit. These chapters also offer a partial answer to the still open question of how the Protestant shift from a celibate priesthood to a married ministry fundamentally reshaped the character and social context of the English clergy.

By looking at women, children and household relations, these three chapters provide the historiography of the English clergy with a much needed analysis of gender relations and gender roles. But, as recent work on historical masculinities has reminded us, the performance of gender does not stop at the household door, nor does it always require the presence of women. Thus, in Chapter Three I focused solely on ministers, in order to shed light on the ways in which clerical authority was fundamentally gendered. In this chapter, I explored how clerical power and authority operated as a form of patriarchal power and authority. Examining ministers' efforts to govern their congregations and discipline their parishioners, I showed that the patriarchal authority that ministers exercised in their communities was but one form out of many. Ministers had to exercise their patriarchal power within parameters that recognized the other types of public and private patriarchal authority belonging to other men. This chapter thus provided a look into the ways in which ministers' interactions with other men were gendered. Additionally, it offered a limited glimpse into the dynamic and complex structure of patriarchal power in seventeenth-century English society.
As I noted in the Introduction, earlier narratives of historical change in the social and political role of households suggested that the early modern period marked the beginning of a decline. In these narratives, the relevance of households and families to economic and cultural production, and to the exercise of political power, progressively diminished from the sixteenth century onward. And as households went, so went women: these narratives argued that as a consequence of this decline, women's access to social, political and cultural power similarly receded. Alongside these earlier historiographical narratives of the decline, developed a separate historiography of the clergy as a profession. This historiography mapped progressive social advancement of the clergy, beginning in the sixteenth century and ending in the early nineteenth. This social advancement stemmed from the same historical changes that constricted the role of households and the power and activities of women. According to this narrative, as politics, culture and economic production generally shifted to public venues, the clergy expanded its public activities and intensified its institutional organization. The clergy became increasingly professional; clerical practice and identity became more church, university and organizationally based. It became even less based in households, even more exclusively male.

This dissertation calls that clerical narrative into question. The reformation set wives, children and households squarely into the middle of ministerial practice. And I would suggest that this integration of family and vocation was not a momentary set-back on the long historical road to modern professionalism. The evidence examined in this project suggests that the role of clerical families became progressively more active and more defined over the course of the seventeenth century. Did this process stop in 1714?
Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall's brief examination of the family life of the nineteenth-century evangelical minister of Colchester, William Marsh, suggests not. They surveyed the exhaustive activities of Marsh's wife, Maria, and his three daughters, which included teaching Sunday School,

...counsel[ing] the poor, distrib[uting] soup from the kitchen, provid[ing] refreshment between services on Sunday for parishioners...[and aided] husband and father in the Bible, Missionary, Conversion of the Jews, Prayer Book, Homily, Religious Trust, Anti-Slavery Societies...

The Reverend Marsh's daughter Catherine capped off her responsibilities by authoring a spiritual biography of her father.\(^4\) Comparing the activities of the Marsh women with those of other contemporary clerical families, Davidoff and Hall conclude that the nineteenth-century "professionalization of the ministry...brought with it a new attentiveness to the position of the clergyman's wife."\(^5\) This dissertation suggests that that attentiveness was not so new. But further work is needed to answer the question of how the roles of clerical wives and children evolved and expanded, through the eighteenth and into the nineteenth century.

---

\(^1\) Mrs. Abigail, Or, A Female Skirmish between the Wife of a Country Squire and the Wife of a Doctor in Divinity, with reflections thereupon: In a Letter to a Friend (London, 1700).


\(^3\) Rosemary O'Day, The Professions in Early Modern England (harlwo: Longman, 2000): many of these changing conditions also applied to lawyers and university-educated physicians.


\(^5\) Davidoff and Hall, Family Fortunes, 123.
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