

## Chapter 10

### **Women, print and locality: Richard Culmer and the practices of polemic during the English Revolution**

*Jason Peacey*

‘On top of the citie ladder, neer sixty steps high, with a whole pike in his hand ratling down proud Becket’s glassy bones’. With this story about the destruction of stained glass windows in Canterbury Cathedral – as well as about the culprit urinating in a sacred space – the puritan minister Richard Culmer was immortalised in his own day, and made famous ever since, as ‘Blew Dick’, the Kent iconoclast.<sup>1</sup> This notoriety was also secured by involvement in local electoral politics in the 1620s, and by his having fallen victim to Caroline church policies, and having been deprived for refusing to read the Book of Sports, Culmer became involved in angry confrontations with Archbishop William Laud, which prompted him to rail against the ‘tribe of Lambeth’ and Laud’s ‘tyrannous patronage’. Culmer’s reputation was then cemented by involvement in puritan petitioning campaigns of the early 1640s, and by providing evidence used in Laud’s trial, as well as by his appointment to a succession of Kentish livings, including positions at Goodnestone, Harbledown and Minster, not to mention the cathedral itself. As was common across the seventeenth century, such appointments generated controversies with parishioners, which in Culmer’s case involved robust responses to his reforming ‘fanatic’ ways. Such exchanges have been seen as prime examples of the period’s ‘culture wars’. Culmer’s legacy and reputation, moreover, have been contested ever since the 1640s, and it has proved tempting to dismiss him for his ‘pathological spleen’. At the very least it seems clear that he was ‘a contentious opinionated person’, with ‘many

enemies'. This reflected his willingness to engage in controversial pamphleteering, but while the tracts by Culmer and his son – Richard Culmer junior – from the 1640s and 1650s are now familiar to scholars, they are worth revisiting because of the light they shed on the political and religious culture of the civil wars and Interregnum.<sup>2</sup> Indeed, the aim of this chapter is to use such tracts to examine the intersection between three key issues that have featured prominently in the work of Ann Hughes: politics and society in a specific locality; the purpose and power of cheap print and its more or less intimate relationship to interpersonal disputation; and the role of women within the upheavals of the mid-seventeenth century, both as active participants in the troubles and as victims of bad behaviour.<sup>3</sup>

That Culmer makes this possible reflects the ways in which he was both similar to and different from the great Presbyterian propagandist, Thomas Edwards, the subject of *Gangraena and the Struggle for the English Revolution*. With this book, Hughes revolutionised our understanding of the print revolution, demonstrating the innovative ways in which texts could elucidate not just the lives and beliefs of their authors, but also how pamphleteers used print as part of political and religious strategies; how they chose to deploy evidence, and how they thought about audiences and readers. Like Edwards, Culmer was a controversial, engaged, and active cleric, and an innovative appropriator of print who provoked heated pamphlet controversies. As with Edwards, the pamphlets produced by Culmer offer a remarkably rich and detailed picture of contemporary happenings, and have too often been treated simply as sources for, rather than the subject of, scholarly enquiry.<sup>4</sup> And as with Edwards's famous heresiography, the tales related by Culmer invite attempts to assess authorial accuracy and veracity. What makes Culmer distinctive, however, is that while he shared with Edwards a determination to catalogue the errors and ills of his age, he focused on royalists and Arminians rather than on sectaries. Moreover, while *Gangraena* certainly drew upon characters and episodes from across the country, including Culmer's

Kent, it was very obviously a Londoner's book, whose author looked outwards from the capital, with whose affairs he was intimately involved. Culmer, while sharing Edwards's determination to address both local and national audiences, very obviously wrote as a participant in *local* battles, and as such he highlights somewhat different dynamics regarding the relationship between centre and locality during the 1640s and 1650s.

The aim of this piece, therefore, is to demonstrate that Culmer provides a means of enhancing our understanding of the political and religious culture within a specific locality, and a window onto a world of political and religious engagement beyond and below the elite, in ways that involved women from all walks of life and that were intimately connected with 'national' affairs. It will thus add to a growing body of scholarship on the infrapolitics of local communities, and the ways in which ministers became focal points for rumour, gossip, and allegations involving both male and female parishioners. This will involve testing and contextualising the claims made in pamphlets by and about Culmer, and it will also mean establishing what made such pamphlets distinctive, in terms of their treatment of evidence and the expectations made of readers. Not the least significant issue to be addressed will be one of Culmer's most striking practices as an author: the decision to anonymise so many of the people to whom he referred. Ultimately, the aim is to deepen our understanding of the nature, practices, and role of polemic during the civil wars and Interregnum, not least in relation to how evidence was deployed to make and break reputations, in ways that are likely to have resonated somewhat differently at national and local levels.<sup>5</sup>

## I

In certain ways, Richard Culmer's pamphleteering reinforces our increasingly well-developed understanding of the role of print in the civil war era. His first work, *Cathedral News from*

*Canterbury* (1644), bore all the hallmarks of a piece of semi-official parliamentary propaganda. It was licensed by John White and Joseph Caryl, who detected in its pages that ‘the hand of providence hath indeed wrought a new thing in our Israel, worthy to be looked upon by all’. It was also dedicated to the Committee for Plundered Ministers, and it chimed with other works that provided damning evidence about the Laudian church, its personnel, and its persecuting practices. Culmer’s particular aim was to expose the ‘corrupt constitution’ of Canterbury Cathedral, ‘that you may more perfectly cure the malignant disease, called the Cathedral evil’, not least in order to support Kentish petitioners.<sup>6</sup> As such, he catalogued grievances regarding the railing of altars and the downgrading of preaching, noted the promotion of Laudian clerics to livings across the county, and outlined evidence of their ‘forwardness in the archbishop’s pious designs’, as well as how they treated parishioners who refused to conform to innovative practices.<sup>7</sup> He also recalled the suspension of local ministers who refused to publish the Book of Sports, including Mr Huntley, Mr Gardiner, Mr Partridge, Mr Player, and Mr Hieron, as well as Thomas Wilson.<sup>8</sup> And he described recent episodes such as the visit by the queen mother (Marie de Medici), who kissed ‘Becket’s stone ... as thousands of papists have done before her’, and who was invited by local clerics to reflect upon the need for ‘vengeance on those that shed this holy martyr’s blood’.<sup>9</sup> As such, Culmer justified attempts to implement reform, noting that the iconoclasm of 1642 took place on ‘that very day’ when the royalist advance into Kent was ‘broken’ by ‘the religious and valiant Sir William Waller’. Culmer did so to make clear to readers that ‘God’s providence fitted that day to begin that deliverance, when that most idolatrous cathedral first began to be purged of those abominable images of jealousy’.<sup>10</sup>

In other words, Culmer’s pamphlet provided not just polemic but also detailed accounts of specific incidents and people, and he painted a vivid picture of the charged atmosphere within Kent during the years before civil war. He noted ‘how often’ the ‘railing

prayer ... against the Scots' was read in that Cathedral, 'with a hundred cathedral bellowing and bawling A-A-mens', and he referred to a sermon on 5 November 1639 in which the covenanters were compared to gunpowder plotters, as well as to a visitation sermon in April 1639, in which Laud was referred to as 'dominus deus noster papa' who had authority 'jure divino'. Elsewhere, Culmer referred to an Ascension Day sermon from 1642, in which a prelate, 'hearing that some of the parishioners of [St] Andrews in Canterbury did not kneel at the communion ... came and administered it there himself, and was so punctual for their kneeling that he looked very low, or under, to see if the females kneeled'.<sup>11</sup> Most strikingly of all, Culmer offered a detailed account of Canterbury's election for the Short Parliament, referring to how 'proctors, fiddlers, tapsters and other friends of the cathedral and prelatical party' mobilised in support of Laud's secretary, William Dell. Culmer noted that Dell not only 'prepared' his friends to vote for him, and presented letters of recommendation from both Laud and the Lord Keeper, but also referred to a portrait of Sir Thomas White, one of the city's benefactors, thereby provoking cries of 'no pictures, no images, no papists, no archbishop's secretary'. After that, the citizens were said to have 'hissed him down, and ... cried up others, whom they chose burgesses'. According to Culmer, moreover, one 'petty canon' who asserted his right to vote as a freeman was mocked as 'a Weaver, a Weaver, a priested weaver, in a canonical coat'.<sup>12</sup>

Secondly, Culmer and his enemies were driven by awareness of the power of cheap print. Culmer reflected having 'seen books of news from several places, as news from Hell, news from Rome, news from court, news from Ipswich etc.', and he made it clear that such works made an impact in the localities. He noted, for example, that Laud's speech at the trial of Burton, Bastwick, and Prynne 'did presently echo' in the cathedral, 'where they were called ... black mouth'd-railing-rabshakees'.<sup>13</sup> He also made it clear that his own pamphlet was a response to how print was being used by other local ministers, referring readers to 'a

printed prelatial sermon ... not long before the long sad eclipse of parliaments', as well as to 'a cathedral news from Canterbury in print', not least to insist that the iconoclasm of August 1642 was undertaken in an orderly fashion.<sup>14</sup> Culmer's rivals, meanwhile, treated such material, and the mobilisation of popular opinion involved, with genuine disdain. One critic mocked how mass petitioning 'put the people into a humour of fluctuation and unquietness', and the way in which 'weavers, tailors, tobacco-pipe-makers and all the poor rabble of London' had been 'called to the office of reformers in church and state', presumably by the Protestation.<sup>15</sup> Another decried how London's streets 'echo with nothing more of late, than news and newsbooks', and dismissed 'that upstart corporation of newsmongers', and it was suggested that Culmer's book was 'fitted to the genius of (his old patrons) the vulgar, calculated to the meridian of their capacities'. According to this author, 'if the people, the rabble, the multitude, relish, taste, resent it well, quoth Dick, why Hey then up go we'.<sup>16</sup>

Thirdly, Culmer's story highlighted how civil war pamphlets could generate extended exchanges within Kent, in which truth claims were tested and reputations challenged, not least in tracts written by his own parishioners.<sup>17</sup> In dealing with the story about Marie de Medici, for example, *The Razing of the Record* suggested that Culmer was told to 'blush at thy own dishonesty and false dealing', on the grounds that 'an unwary reader might be caught, and think twas some cathedral man spake it'.<sup>18</sup> The author of *Antidotum Culmerianum* challenged Culmer's 'saucy' account of the Canterbury election, given that Dell's supporters were 'neither proctors, fiddlers, nor tapsters', but rather 'prime citizens', and that he had been defeated by the 'rude and uncivil' behaviour of 'the opposite party'.<sup>19</sup> More generally, such authors questioned Culmer's reputation, often with the hallmarks of cheap print: abuse and libellous verse. Culmer was portrayed as a 'pitiful news-monger' and peddler of 'a rag tag collection of poor tales, ending in nonsense and slanders'.<sup>20</sup> *Culmers Crown Crackt* styled him a 'prodigious monster', a 'pseudo-martyr', and the 'grand imposter

of this age', and in responding to his 'impertinent, false and frivolous' pamphlet the author referred to the 'woeful exchange the good but unfortunate men of Minster have made of a doctor for a dunce, of a learned divine for a leaden Dick, of a revered pastor for a ravenous persecutor'. Its author also claimed that Culmer told 'a tale of a turd ... wrapping it up in a legend of lies, forgeries and other base trumpery, to say nothing of his shitten style'.<sup>21</sup> And as with that other notorious pamphleteer, Henry Walker, much was made of the fact that Culmer was 'a red-haired freckle-faced fellow', who had 'Judas's own complexion'.<sup>22</sup>

As with so many puritans, moreover, Culmer was challenged not just about his unorthodox views but also about his godliness and hypocrisy. This was not just a matter of decrying his iconoclasm, at Minster as well as at Canterbury, but also of noting how he conducted irregular marriages, 'without license, without ring, without book'.<sup>23</sup> More importantly, he was said to have shown 'impiety' by neglecting his father, to have been quick to criticise the morality of others while apparently condoning incest by 'a precious pair' of his 'acquaintances', and to have been excessively litigious. One critic noted 'his continual suits at law', concluding that he was 'a better lawyer than divine'.<sup>24</sup> Ultimately, such traits were linked to Culmer's apparent covetousness, as opponents made repeated claims about his 'gripping usury' in dealings with men like 'his friend Richard Pising', and about how, despite his evident wealth, he pleaded poverty to the people of Harbledown, 'to borrow a few pence to buy himself and family bread'.<sup>25</sup> What such allegations made clear was the importance of delving into Culmer's life history. One author, therefore, claimed to be 'furnished ... with materials from Thanet, from the free school at Canterbury, from Magdalen College in Cambridge, from Goodnestone in East Kent, from Herbaldowne and elsewhere'.<sup>26</sup> Culmer was said to have been 'famous' in his youth for 'football and swimming', and for 'his new-found way for descending the cliffs to catch Jackdaws by the help of a rope fastened to his father's cowhorns'.<sup>27</sup> It was said that at Canterbury school he proved to be a 'blockhead', and

the 'senior dunce of all the school', although he showed 'some proficiency in his laudable liberal arts of swimming, thieving, cussing, football-playing'.<sup>28</sup> Repeated references were made to the story about how at Cambridge he narrowly avoided a beating for stealing wheat, and how he was 'shamefully expelled'.<sup>29</sup>

More importantly, critics exposed the traits that were revealed through Culmer's clerical career. It was claimed that after Cambridge he 'betook himself ... to vulgar association', consorting with 'the ignobile *mobile vulgus*, the vulgar spirited rabble, a sort of people naturally given to condemn their governors and superiors, and to quarrel with the present state'. However, he was accused not just of 'courting and countenancing the common people's humour', for 'private ends', but also of deliberately deceiving them, not least by telling them that Parliament had ordered 'that no jot of painted glass must be left standing' in the cathedral. At the same time, critics also decried how he ingratiated himself with the parliamentary authorities at Westminster, by telling 'lies' about Laudianism at Canterbury, by engaging in blatant self-promotion, and by using 'tricks and impudent practices' – as well as the exploitation of 'good friends' – to intrude himself into a succession of clerical positions, at the expense of honest ministers like Stephen Goffe.<sup>30</sup> As a minister, moreover, Culmer was said to have been unpopular, not least as someone who was tyrannical and money-grabbing, and who was guilty of 'following his barn more than his book'. It was said that he was almost 'stoned' by 'enraged parishioners' of St Stephen's; that he failed to intrude himself at Margate because of the 'distaste both to ministers and people'; and that at Minster – 'a fit morsel for his insatiate maw' – he provoked the 'ill-will and odium of the parish who were not such arrant asses as willingly to suffer such a fool to ride them'. It was also said that 'by the saving of their souls he meant the gaining of their tithes, not caring so much to reform their lives as to improve his own livelihood', and that he behaved 'like a very tyrant or a tiger'.<sup>31</sup> After fleeing the royalist rising in Kent in 1648, moreover, Culmer was said to have

engaged in ‘preaching in [a] chimney corner’ at his cousin’s house in Deal, to have been seen ‘prattling at Bermondsey’, and to have accepted the protection of the army.<sup>32</sup>

In the face of ‘open slanders ... and printed libels’, Culmer and his son felt compelled to respond. They decried ‘venomous calumnies’ which served as ‘deadly poison’ to damage Culmer’s ‘good name and reputation’, and they defended a book which was described as ‘the finger in the bile and swelling ulcer of prelacy’, and as ‘true history’. This naturally involved discussing episodes like the iconoclasm at Canterbury, where labourers were said to have exceeded their orders, as well as Culmer’s removal from Goodnestone, ‘only for refusing to publish the king’s book for sabbath recreations’, for which he referred readers to the printed account of Laud’s trial.<sup>33</sup> However, the explanation for issuing such responses is revealing, because readers were informed that Culmer initially ‘thought fit to answer only with scorn and contempt’, ‘being confident that no wise man would believe that, which no man doth avow’. Ultimately, however, he realised that such libels were being used ‘not only against him, but against the common cause’.<sup>34</sup> What was particularly concerning was the impact of such pamphlets *within Kent*. Culmer’s son claimed that the ‘cathedral hornets ... flew about my father’s ears, bombalizing and toating so loud, that city and country rang of their railing and libelling’, and that ‘after those libels were spread abroad in print’, other libels, false reports, and mocking verses were also circulated around Canterbury, ‘and in the night thrown under the door of the then mayor’, in order to ‘cause the people to destroy him’.<sup>35</sup>

## II

Complaints about the impact of pamphlets in Kent indicate that tracts by and about Culmer add weight to recent scholarship regarding the importance of print and polemic during the civil wars, but they also demonstrate that the controversy surrounding him can be used to

highlight aspects of seventeenth-century print culture which are not yet widely recognised. These relate to the role of pamphlets as part of political *processes*, rhetorical tactics relating to authorial credibility, and the deployment of evidence to engage with different audiences.

First, the pamphlets produced in Culmer's defence represented part of a wider strategy for dealing with attempts to undermine puritan preachers in Kent. References were made to the 'lawless liberty' which saw people attacking ministers like Culmer, and the 'worrying and wearying out most precious ministers by word and deed, by tearing and tugging, lyings and slanderings, revilings and defraudings, and withholding their maintenance by confederacy'. It was also made clear that attacks in print were intimately connected to how Culmer's enemies submitted 'articles' against him, and 'raised persecution against him to the shedding of his blood'.<sup>36</sup> It was suggested that 'libels, printed and published, and spread all the nation over' led to his being 'assaulted at Billingsgate' in 1648, when 'the people were incensed against him by a scribe that did belong to the archbishop's registry at Canterbury', and when Culmer 'hardly escaped with his life'.<sup>37</sup> More importantly, pamphleteering was directly linked to the petitions about Culmer that were submitted to the authorities in Whitehall and Westminster, and to the difficulties encountered during political and legal proceedings, not least in relation to the withholding of tithes. It was suggested that publishing books against such 'persecutors' – whose 'complaints and moans' were 'daily heard' – arose from the need 'to awaken the Christian magistrate', and to supplement difficult legal cases that Culmer undertook through the Court of Exchequer. Pamphleteering, in other words, reflected a concern that, while 'relief is certain', it was 'so long waited for, that in the meantime the poor ministers and their families perish'. The resort to print, in short, was a practical political expedient.<sup>38</sup>

Secondly, the pamphlets produced by and about Culmer highlight the novel strategies that authors used to assert credibility. For Culmer's son this naturally involved rhetorical

flourishes, and he mocked ‘silly fictions’ that were ‘invented and published in those railing libels’. He also boasted that his books ‘caused them to gnaw their tongues for pain, and to put so much gall in their ink, in their pretended confutation of his books’.<sup>39</sup> But he also drew attention to Culmer’s powerful connections, something that could be done not just by printing official licenses, as well as dedications to powerful committees and local grandees, but also by depicting Culmer as someone well-connected at Westminster.<sup>40</sup> One example involved the privileged access that Culmer gained to Laud’s as-yet-unpublished diary, which ‘Mr Prynne found in his pockets in the Tower of London’, and which readers were told they might ‘see ... in Mr Prynne’s custody’.<sup>41</sup> Another involved an attempt to refute the ‘forgery’ about Culmer’s being expelled from Cambridge, which involved name-checking ‘worthy Mr [Richard] Vines, of the reverend assembly of divines’, who could prove its falsity.<sup>42</sup> Beyond this, Culmer and his son frequently referred readers to official archives: to evidence that could be seen ‘upon record in this present parliament’; to the proceedings of the Committee for Plundered Ministers; to the papers of the committee chaired by ‘the truly religious’ Sir Robert Harley; to the records of the Committee of Examinations; and to the minutes of the Council of State.<sup>43</sup> Indeed, Culmer frequently reprinted specific documents relating to official business, including testimonials that had been submitted in his favour by parliamentary peers like the earl of Warwick, as well as by local magistrates, MPs, and certain parishes. All of these attested to his ‘exemplary life and conversation’, his ‘diligence’ as a preacher, and his zeal for the ‘common cause’ and the ‘cause of God’, and at least some of them were said to remain on record.<sup>44</sup>

Thirdly, this use of testimonials formed part of a wider pattern in which Culmer, his son, and their critics traded on being able to deploy *local knowledge*. His opponents certainly proclaimed their familiarity with both Culmer and his locality, informing readers that they were his parishioners, and that Canterbury was ‘a place whereunto I have formerly had some

relation'.<sup>45</sup> As will already be clear, this made it possible to refer to things that were 'very well known' in the region. These included the fact that one of Culmer's sons was a convicted drunkard, while another 'hath attempted the abuse of several women', and the fact that Culmer himself was worth '120 pounds per annum besides ... land in Ireland', not to mention the fact that he neglected his aged father, of which 'the whole island where he lives rings'. On another occasion it was claimed that 'all the city and parts adjacent' had 'long experience of his common, customary, habitual lying'.<sup>46</sup> Culmer, meanwhile, frequently glossed the evidence he provided by saying that it involved 'no news', or 'no cathedral news to those that live near the Canterburian cathedral', and that he referred to things 'well known to all that live in or near Canterbury'.<sup>47</sup>

Ultimately, however, what makes the pamphlets produced by Culmer and his son particularly intriguing is their tendency to anonymise the characters to whom reference was made, in marked contrast to the practice of Thomas Edwards.<sup>48</sup> In cataloguing the problems at Canterbury, for example, Culmer referred to the 'singingmen' who were appointed to benefices 'in and about the city', including

Mr etc late weaver, now reading priest, and parson of St Mary Bredman, and peticanon of that cathedral; Mr etc late tobaccopipe maker, and reprieved from the gallows, now reading priest and parson of St Martins ...; Mr etc, late taylor, servingman and butler to the dean of that cathedral, now reading priest and curate of St Mary Bredin, and also of St Mary Magdalen ...; Mr etc late servingman, now reading priest and curate of St Johns.<sup>49</sup>

In referring to the erecting and railing of altars, Culmer referred to 'the command of Dr etc, parson of Hithe, parson of Ickham, parson of Well, parson of Saltwood, prebend of

Canterbury, Archdeacon etc'. Similarly, in discussing the superstitious font in the cathedral, Culmer explained that this was erected 'at the costs of Dr etc, late prebend there, now parson of Backchurch in London, parson of Barham in East Kent, near Dover, parson of Bishops Bourn, Lord Bishop of Rochester etc'.<sup>50</sup> In part, of course, these lists represented conceits, since Culmer was not so much identifying a large group of clerics as mocking a few pluralist ministers who held multiple posts simultaneously, including Matthew Warriner (*d.*1644), Rowland Vaughan, Dr William Kingsley (*d.*1648), and Bishop John Warner.<sup>51</sup> The same was true of the story about Laud's 'young chaplain' who was made a prebend of Canterbury and given three of the seven livings within the Isle of Thanet – a reference to Meric Casaubon.<sup>52</sup> And the same was also true of the author of 'news from Canterbury in print', who was said to be 'a master of a college, an archdeacon, two prebends, and three parsons, and yet but one man, a Canterburian cathedralist', and who can be identified as Dr Thomas Paske.<sup>53</sup> However, this was also part of Culmer's broader style, as with the story about healths being drunk to Prince Rupert in the cathedral, wherein Culmer referred to 'Mr etc', a 'tavern-haunting cathedral doctor', who 'upon the fast day in the afternoon, at the tavern with other gentlemen, drunk about ten healths, and continued there until night, where he was left with the dean of Canterbury'.<sup>54</sup> Similarly, when Culmer claimed to have seen a note, in a Bible belonging to a 'well-affected Alderman', regarding a sermon on the 'first day of the high altar' in 1633, he noted that it was preached by 'Dr etc', who told worshippers that 'if they would find Christ, they must come to the altar, and there they should find him really present'.<sup>55</sup>

In part, using terms like 'Dr etc' were probably used as mocking nicknames for people who endorsed the controversial 'etcetera' oath introduced in the Laudian canons of 1640, and yet it also involved a deliberate policy of withholding the names of key adversaries. Anonymity was certainly Culmer's preferred way of discussing the cathedral's

dean, Isaac Bargrave. On one occasion, Culmer referred to him as ‘the Nimrod of that Cathedral, a mighty hunter, and hawker too’, who not only hunted hares and foxes ‘on weekdays’, but also ‘the GRAY or badger on the sabbath day’. This was a reference to how, ‘about five years since’, Bargrave had heard that ‘one Mr Gray (a godly and able minister, now living in Essex)’ had preached against the prelates’ ‘popish proceedings’, whereupon he ‘rode out to find him’ one Sunday, and ‘hunted’ him ‘from Shoulden to Ham, from parish to parish’. According to Culmer, Bargrave almost caught his prey at Sandwich, only to be thwarted once Gray ‘crept through a secret muse’, whereupon he ‘caused the town gates to be shut, and watchmen were set with halbards at every corner, but the preacher escaped them all’. According to Culmer, Gray then ‘went beyond the bridge by the windmill, and escaped the wrath of that cathedral Levi’, escaping along the coast with the assistance of Anthony Oldfield, ‘to Lid, and so to Tenderden, and so to London’. Meanwhile, the dean brought in several people for questioning, ‘in his prelatical outrageous fury’, and bound over one of them, Thomas Foach, to the High Commission.<sup>56</sup> Elsewhere, Culmer referred to Bargrave as ‘the grandee’, who fired up troops mustered for the first Bishops’ War in 1639 by expressing the hope to see them ‘return ... with blew Scots caps’ on their heads. He was also said to have ‘laughed exceedingly’ at a comment that the King ‘would make the Scots glad to take bishops, and archbishops, and popes too’.<sup>57</sup> Culmer also used this term ‘grandee’ when referring to an incident in 1642, when Bargrave apparently ‘feasted some malignants’ who planned to seize parliamentary ships, and who was then rewarded by God on his journey home, when his coach ‘overthrew into the common sewer, or broad stinking ditch, between the Three Kings tavern and King’s Bridge in Canterbury’. According to Culmer, ‘the great cathedralist’ duly cried out for help, only to find ‘the people laughing at their land shipwreck, and filthy pickle’, and at the ‘bedaubed white satin gown of the female cathedralist’, adding that ‘the people said also that the prelates would have a greater fall, they hoped’.<sup>58</sup>

Here, in other words, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that Culmer deliberately framed stories in ways that were likely to have been particularly *legible* and meaningful to readers in Kent, such that they are likely to have been understood very differently by local and national audiences. Indeed, similar tactics are also evident in his son's relation of Culmer's own troubles and trials, especially in relation to his enemies, if not perhaps his friends, some of whom were explicitly identified, so that those who were 'yet living' could verify his stories.<sup>59</sup> In relating Culmer's experiences at Harbledown, for example, where he became 'assistant' to Robert Austin – 'now living' – and where he 'had very many auditors' from Canterbury, Culmer jr described how his father was

persecuted for his actings against drunkenness, and against prophaning the sabbath by cricket playing before his door, to spite him, which, when he had reproved privately and publicly, they removed that sport to a field near the woods, where they threw stones at his sons, whom he sent to see if they played there.

Moreover, 'upon public reproof, the churchwarden (whose wife was for just cause denied the sacrament) bought boards to keep the people of Canterbury out of the church seats', while 'the grandee persecutor J. W. used to go with his crew of brawlers and railers, his wife especially, upon the sabbath to the parsonage house, and there did clamour and bawl to the doctor to move him, that Mr Culmer might preach no more there'. Indeed, it was also noted that one of this 'crew', one 'S. S.', tried to get Culmer removed by hinting at shameful behaviour which had caused his removal from Goodnestone parish, prompting the conclusion that 'some people are like a kennel of hounds, that will bark for company'.<sup>60</sup> Elsewhere, reference was made to 'a debauched malignant priest' – 'P. K.' – who 'incensed the people' of the Minories (London) against Culmer in the mid-1650s, thereby endangering his life once

again. Another story involved an elder in the ‘pretended separatist congregation’ of ‘J. T.’, some thirty miles from Minster, who ‘meeting Mr Culmer lately upon the road, affronted him, and used opprobrious terms’.<sup>61</sup>

In other words, the aim behind the pamphlets produced by both Culmer and his son was to provide stories that were *verifiable*, at least for some readers, and it seems clear that the characters involved were real, and that the incidents recounted had at least some basis in fact. Beyond this, of course, readers may have disputed the way in which particular people and episodes were discussed, especially in terms of the emphasis that was placed on the providential ‘hand of God against such persecutors’. This involved the story of ‘Mr E. K. of Dover’, who ‘joined in the hurly-burly’ against ‘a godly able minister’ at St James, Dover – John Vincent – but who ‘a little after’ was a ‘self-executioner by hanging himself’.<sup>62</sup>

Likewise, it involved the account of Mr Morgan, who tried to dupe those illiterate parishioners who were Culmer’s allies into signing petitions against him (professing that they would help to secure his ‘preferment’), who ‘a few days after was stricken with death’.<sup>63</sup> It also involved an episode following the publication of Culmer’s suspension from Goodnestone by ‘Mr D (yet living), then curate to the Bishop of Rochester at Barham’, when ‘the people of Barham fell to dancing on the sabbath’, leading to a ‘quarrel ... between two dancers’ which resulted in one man having ‘his brains knocked out’.<sup>64</sup> And it involved ‘the grandee persecutor J. W.’ from Harbledown, whose son ‘used to thresh corn on sabbath mornings’, and who himself wound up in Canterbury gaol, as well as another man from the same parish, ‘E. Br.’, who promoted a petition against Culmer when he was refused the sacrament for having been drunk, and when he was denied a loan of twenty shillings. This man was soon ‘found guilty of a felony’ for having chased his wife ‘with a drawn sword’, and was ‘burnt in the hand at the sessions at Canterbury’. Apparently, he would have been ‘hanged’ if Culmer had not ‘taught him to read’, presumably meaning that he escaped by

reciting the so-called ‘neck verse’.<sup>65</sup> Finally, it involved the story – ‘which a thousand can witness, and which you know to be true’ – of Joan Yates, who was executed at Canterbury for infanticide, and who also confessed to having eluded her mistress in order to skip church services, specifically so that she could attend a ‘bawdy house’ where she ‘played the whore’.<sup>66</sup> Not every reader, one assumes, would have agreed that these interpretations were ‘famously known’, even if the stories themselves were based in fact.

However, given the willingness of Culmer’s contemporaries to respond to the pamphlets that he and his son published, it is noteworthy that such enemies not only felt compelled to deal with stories where characters had been anonymised, but also that they were able to identify those involved, and that they tended to confirm at least part of what had been alleged. This is particularly striking in relation to the lives and activities of local women. Culmer, for example, referred to an episode involving ‘their brave female cathedralist’, otherwise ‘a cathedral lasse beguiled [i.e. seduced] by a singing man’. Having been ‘delivered of a child alone’, this woman was arraigned for murder when the baby was subsequently ‘found dead in the vault’. Culmer’s point was to expose how ‘malignant and prelatical justices’ had ‘so bestirred themselves’ that she was acquitted, in order to protect the reputation of the cathedral, and in the face of protests from the bench.<sup>67</sup> In essence, this story – which cannot be verified due to the lack of surviving sessions papers – was confirmed by one of Culmer’s opponents, who admitted that it involved ‘a maidservant of a prebend’. Culmer’s story had basis in fact, even if the interpretation was contested, and his opponent insisted that it was merely a ‘private’ matter; that it was more important to show sympathy for the ‘weak female cathedralist’; that the father was ‘no singing man, but a townsman’ (a surgeon who had ‘left the city to dwell in the church’); and that it was ‘notorious in the country ... that the business had a square, fair trial’.<sup>68</sup>

Indeed, the fact that the identity of those involved would doubtless have been recognised from the evidence presented perhaps lends credibility to at least elements of Culmer's other stories relating to local women. One of these involved the 'proud cathedral dame' and the maidservant who was beaten for failing to starch her ruff properly. According to Culmer, the ruff in question was then miraculously starched overnight, 'none knew how'; it was then cast into a fire, 'out of which it leapt', until it was finally destroyed by being held in the flames. Once again, Culmer insisted that this story was 'famous in city and country', and although not everyone might have agreed with the conclusion that 'the devil was the cathedral laundress', none of his critics attacked the story's basis in fact.<sup>69</sup> The same is also true for Culmer's story about 'a rich widow Mrs R.' of Harbledown, who 'clamoured' against him and refused to pay her assessment of 2s. 6d. towards the poor, as well as for his story of the 'patroness' of Goodnestone, 'Mrs P', who gave his living to 'Mr A. H.', the latter of whom soon 'lost his goods by fire' and was then 'drowned in the water'.<sup>70</sup>

Very occasionally, Culmer's critics were willing and able to identify specific characters from Culmer's pamphlets very precisely. Thus, in addition to making allusive references of their own – to characters like 'Mr P. E.', who was 'yet alive', and who had apparently tried to stop Culmer from smashing the windows in the Cathedral, by 'dashing out those little brains he had' – they sometimes identified those whom Culmer had mentioned only cryptically.<sup>71</sup> For example, in criticising Canterbury's prelates for 'carding, dicing, dancing, swearing, drunkenness and drabbing too', and for 'tavern tospotting' – all which things were 'no news' – Culmer made a vague reference to seeing 'sack bottles keep rank and file in their studies'.<sup>72</sup> One critic responded by naming the culprit as Dr Thomas Jackson, one of the prebends. That this was done reflected the fact that Jackson was someone who had offended both Puritans and Laudians, and it was said to be 'no wonder' to see such a sight in Jackson's study – 'and no where else in the whole church' – given that he probably felt the

need to return to ‘those warm draughts of canary’ out of the guilt that arose from his ability to ‘one day preach for bishops, another day against them; one day for the liturgy, and the next day against it’.<sup>73</sup>

### III

Thus, while Culmer was considered to be ‘a notable plunderer of the good names, and rigid ransacker of the lives and conversations of his other fellow ministers’, his stories were not regarded as mere fictions. They were probably susceptible to being interrogated and verified by local readers, and they thus provide valuable insights into both the nature of the civil war in Kent, and into the uses of print.<sup>74</sup> These three facets of the pamphleteering surrounding Culmer can best be demonstrated, and perhaps also explained, by means of three small case studies, not least to show that they also applied to Culmer’s enemies.

The first relates to someone who was described by Culmer’s critics as ‘Mr E. B. of B. in the Parish of G.’, a gentleman ‘of birth and credit’ who was ‘brought in question for his life by the treacherous malice of this grand imposter’. More specifically, it was claimed that Culmer had made accusations about ‘treasonable speeches’ regarding Ship Money in the late 1630s, namely that ‘if we have such taxes laid upon us, we must rebel, or we must be fain to rebel’.<sup>75</sup> Culmer was apparently motivated by the desire to secure revenge upon someone who had helped secure his removal from a ‘curateship’, and the story was supplemented by a copy of the deposition that Culmer submitted to the Privy Council in July 1635, as well as by a transcript of the Council’s order of 9 October 1635, which insisted that his allegations were ‘causeless and unjust’, and which ordered his incarceration in the Fleet prison.<sup>76</sup> This can all be shown to have been true, in terms of the trouble in which Culmer found himself for accusations levelled against Edward Boys of Bonnington in Goodnestone, even though he

continued to maintain his innocence, blamed Laud for his ‘crying persecution’, and pointed out how quickly he was released.<sup>77</sup>

The second case study involves further allegations against Culmer by his enemies, in relation to two female parishioners in Harbledown. The first of these was the ‘rich matron’ into whose favour he ‘wound himself’ with various ‘tricks’, to the point where, ‘in commiseration’ of his perceived poverty, ‘she made him her constant almsman while she lived, and her executor when she died’.<sup>78</sup> This was a reference to the widow Ann Bull – another critic referred to Culmer going ‘a Bulling to Herbaldowne’ – who was actually Culmer’s ‘loving cousin’, and who made him both a beneficiary of her will as well as its executor in 1640.<sup>79</sup> The second woman was ‘Mrs B’ (and her husband ‘Mr B’), with whom Culmer was said to have become embroiled in law suits, and to whom he refused to pay money that was owed.<sup>80</sup> This was Grace Bull and her husband Miles, both of whom were beneficiaries of Ann Bull’s will, and both of whom became involved in complex and protracted Chancery suits with Culmer over unpaid legacies between 1641 and 1644, which resulted not just in ‘causeless suits’ but also hot words, threats of excommunication, and physical assaults, with Culmer claiming to have been attacked with a sword, and to have received ‘many sore blows’.<sup>81</sup> Here too, Culmer’s critics referred to verifiable events, and to a case that was probably notorious within Kent, and as such it is intriguing that reference was made to a bizarre episode which involved Culmer being ‘pursued from street to street’ by an irate ‘Mrs B’. According to the author of the *Antidotum*, Culmer was chased ‘up to St Thomas Hill ... and so towards Christchurch Wood’ – ‘a good breathing you may think for a gentlewoman’ – with his pursuer ‘chattering at him all the way for her money’, so that ‘all they met took notice of it’. Culmer apparently only escaped when, after a chase of some few miles, he was able to gather up his cloak and make for ‘a rough thicket’, which was ‘hard of access, especially for a gentlewoman’.<sup>82</sup>

The third and most substantial of the case studies involves Culmer's troubled time at Minster in Thanet during the 1640s and 1650s, and someone who was referred to merely as the '£500 man'.<sup>83</sup> Culmer's son recognised that his father's appointment to the parish was inherently controversial, noting how it prompted attempts 'to make the minds of the people ... ill-affected against him', not least by means of allegations made 'openly in the streets at Canterbury'. This doubtless reflected his puritan practices – his removal of images and crosses, his opposition to the maypole, and his refusal to preach on Christmas day – but it also involved claims that he courted 'poor people', so that they would not 'join with the rich men against him'.<sup>84</sup> However, serious difficulties were said to have begun in earnest following a dispute with a parishioner (and churchwarden) who 'desired him to entertain his brother-in-law, Mr P, then curate, to be his assistant', an offer that Culmer refused because the curate was 'the father of drunkards', and also a Laudian royalist. The curate's brother-in-law responded by boasting that he would spend £500 to get Culmer out of the living, and it was this '£500 man' who was said to have demonstrated 'burning malice' against Culmer, and who became the 'grandee' of the 'faction' that sought to undermine him.<sup>85</sup>

This campaign against Culmer by the 'faction' around the '£500 man' apparently involved 'taunts and cries', and repeated outbursts of verbal abuse, including an incident where one parishioner – a 'common swearer' called 'J. D.' – pointed to an open grave and cried 'we shall have him here, here, here shortly', before threatening to hang him from a nearby tree. However, it also involved attempts to petition the Westminster Assembly, a committee of parliamentarian peers, and Kent's deputy lieutenants, as well as the county committee, all of whom expressed their support for Culmer.<sup>86</sup> Thereafter, unsuccessful plans were allegedly made to complain about him to the Committee for Plundered Ministers, which involved collecting a common purse of £300, as well as the appointment of a treasurer, and processing 'coaches full of witnesses through Canterbury in triumphant bravado'.<sup>87</sup> Culmer's

son also referred to a complaint being made to the Commissioners for Scandalous Ministers, to a petition being submitted to Oliver Cromwell, and to the burdening of Culmer with billeted soldiers, to the point where he had to borrow money from two local JPs, Thomas Paramour and Major Thomas Foach. Culmer junior also pointed to the fact that a range of parishioners engaged in 'tithe-robbing tricks', and to the occasion when Culmer's 'tithing servant' was 'knocked down, and beaten and bruised'.<sup>88</sup>

Ultimately, Culmer himself was said to have become the target for physical abuse in 1647. It was claimed that a group of parishioners 'crushed his body so, that he vomited blood, and purged blood', and then 'dragged him by head and shoulders out of the church'. It was also alleged that riotous parishioners used force to keep Culmer from preaching: they 'bedaubed' the church windows with a 'filthy sir-reverence', and removed the clappers from the church bells, so that he could not call parishioners to worship. Eventually, a force was raised to assist Culmer, and the rioters – including someone who was referred to as 'C. S.', and as the 'scout', 'ringleader', 'incendiary', and 'trumpeter' – were all 'indicted and found guilty'. Their fines were promptly paid, however, by some of Culmer's parishioners, and new articles were promptly submitted against him by the '£500 man', alongside three others that Culmer claimed to be able to identify.<sup>89</sup> Apparently, Culmer then became a target for rioters at Canterbury (December 1647), not least as a result of having tried to defend the city's mayor, who had been 'knocked down'. Having been assaulted by a mob led by Joseph Philips, innkeeper of the Saracen's Head, Culmer was reported to have taken refuge with Sir James Oxinden, one of the deputy lieutenants, before returning to Minster and witnessing the murder of Richard Langley – 'a very godly man, and active for the state' – by a 'gentleman cavalier'. Thereafter, Culmer's son claimed that his father made a dramatic escape via Sandwich and Deal, pursued by a tumultuous mob, and assisted by a cast of named characters, including John Culmer of Deal, the physician Mr Wood, and one Mr Potter, as

well as Colonel Thomas Rainsborough and Captain Nubery of the *Hunter* frigate. Readers were explicitly informed that Mr Wade, gentleman usher at Whitehall, could ‘tell more of this’. According to this version of events, Culmer eventually wound up in Berdmondsey, where he preached at the church of Jeremiah Whitaker.<sup>90</sup>

Here too, Culmer’s son drew attention to the workings of providence in relation to the ‘chief agitators’ from Minster. One parishioner who offered verbal threats was said to have ‘died a little after stark mad, cursing and calling out the devil, the devil’, while another, ‘J.W.’, was soon ‘crushed to death’ after falling under a wagon in a ‘drunken reel’. Yet another, the bigamist ‘T. D.’ who ‘did beat his own aged dearest father’, was soon after hanged in Sussex. One of those who was supposed to witness against Culmer at Westminster – a ditcher from Upstreet called Wilde – fell sick soon after, and ‘died in a fearful manner’, and one of those who took part in the Minster riot subsequently became a pirate and a ‘cavalier captain’, and was ‘slain at sea’.<sup>91</sup> Although he did not say so explicitly, Culmer’s son also intimated that the death of the ‘£500 man’ shortly after participating in the Kentish rising – thereby enabling Culmer to live ‘peaceably without disturbance’ – also involved divine sanction.<sup>92</sup>

As elsewhere in the controversy surrounding Culmer, the troubles at Minster were also said to have revolved around the role of, and treatment of, female parishioners. In part, attention was paid to women who suffered at the hands of Culmer’s enemies, or who fell victim to the feuds in which he was involved. These included the poor bastard girl whom his adversaries sought to make his servant or apprentice, as well as the wife of the ‘£500 man’, who, having told her husband that she was ‘edified’ by Culmer’s sermons, and that she did not want to ‘gad’ to other parishes, suffered the indignity of having ‘a sir reverence... laid in her pew in the church’. To make matters worse, it was instead a visiting ‘gentlewoman of London’ who was ‘bedaubed with that stinking excrement’, such that she was ‘constrained to

strip her white satin petticoat over her feet in public, in the church, in the time of divine worship'.<sup>93</sup> More obviously, attention was drawn to the active part that local women played in such contests. These were said to have included a 'gentlewoman' – the wife of a local yeoman, William Goldfinch – who appeared as a witness against Culmer before a parliamentary committee, as well as a woman who threatened Culmer in a Canterbury street during the agitation in December 1647.<sup>94</sup> Most strikingly, reference was made to plans to raise a 'band of women', who were to attack Culmer 'and throw him in a ditch'. On this occasion, the plans were apparently mocked by a female parishioner, 'Mrs O', who told 'the gossips in the church porch' that the likely 'captain' of this group would probably be a 'whore', like the woman who 'was brought a bed a month after she was married'. As a result, Culmer's son was able to report that 'the band of women never advanced ... but with their sharp tongues'. Nevertheless, it was also noted that Culmer was accused for 'rehearsing' some 'words of the feminine gender'.<sup>95</sup>

Finally, the story of Culmer's trials at Minster confirms not just that such claims were susceptible to being interpreted by local readers, but also that even his enemies made concessions about their accuracy. On this occasion, verification came in the form of a pamphlet by Stephen Blaxland called *Speculum Culmerianum*, which mocked the 'false and opprobrious assertions' made by Culmer junior – they were said to reveal his father's 'vainglory', and to have been peddled to serve a 'private interest' – but which tended to quibble over details rather than challenge basic facts.<sup>96</sup> Blaxland thus confirmed the essence of the story about the Minster riot, including the fact that one of the ringleaders was nicknamed the 'trumpeter', while insisting that he had been made parish clerk out of charity – as someone who was 'aged and lame' – rather than because of his loyalty to 'the faction'.<sup>97</sup> Blaxland also confirmed that Culmer's sermons were attended by local magistrates, while denying that these included anyone other than Paramour and Foach.<sup>98</sup> Most interesting of all,

Blaxland confirmed the essence of the story about the ‘£500 man’, revealing his identity as John Blaxland – ‘my father’ – while defending his reputation from ‘insufferable injury’ by insisting that he was ‘very well known to all in that island’, as ‘a man of quiet and peaceable spirit’. Moreover, while Blaxland claimed that it was ‘altogether untrue’ that his mother valued Culmer’s sermons, comments about his father generally involved little more than qualifying his role in opposing Culmer, and reflecting upon his motivations.<sup>99</sup> Finally, and perhaps most interestingly, Blaxland picked up on a reference to an anonymous parishioner who mocked some locals as ‘Culmer’s disciples’, noting that ‘I know you mean me’. This involved complaining about an ‘undeserving scandal ... cast upon me’, while admitting that he had been involved in erecting a controversial pew in Minster church.<sup>100</sup>

#### IV

These comments by Stephen Blaxland take us to the heart of what makes Culmer’s pamphlets, and those of his enemies, so intriguing. In responding to tracts by Culmer’s son, Blaxland understood even the vaguest of references, worried about the response within his local community, and subjected the evidence to close scrutiny. As such, he makes it possible to draw to a close by suggesting that the Culmer affair sheds light on a somewhat different kind of pamphleteering to the one with which historians are familiar. This is partly because Culmer, his son, and their enemies highlight the innovative ways in which pamphlets could be composed and constructed, in terms of how credibility was promoted rhetorically and evidentially, and in terms of the strategic ways in which they could be used alongside other kinds of political and legal activity. But it is also because such authors wrote about the political and religious issues that drove the civil wars as they played out in Kent – most obviously in Canterbury and the parishes where Culmer ministered – through detailed

accounts of local factions, tensions, and disputes. In many ways, of course, this was predictable and natural, and in line with the wider culture of pamphleteering, but what merits attention is how these authors chose to provide vivid and detailed narratives while also anonymising many of those involved. This was not done systematically, and there was certainly scope for *revealing* the identities of those involved, so that stories might be verified, or so that authors could make rhetorical claims about the possibility of stories being verified. At the same time, there was no clear pattern whereby authors named their friends while anonymising their enemies, and to the extent that patterns can be discerned it is not immediately apparent why this tactic should have been deployed. It is possible that such information was thought to be redundant in pamphlets that were published in London for more widespread consumption. It is also possible that authors wanted to be able to say provocative things without being accused of libelling living people. However, irrespective of the precise reasoning involved, the implications seem clear. First, the stories written by and about Culmer involved identifiable individuals, and episodes that can often be shown to have taken place, or at least that nobody denied having happened. Secondly, the anonymity surrounding key players did not stop other people in Kent from being able to identify those involved, and to recognise the stories being told. Thirdly, these pamphlets thus provide a more or less reliable means of recovering the kinds of things that happened in Kent during the 1640s and 1650s. Such things are striking in terms of the nature of popular politics and religion, and in terms of the awareness that locals had about print culture, national affairs, and the political and legal processes of Westminster and Whitehall. They are also revealing in terms of the active role of women from all walks of life, as well as in terms of the complex and distasteful ways in which contemporaries responded to female power and agency. Fourthly, anonymity can also be presumed to have been deployed in the expectation that, while many of the characters and episodes would have read for their general value outside

Kent, they would also have been read and interpreted differently, and more *knowingly*, by people *within* the local area. As such, it becomes clear how far the authors of these pamphlets wrote with more than one audience in mind, and at least in part for an audience for cheap, polemical, and topical print, which was presumed to exist within their own community. What Culmer and his enemies understood, in other words, was that pamphleteering could be undertaken with the intention that texts would prove useful in different ways in local and national contexts, and with different kinds of audience.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Certain Informations*, 49 (18-23 Dec. 1643, BL, E.79[8]), pp. 385-6; *ODNB*; R. Greaves, *Saints and Rebels* (Macon, 1985), pp. 63-75; E. Calamy, *The Nonconformist's Memorial*, ed. Samuel Palmer (3 vols, London, 1802-3), ii. 345-6; J. Eales, 'Kent and the English Civil Wars, 1640-1660', in F. Lansberry, ed., *Government and Politics in Kent, 1640-1914* (Woodbridge, 2001), p. 17; M. Aston, *England's Iconoclasts* (Oxford, 1988), pp. 84-95. For a later claim for financial aid by a Canterbury cordwainer, William Cooke, who had been injured trying to resist Culmer, see: Kent History and Library Centre, Maidstone [hereafter KHLC], DCc/PET/232.

<sup>2</sup> J. Eales, 'The rise of ideological politics in Kent, 1558-1640', in M. Zell, ed., *Early Modern Kent, 1540-1640* (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 285; *CSPD 1640-1*, pp. 453-4; *CSPD 1641-3*, p. 545; *CSPD 1644*, p. 15; HMC, *Fifth Report*, p. 70; *LJ*, v. 588; W. Prynne, *Canterburies Doome* (1646), pp. 27, 33, 388-409, 539-43; Calamy, *Memorial*, ii. 345-6; E. Hasted, *The History and Topographical Survey of the County of Kent* (12 vols, Canterbury, 1797-1801), x. 288; B. Capp, *England's Culture Wars* (Oxford, 2012), pp. 1-3; Alan Everitt, *The Community of Kent and the Great Rebellion, 1640-60* (Leicester, 1966), p. 60; Aston, *Iconoclasts*, p. 88. For Culmer and the petitioning campaign, see: BL, Add. MS 26785, fo. 84; L. B. Larking, ed., *Proceedings, Principally in the County of Kent* (Camden Society, 1862), p. 119. For his petition for a place at Canterbury Cathedral in 1644, see: PA,

---

HL/PO/JO/10/1/174; *LJ*, vii. 10. For evidence of a dispute in 1659, see: Canterbury Cathedral Archives [hereafter CCA], CC/F/A/26, fo. 435.

<sup>3</sup> A. Hughes, *Politics, Society and Civil War in Warwickshire, 1620-1660* (Cambridge, 1987); A. Hughes, *Gangraena and the Struggle for the English Revolution* (Oxford, 2004); A. Hughes, *Gender and the English Revolution* (London, 2012).

<sup>4</sup> Everitt, *Community of Kent*, pp. 53, 59, 60, 74, 85, 117, 127, 202-3, 204, 225-6, 233.

<sup>5</sup> See: Steve Hindle, 'The shaming of Margaret Knowsley: gossip, gender and the experience of authority in early modern England', *Continuity and Change*, 9.3 (1994), 391-419; John Walter, "'Affronts & Insolencies': the voices of Radwinter and popular opposition to Laudianism", *EHR*, 122.495 (2007), 35-60; John Walter, 'Popular iconoclasm and the politics of the parish in Eastern England, 1640-1642', *HJ*, 47.2 (2004), 261-90; David Cressy, 'Mercy Gould and the vicar of Cuckfield: domestic and clerical pleading', in *Agnes Bowker's Cat* (Oxford, 2000), pp. 51-72; J. Eales, 'The clergy and allegiance at the outbreak of the English civil wars: the case of John Marston of Canterbury', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 132 (2012), 83-109.

<sup>6</sup> R. Culmer, *Cathedral Newes from Canterbury* (1644, ESTC C7478), sig. A2.

<sup>7</sup> Culmer, *Cathedral*, pp. 2, 3, 5.

<sup>8</sup> Culmer, *Cathedral*, pp. 7, 8, 12. See: P. Clark, *English Provincial Society from the Reformation to the Revolution* (Hassocks, 1977), pp. 364-5, 370. For George Huntley (d.1646), of Stourmouth, see: Larking, ed., *Proceedings*, pp. 196-8; *An Argument Upon a General Demurrer* (1642, ESTC H3779); TNA, PROB 11/195, fo. 326v. For Gardiner, vicar of St Mary Sandwich, see: *Canterbury Licences 1568-1646* (London, 1972) [hereafter *CL*], p. 382; *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, comp. J. Venn (4 vols, Cambridge, 1922-54) (hereafter *Al. Cant.*), ii. 194. For Partridge, curate of Sutton by Dover, see: *CL*, pp. 96-7; *Al. Cant.*, iii. 316. For Player (d.1660), vicar of Kennington, see: A. G. Matthews, *Calamy Revised* (Oxford,

---

1934) [hereafter *CR*], p. 392; *CL*, p. 99; Everitt, *Community of Kent*, pp. 77-80. For Hieron, vicar of Hernhill, see: *CL*, p. 99; *Al. Cant.*, ii. 367. For Thomas Wilson, rector of St George the Martyr, Canterbury see: *ODNB*. For the clash between Laud and these ministers, see: TNA, SP 16/477, fo. 17; SP 16/499, fo. 218; SP 16/500, fo. 123; SP 16/502, fo. 16.

<sup>9</sup> Culmer, *Cathedral*, p. 7.

<sup>10</sup> Culmer, *Cathedral*, pp. 20, 24.

<sup>11</sup> Culmer, *Cathedral*, pp. 8, 9-10, 10-11.

<sup>12</sup> Culmer, *Cathedral*, pp. 18-19. For Dell, see: *A Biographical Register St John's College, Oxford*, ed. A. Hegarty (Woodbridge, 2011), p. 253; TNA, PROB/11/204, fo. 197v. In the election, Dell and Sir Roger Palmer (a future royalist and a court nominee) were defeated by two local men, John Nutt and Sir Edward Masters, amid lively scenes in which at least one libel against Dell was 'cast abroad'. Dell secured election at St Ives, and served as Laud's solicitor at his trial. See: CCA, A/C4, fos 121v, 151v, 158; BL, Add. MS 11045, fo. 99v; *CSPD 1639-40*, pp. 561-2.

<sup>13</sup> Culmer, *Cathedral*, pp. 1, 9.

<sup>14</sup> Culmer, *Cathedral*, pp. 10, 18. These comments referred to Isaac Baggrave, *A Sermon Preached before King Charles* (1627, ESTC 1414) and T. Paske, *A Copy of a Letter* (1642, ESTC P646).

<sup>15</sup> *The Razing of the Record* (Oxford, 1644, ESTC R420), p. 1.

<sup>16</sup> *Antidotum Culmerianum* (Oxford, 1644, ESTC A3500), sig. A2, p. 20.

<sup>17</sup> One tract reprinted *Cathedral Newes*, with additions apparently written by his son: *Dean and Chapter Newes from Canterbury* (1649, ESTC C7479). Another tract was attributed to Richard Culmer junior: R. Culmer, *A Parish Looking-Glasse* (1657, ESTC C7482). His role was disputed by other authors – both parishioners – but is accepted for the purpose of this chapter: *Culmers Crown Crackt* (1657, ESTC C7483); S. Blaxland, *Speculum Culmerianum*

---

(1657, ESTC B3176). See also: R. Culmer, *The Ministers Hue and Cry* (1651, ESTC C7481); C. Nichols, *The Hue and Cry* (1651, ESTC N1099); R. Culmer, *Lawles Tythe-Robbers* (1655, ESTC C7480).

<sup>18</sup> *Razing*, p. 4.

<sup>19</sup> *Antidotum*, pp. 28-9.

<sup>20</sup> *Razing*, pp. 11-12. For verses, see: *Crown*, pp. 15-17.

<sup>21</sup> *Crown*, title page.

<sup>22</sup> *Razing*, p. 3; *Antidotum*, p. 6; *Crown*, pp. 15-17.

<sup>23</sup> *Crown*, p. 8; Blaxland, *Speculum*, p. 14; *Antidotum*, pp. 23-4. Culmer was said to have removed the cross from the steeple at Minster.

<sup>24</sup> *Antidotum*, pp. 17, 23.

<sup>25</sup> *Antidotum*, p. 12. Culmer was said to be worth £1200.

<sup>26</sup> *Antidotum*, sig. A2v.

<sup>27</sup> *Antidotum*, pp. 5-6; *Crown*, p. 1.

<sup>28</sup> *Crown*, p. 2.

<sup>29</sup> *Antidotum*, pp. 6-7; *Crown*, pp. 2, 10-12.

<sup>30</sup> *Antidotum*, pp. 8, 9, 13, 14; *Razing*, sig. A2v, p. 3; *Crown*, p. 2.

<sup>31</sup> *Antidotum*, pp. 6-7; *Crown*, pp. 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10-12.

<sup>32</sup> *Antidotum*, pp. 6-7; *Crown*, pp. 2, 10-12.

<sup>33</sup> Culmer, *Dean and Chapter*, title page, p. 24; Culmer, *Parish*, sig. A2, pp. 3, 5, 6. For Culmer at Goodnestone, see: *CL*, 64.

<sup>34</sup> Culmer, *Parish*, p. 6; Culmer, *Dean and Chapter*, p. 24.

<sup>35</sup> Culmer, *Dean and Chapter*, p. 24; Culmer, *Parish*, pp. 9-10, 36.

<sup>36</sup> Culmer, *Parish*, sig. A2, pp. 2, 3.

---

<sup>37</sup> Culmer, *Parish*, p. 37. Culmer apparently fled to Summers Key, where one Mr Mapsden gave him shelter.

<sup>38</sup> Culmer, *Parish*, pp. 2-3, 22; *Culmers Crown*, p. 13.

<sup>39</sup> Culmer, *Parish*, p. 7.

<sup>40</sup> Culmer, *Parish*, sig. A2.

<sup>41</sup> Culmer, *Cathedral*, pp. 15-17. Culmer's stories about Laud and his dreams included material not in Prynne's edition of the diary.

<sup>42</sup> Culmer, *Dean and Chapter*, p. 24; Culmer, *Parish*, pp. 3, 6-7. Culmer named his tutor in Canterbury as Roger Raven, 'an eminent, godly learned yet persecuted and silenced minister': *Al. Cant.*, iii. 423.

<sup>43</sup> Culmer, *Cathedral*, pp. 4, 5, 6, 12; Culmer, *Parish*, pp. 19-20.

<sup>44</sup> Culmer, *Parish*, pp. 7-8, 8-9, 38-9; Culmer, *Dean and Chapter*, pp. 26-8. For such testimonials and correspondence with those involved, see: PA, HL/PO/JO/10/1/174; HL/PO/JO/10/1/142. These testimonials were mocked by Culmer's enemies, forcing him to insist that they were 'real, under so many names of worth': Blaxland, *Speculum*, p. 7; Culmer, *Parish*, p. 7.

<sup>45</sup> *Antidotum*, sig. A2.

<sup>46</sup> Blaxland, *Speculum*, pp. 9, 28; *Antidotum*, pp. 17, 12. For evidence of Culmer's investment as an Irish 'adventurer', see: TNA, SP 63/298, fo. 349; SP 63/285, fo. 3.

<sup>47</sup> Culmer, *Cathedral*, pp. 4, 12, 13.

<sup>48</sup> Hughes, *Gangraena*, pp. 166, 177, 205. Edwards occasionally anonymised his *sources*, perhaps reflecting the information he received, and decisions of his informers: Edwards, *Gangraena*, i. 68, 69, 70-1, 81, ii. 50, 53, 57. For other examples of how stories regarding local disputes involved anonymised characters, see: Ralph Wallis, *More News from Rome*

---

(1666, ESTC W616), pp. 29-32; Ralph Wallis, *Room for the Cobler of Gloucester* (1668, ESTC W619), pp. 14, 25, 27-30, 33, 38-9.

<sup>49</sup> Culmer, *Cathedral*, p. 2.

<sup>50</sup> Culmer, *Cathedral*, p. 3.

<sup>51</sup> For Warriner, see: A. G. Matthews, *Walker Revised* (Oxford, 1988) [hereafter *WR*], p. 2.

For Archdeacon Kingsley, whose 1647 will claimed that he was ‘a firm and constant professor of the faith, doctrine and discipline which is now by law established in the Church of England’, see: *WR*, p. 220; J. Le Neve, *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 1541-1857* (13 vols, London, 1969-2014), iii. 15, 31. TNA, PROB 11/204, fo. 109. For Warner, see: *ODNB*. Others cannot be identified.

<sup>52</sup> Culmer, *Cathedral*, p. 5. For Casaubon, see: *WR*, p. 213. For the claims about Casaubon and his curate, John Picard, including enthusiasm for ceremonies, see: Larking, ed., *Proceedings*, pp. 104, 107; *ODNB*.

<sup>53</sup> *Cathedral*, p. 18. See *Antidotum*, p. 26, where the author identified Culmer’s target as ‘Dr P’. For Paske, see: *A Copy of a Letter* (1642, ESTC P646); Le Neve, *Fasti*, iii. 25.

<sup>54</sup> Culmer, *Cathedral*, p. 4. This may have been a reference to William Dunkin, sometime minister at St Laurence, Isle of Thanet, canon of the cathedral and six preacher, a frequenter of alehouses who drank healths to Prince Rupert, bowed before the altar and likened the covenanter invasion to the Spanish Armada: *WR*, p. 215.

<sup>55</sup> Culmer, *Cathedral*, pp. 8-9.

<sup>56</sup> Culmer, *Cathedral*, pp. 7-8. For Bargrave, see: *ODNB*; Le Neve, *Fasti*, iii. 12. This story referred to Enoch Gray, sometime minister in Sandwich, who then became rector of Wickham Bishop, Essex: *CR*, p. 232; *Al. Cant.*, ii. 250. It also refers to Thomas Foach or Foche of Monckton, who had signed an anti-Casaubon petition in 1641, and who became a prominent parliamentary JP and committee-man, and an ally of Culmer. See: Larking, ed.,

---

*Proceedings*, p. 107; Everitt, *Community of Kent*, pp. 151, 154; *The Visitation of Kent... 1619-1621* (Harleian Society, 42, 1898), pp. 49, 73; G. J. Armytage, ed., *The Visitation of Kent... 1663* (Harleian Society, 54, 1906), p. 27.

<sup>57</sup> Culmer, *Cathedral*, p. 8.

<sup>58</sup> Culmer, *Cathedral*, p. 19.

<sup>59</sup> Named friends include John Lade, sometime mayor of Canterbury, and Richard Pysing: Culmer, *Parish*, pp. 6-7. For Robert Austin, sometime rector of Harbledown and parliamentary pamphleteer, see: *ODNB*; TNA, PROB 11/310, fo. 236v. For Pysing (*d.* 1675), from Canterbury, see: Armytage, ed., *Visitation of Kent*, p. 152; *CL*, p. 806; CCA, PRC/27/26/92.

<sup>60</sup> Culmer, *Parish*, p. 4; Culmer, *Dean and Chapter*, pp. 24-5. This may have been Stephen Smith, identified in another pamphlet: Culmer, *Ministers*, p. 8, but it may also have been Stephen Swayne: J. M. Cowper, ed., *The Christnynges, Weddinges and Burynges in the Parish of Harballldowne* (Canterbury, 1907), p. 6. 'J.W.' was James Wood: Cowper, ed., *Christnynges*, pp. 80-83; Culmer, *Dean and Chapter*, pp. 24-5.

<sup>61</sup> Culmer, *Parish*, pp. 37-8. 'P. K.' was Paul Knell (*d.* 1664), sometime minister of St Dunstan, Canterbury, a royalist sequestered from his living, who later preached in London in the late 1640s. See: Larking, ed., *Proceedings*, pp. 136-9; *WR*, p. 221; *ODNB*. 'J. T.' was John Turner of Sutton Valence. See: R. J. Acheson, 'Sion's Saint: John Turner of Sutton Valence', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 99 (1983), 183-97; *No Age Like Unto This Age* (1653, ESTC N1173), pp. 1, 9, 11-13.

<sup>62</sup> Culmer, *Parish*, p. 3. This was a reference to Edward Kemp, a moderate reformer and sometime ally of Sir Edward Dering, who subsequently become a royalist: Larking, ed., *Proceedings*, pp. 23-4, 60-2; *Visitation of Kent 1619-1621*, p. 32; Everitt, *Community of Kent*, pp. 71-8, 213. Vincent, who was appointed by Parliament, later served as a naval chaplain

---

and died on board ship during the second Anglo-Dutch war in 1665: *CJ*, ii. 489; *CJ*, iii. 66-7; TNA, PROB 11/317, fo. 383.

<sup>63</sup> Culmer, *Ministers*, p. 8.

<sup>64</sup> Culmer, *Parish*, p. 4. This was Francis Drayton (*d.*1669), curate of Barham from 1637, and later vicar of Little Chart: *CL*, pp. 66, 71, 137; *Al. Cant.*, ii. 66; *WR*, p. 210.

<sup>65</sup> Culmer, *Parish*, p. 5; Culmer, *Ministers*, p. 8; Culmer, *Dean and Chapter*, pp. 24-5. For J. W., i.e. James Wood, see above, n.60. 'E. Br' was Edward Browning: Cowper, ed., *Christnynges*, p. 82.

<sup>66</sup> Culmer, *Ministers*, p. 14.

<sup>67</sup> Culmer, *Cathedral*, p. 4.

<sup>68</sup> *Razing*, p. 3; *Antidotum*, p. 22. This involved drawing a parallel with the case of 'another gracious virgin', who miscarried after having 'conceived a child' by the 'religious son' of 'Master Necessity, alias Ladde, now judge of the archbishop's court at Canterbury'. For Ladde, who had apparently been presiding at the sessions when the case was tried, see: Robert Ladd or Lade of Canterbury, Staple Inn and Gray's Inn: *CL*, p. 597; J. Foster, *The Register of Admissions to Gray's Inn* (2 vols, London, 1889), i. 128; R. Fletcher, ed., *The Pension Book of Gray's Inn* (2 vols, London, 1901-10), i. 226, 339; J. S. Cockburn, ed., *Calendar of Assize Records. Kent Indictments Charles I* (London, 1995), pp. 392, 409, 537. One pamphleteer claimed that the acquittal may have resulted from 'the counsel of friends', just as Culmer was supposed to have used friends to secure a clerical living at the expense of Stephen Goffe: *Razing*, p. 3. For Goffe, see: *WR*, p. 356; *ODNB*.

<sup>69</sup> Culmer, *Cathedral*, pp. 4-5.

<sup>70</sup> Culmer, *Parish*, pp. 3-4, 5; Culmer, *Ministers*, p. 8. 'Mrs P' was perhaps Alice Pordage of Goodnestone, widow of Nicholas Pordage of St Dunstan in the East, London. She remarried in 1634: TNA, PROB 11/218, fo. 59v; PROB 11/164, fo. 287v. 'A.H.' was Arthur Hatch: *CL*,

---

pp. 64, 66; J. Foster, *Alumni Oxonienses* (4 vols, Oxford, 1891-2), ii. 671. 'Mrs R' was probably Jane, widow of Christopher Rich: Cowper, ed., *Christnynges*, p. 83; CCA, DCb/BT1/107/19, 29; CCA, PRC/17/65/380a, PRC/10/54/104.

<sup>71</sup> *Crown*, pp. 3-4.

<sup>72</sup> Culmer, *Cathedral*, p. 4.

<sup>73</sup> *Razing*, pp. 2, 4. Dr Thomas Jackson (*d.*1646) was a cathedral canon and prebend, rector of St George, Canterbury and vicar of Ivychurch, who later witnessed against Laud, who accused him of frequently changing his views. See: *WR*, p. 219; Le Neve, *Fasti*, iii. 21; W. Laud, *Troubles and Tryal* (1695), p. 326. In his 1642 will, Jackson professed loyalty to the Church of England, and bemoaned 'all such heterodox novel and curious tenets as by papists, Arminians and sectaries have been most unhappily broached, preached and printed to the great trouble of the church and the disquieting of the minds of many godly people'. He hoped that God would 'compose the many and great differences lately risen amongst us'. A 1644 codicil referred to 'the continuance of those grievous, troublesome and bloody times', and to how his estate was 'much diminished'. See: TNA, PROB 11/201, fo. 205v.

<sup>74</sup> *Razing*, sig. A2.

<sup>75</sup> *Antidotum*, pp. 17-18.

<sup>76</sup> *Antidotum*, pp. 19, 34-5.

<sup>77</sup> Culmer, *Dean and Chapter*, p. 24; Culmer, *Parish*, p. 7. Culmer's son blamed not just Laud but also 'Sir J. F.', i.e. Sir John Finch, a prominent lawyer and sometime speaker of the House of Commons. See: *ODNB*. For the documentation, see: *CSPD 1635*, pp. 301, 368; TNA, SP 16/294, fo. 151; SP 16/297, fos 145, 147; TNA, PC 2/45, fos 43, 44, 66-v. Culmer's deposition contained the allegation that Boys wanted to 'get my benefice for his cousin Hatch by my ruin'. For Boys (*d.*1661), see: *Visitation of Kent... 1619-1621*, p. 39.

<sup>78</sup> *Antidotum*, p. 12.

---

<sup>79</sup> *Culmers Crown*, p. 3; CCA, PRC/27/8/140; PRC/31/114 B/1. Bull left books worth £7, including Foxe's 'book of martyrs', and asked to be buried 'without pomp'.

<sup>80</sup> *Antidotum*, p. 15.

<sup>81</sup> TNA, C 2/Chas1/B160/77; C 2/Chas1/C41/52; C 2/Chas1/B27/60. It was alleged that Culmer, a 'troublesome and lawing man' had threatened 'to go beyond the seas and to live in Holland, New England or some other remote part', while Culmer claimed that his rival said that 'Hell is too good for such a rascal as you are'. In his will of December 1643, Miles Bull expressed the hope that Culmer would 'show himself both faithful and just in pursuance of my aunt's will, in so ample a manner as may be desired'. He also referred to money 'due to me from the king': CCA, PRC/27/11/33; PRC 31/122 B/3. For ecclesiastical court wrangling within the Bull family, and with local ministers like James Hirst, John Gee and Francis Kettleby, involving libels and tithe disputes, see: CCA, DCb/J/J/36/63; DCb/J/J/35/103 and 105; DCb/J/J/39/67; DCb/J/J/51/64; DCb/J/J/58/211; DCb/PRC/18/19/28 and 36.

<sup>82</sup> *Antidotum*, pp. 16-17.

<sup>83</sup> Aston, *Iconoclasts*, pp. 89-91. For a report by Culmer on Minster and the Isle of Thanet from 1651, see: TNA, SP 25/65, fo. 43; SP 25/96, fo. 19. Unpicking the story of Minster is made more difficult by the fact that while the churchwarden's accounts survive they are too fragile to be made accessible: CCA, U3/164/P255/5/A4.

<sup>84</sup> Culmer, *Parish*, pp. 9, 11, 17, 18, 24. The '£500 man' refused to support Culmer's attempt to remove 'idolatry' from the church, whereupon Culmer apparently hired two parishioners, Peter Wotton and Thomas Austin (*d.*1648) to remove the crosses. For these men, see: KHL, U3/164/1/1.

<sup>85</sup> Culmer, *Parish*, pp. 9, 11, 24-5, 27-33. This cleric was John Picard, who had been curate at Minster since 1621, and had been criticised in 1641 alongside Casaubon as being 'zealously observant of all innovations, and bowing and cringeing to the communion table'. He also

---

refused the sacrament to those who refused to kneel at the altar rail. See: KHLc, DCb/BT1/160/14-29; *CL*, pp. 62, 69, 99, 136, 779, 1340; *Al. Cant.*, iii. 358; Larking, ed., *Proceedings*, p. 104.

<sup>86</sup> Culmer, *Parish*, pp. 17, 18, 24. 'J.D.' was perhaps John Dyer (*d.*1670) of Minster: CCA, PRC/16/286 D/2. It might also have been James Dobson (fl. 1626-1651) of Minster: KHLc, DCb/BT1/160/16; KHLc, U3/164/1/1. In the Assembly, Culmer was apparently defended by Dr Peter Smith, Herbert Palmer, William Gouge, Dr Thomas Wilson and Dr Edward Corbet (for whom see *ODNB*), and elsewhere he received support from the earl of Warwick, as well as from a string of prominent Kent parliamentarians: Sir James Oxinden, Mr Boys of Betteshanger MP, Richard Hardres, Anthony Weldon, Robert Scot, William Miller, John Boys and William Kenwick, as well as Sir Edward Boys (MP and governor of Dover Castle), and Thomas Blount. See: Culmer, *Parish*, pp. 11-13, 15, 16.

<sup>87</sup> Culmer, *Parish*, pp. 18, 19.

<sup>88</sup> Culmer, *Parish*, pp. 20, 21, 22, 34, 35. For Paramour and Foach, see: *A&O*, i. 1238; ii. 119, 301; *Visitation of Kent... 1619-1621*, p. 13; KHLc, U3/164/11/1, fos 85v, 131. For action against Minster parishioners for tithe infractions, see: KHLc, Q/SB/3/4.

<sup>89</sup> Culmer, *Parish*, pp. 25-8, 34. Culmer apparently received support from 'good people' like Mr Hartius of Birchington, while the attackers seem to have included a parishioner called Robert Wells, who had signed the parish petition of 1641 and who was constable of Ringslow hundred in 1647: Larking, ed., *Proceedings*, p. 104; Cockburn, ed., *Kent Indictments*, pp. 489, 508; KHLc, U3/164/11/1, fos 1-2, 45v. Warrants were issued by the Committee for Plundered Ministers to protect Culmer, and by the earl of Warwick as Lord Admiral at Walmer Castle. Culmer responded to the silencing of the bells by using his wife's 'great iron pestle'. Subsequently 'a quondam singing man of the cathedral said in the open street that he

---

heard Mr Culmer had routed C.S. at the sessions but C.S. would rout him out of Minister': Culmer, *Parish*, p. 35. 'C.S.' has not been identified.

<sup>90</sup> Culmer, *Parish*, pp. 29, 30, 32. For Richard Langley of St Laurence, see: Everitt, *Community of Kent*, pp. 244-5; For Philips (*d.*1670), see: CCA, PRC/31/139 P/5. For John Culmer (*d.*1671) of Deal, see: CCA, PRC/32/54/669.

<sup>91</sup> Culmer, *Parish*, pp. 17-18, 19, 27. 'J.W.' was probably John Warden, whose son, John Warden junior, was accused in 1655 of stealing wood from Culmer: KHLC, Q/SB/6/7 (information of Richard Culmer, 19 April 1655).

<sup>92</sup> Culmer, *Parish*, pp. 30, 32. Readers were also told about the sad fate of the murderer of Richard Langley, who 'did afterwards cut down his own wife in pieces, and was hanged at Sandwich'. According to Culmer, this man was 'a great jeerer at praying by the spirit, a contemner of public ordinances, a great incendiary against Mr Culmer': *ibid.*, p. 31. The murderer was Adam Sprackling: *The Bloody Husband and Cruell Neighbour* (1653, ESTC B2254).

<sup>93</sup> Culmer, *Parish*, p. 29.

<sup>94</sup> Culmer, *Parish*, pp. 20, 30. The first of these was Joan Goldfinch, widow of Daniel Pamphlet of Minister, who was licensed to marry William Goldfinch (*d.*1651) in 1643. He was sometime churchwarden of Minster in the 1620s and 1630s, and had signed the petition complaining about Meric Casaubon and John Picard in 1641: KHLC, DCb/BT1/160/14, 18, 25; KHLC, U3/164/1/1; KHLC, U3/164/11/1, fos 1-2, 5v; Larking, ed., *Proceedings*, p. 104; *CL*, p. 413.

<sup>95</sup> Culmer, *Parish*, p. 12.

<sup>96</sup> Blaxland, *Speculum*, sig. A2, pp. 3, 18, 21-2.

<sup>97</sup> Blaxland, *Speculum*, pp. 19, 23-4.

<sup>98</sup> Blaxland, *Speculum*, pp. 20-1.

---

<sup>99</sup> Blaxland, *Speculum*, sig. A2, 8-9, 14-15, 17, 21-2. For John Blaxland (*d.*1649), of St Margaret Atwade and Minster, who served as churchwarden at the latter in 1644, see: *CL*, ii. 109-10; TNA, PROB 11/208, fo. 228v; KHLC, U3/164/1/1; KHLC, U164/11/1, fos 1-2, 13v, 16, 33v, 45v.

<sup>100</sup> Blaxland, *Speculum*, p. 25.