

## “The Sixteen” of Heanor.

By the REV. R. JOWETT BURTON, M.A.



OME few years ago there was restored to the parish chest of Heanor an old and dilapidated manuscript-book, measuring 12 in. by 8 in., and about 1 in. thick. It had become unbound, and had been rolled up. The parchment cover, dilapidated and worm-eaten, has a “flap” to which a thong was originally sewn. For a great part the writing is on one side of the leaf only. It has been repaired and rebound by Messrs. Bemrose & Sons Ltd., and is now a comely volume.

This was spoken of as the “Old Churchwardens’ Accounts.” As such it is an interesting parish document, for it extends from the year 1585 to 1744; but examination discloses a still greater interest and value. It shows that the government of things ecclesiastical in the parish was in the hands of specially chosen men, who were called “The XVI.,” or “The Sixteen” —a system of organisation which is apparently mentioned here for the first time as existing in Derbyshire. Nor does the interest end there, for the names recorded preserve a list of the “most substantial men in the parish.” The question of the origin of this particular system raises a still more interesting subject.

The book begins thus:—

“The Book of the Accompts for the . . . Heynor (coteyning ?) all suche Charges As shall . . . be leid for the for the (*sic*) same church, by the churchwardens Appointed for the same office, Dated the first daye of Maye Ano Dni 1585, in the xxviith yeare of the rayne of or souveraigne lady quene Elyzabethe &c.

“ forthermore it is Agreid by the whole consent of the prishe, that there shalby appointed, from tyme to ty(me) XVI men being of the most substanciall men in the prishe, that shall take suche order for the same (? church) of heynor, in making of leyes of mony for the (? same) churche, & to elect suche churche wardens as they (shall) thinke most fittest for the same office (wi)th . . . (? consent) of the vicar of the same churche & to take accoump(t—of ?) the same wardens yerly.”

Then follow “ The names of the xvi. men that ar Appointed for the churche to take order for the prishe.”

“ The Sixteen ” represented three districts; for Codnor and Loscoe there were seven; for Heanor, Langley and Milnhay there were five; and for Shipley there were four. The parish was so divided until the nineteenth century, when Codnor and Loscoe were made into a separate parish, and Shipley was united with Cotmanhay in forming a new parish. Until this separation, three churchwardens were appointed to represent Codnor, Heanor, and Shipley.

It has been suggested, by one well versed in antiquarian lore, that the system of Church government by “ the Sixteen ” was a product of the Reformation movement during the reign of Elizabeth; and the words, “ it is agreed by the whole consent of the parish that there shall be appointed from time to time xvi. men,” seem to convey the impression of novelty. This may be the true explanation. But a comparison with other cases of “ Sixteens ” indicates a far more ancient and obscure origin of this custom in local government. The sixteenth century was an age when many customs disappeared, and when many rights lapsed or were transferred from one power to another, and in this process it is possible that the duties of the “ Sixteen,” as distinctly and solely matters of Church government, *may* have been, in this case, a *new* idea.

The accounts given in the book show that the duties were not throughout confined to those specified in the memorandum, and the oversight of surveyors and constables may have been a survival of an older order of things when the duties of the “ Sixteen ” were more extensive, rather than an additional burden laid on them after their inauguration in 1585.

In the *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Archaeological Society*, 1903, vol. iii., new series, pp. 172 *sq.*, there is an interesting account of "The Sixteen Men of Holme Cultram," in Cumberland, who had, as a body, "existed for the last 350 years as a species of local parliament." But the notable admission is made that the date of their institution is lost in obscurity. Such a form of government existed in other manors, notably the Honour of Penrith, which was, in the sixteenth century, like Holme Cultram, in the hands of the Crown. The first actual mention of the "Sixteen" is in a tithe suit in 1586.

The "Sixteen" were elected by the tenants themselves in the manor court. In the sixteenth century they were elected at the September court, and came into office in the monthly court of the following November or December. The term of office was generally for three years. The members were chosen four from each of the quarters into which the manor was divided under the first institution of the poor rate in the reign of Queen Elizabeth.

Their duties were:—

Maintaining and repairing of the seadykes and the care of Wedholme Wood.

The care of the three bridges.

The levying of all rates and taxes.

The appointment of schoolmaster and clerk.

The custody of the parish stock (money).

Supervision of the churchwardens' and overseers' accounts.

They were also often chosen as a court of appeal or as arbitrators.

The early records are lost, but isolated minutes occur from 1599 to 1630, from which time they are fairly perfect until 1884, when the "Sixteen" were lost in the Seadyke Charity Scheme.

Thus far Holme Cultram, in which we probably see something of the original duties of the "Sixteen" of Heanor, which were reduced, by the end of the sixteenth century, almost entirely to the supervision of matters ecclesiastical.

“ The date of their institution is lost in obscurity.” Indeed, if Mr. G. L. Gomme be correct in his reading of ancient customs, the origin is somewhat startling. In *The Village Community*, pp. 160 *sq.*, he discusses the “ Sixteen ” of the manor of Aston and Cote, Oxfordshire, incidentally mentioning similar cases at Ditmarsh and Corbey.

In 1657 it was found that “ there hath been a custom time out of mind that a certain number of persons called *the Sixteens*, or the greater part of them, have used to make orders, set penalties, choose officers, and lot the meadows, and do all such things as *are usually performed or done in the Courts Baron of other manors.* ”

It is unnecessary to enter into all the details of Mr. Gomme’s examination of the evidence, but his conclusions may be briefly summed up. The “ Sixteen ” were elected, each one to represent one of the sixteen hides into which the manor was originally divided; four of their number—“ four of the most influential persons ”—were elected as grass stewards, and represented the manor of Aston and Cote at the superior court of the manor of Bampton. The most distinguishing parts of their duties were: to provide four two-year-old bulls every season to run on the common pasture; to hold lands for the benefit of the community; to appoint and pay officers. Their meetings were held in the open air, like all early social groups. And the conclusion is that “ this is the free democratic assembly, and its title, *The Sixteens*, as well as its constitution, takes us back to primitive times.”

“ This history tells us of (i.) the original sixteen families forming a community of hereditary villagers; (ii.) the periodical allotment of land on the basis of the original ancestral shares, and the subdivision of each ancestral share among the under-shareholders; (iii.) the peculiar method of allotment according to marks belonging to each of the ancestral shares; (iv.) the holding of land by the community for the benefit of the villagers generally; (v.) the corporate assembly of the villagers in the open air, and the rights of government by this assembly;



(vi.) the position of the lord as holder of village lands bound to conform to village rights, and unable to translate these as lord's rights; and (vii.) the position of the cottar tenancy as servants of the community."

These characteristics were shown as late as 1657.

It seems the natural conclusion, therefore, that the duties common to the "Sixteens" of Heanor (in 1585) and Holme Cultram had their origin in primitive times; and, if not known to the British population, at least introduced into the district when the English or Saxons made their settlement.

It would seem, also, that by the end of the sixteenth century the lord of the manor had been able, as in other manors, to become possessed of most of the rights of the people; a transfer of rights which led to considerable trouble and, at least, the statement of a "case" eighty years later, in 1667, through the exactions and claims of the steward of the Courts Baron and Leet of the manor of Codnor.

The inclusion of Shipley in the parish of Heanor is not very obvious, and at first sight would appear to have been not earlier than the thirteenth century. In the *Domesday Book*, Codnor, Heanor, etc., were a possession of William Peverel, held by Warner, but formerly held by "eight thanes"; while Shipley was a possession of Gilbert de Gand, held by Malgar, but formerly by Brun and Odincar. They were separate manors, and apparently unconnected. Any ecclesiastical connection outside the borders of Shipley would be with Gilbert de Gand's manor of Ilkeston, rather than with the manor of Codnor, etc. The evidence of the "Sixteen" may throw an interesting and important light on the point, showing that the ancient rights and customs of the people held their own, despite the Conquest and the manorial divisions of the Domesday Survey.

A democratic custom, such as the one under discussion, would be as likely to break down as undergo, at a comparatively late period, radical reorganisation by the addition of a new manor, *with the same number of representatives* for the whole

district as for the smaller and original one. And it would seem, rather, that the “ Sixteen ” of the sixteenth century represented the shares of the original sixteen families of the community, indicating a close and continuous connection between the manors of Codnor, etc., and Shipley, in matters civil as well as ecclesiastical, from the time of the Teutonic settlement until the last century. This might explain a connection which is not otherwise obvious.

Quite a possible basis for the representation is to be found in the *Domesday Book*, where Codnor, Heanor, Langley, and “ Smitecote ” are given as six manors and Shipley as two; in all, eight manors. Each represented by two will make the necessary sixteen. It may be well, perhaps, to say here that “ Smitecote,” as a manor, has disappeared; but, like many early manors which have shared the same fate, it is located by the survival of the name. On the north side of Bailey Brook, and north-east of the Church at Heanor, are two fields called Upper and Lower Smithy Cote, the modern remnants of the ancient Smitecote.

Bailey Brook would form a natural boundary between the Domesday manors of Codnor and Smitecote and the manors of Heanor and Langley; the former, and larger, manors being on the north, and the latter on the south. The manor of Milnhay, mentioned as early, at least, as the thirteenth century, causes some confusion as to this boundary; for there is a question as to its relationship to Langley Mill, whether it extended over the brook to the north or whether it extended south, and part of it eventually became incorporated as part of Shipley after the purchase of a moiety of the manor in 1258. But it may be noted that in the modern parish of Heanor the only extension over the brook is the ecclesiastical district of Aldercar, possibly the modern representative of Smitecote.

A more definite basis for the “ Sixteen,” however, may be found in the fact that in pre-Conquest times eight thanes held Codnor, etc., and Brun and Odincar held Shipley. If,

as is quite possible, the eight thanes held their possessions in the modern parishes of Codnor (together with Codnor Park, which is in the parish of Ironville) and Heanor in the proportion of five in the former and three in the latter, then we have the old proportionate representation as Codnor five, Heanor three, and Shipley two; a striking resemblance to the "Sixteen" who represented the three parts of the parish in the respective proportions of seven, five, and four.

The existence of the "Sixteen" here, as well as elsewhere, needs explanation, and Mr. Gomme's solution (applied here in some detail to Heanor and Shipley) gives it. And not only does such an origin explain their existence, but the fact that sixteen representatives controlled the affairs of Heanor and Shipley gives a reason why there has always existed a connection, however loose it may have been, between manors otherwise unconnected, difficult as it is to understand how those manors maintained a unity in government. The government by the "XVI.," however, arose, not from national legislation, but from the family or village community, a democratic custom maintaining communal rights, and was so ingrained in the spirit and character of the people that it had a vitality strong enough to retain something of its old power and lustre as late as the seventeenth century, in spite of the destruction of old English power, the substitution of Norman overlords, and the crushing force of the feudal tenure.

And now with respect to the duties of the "Sixteen." These were, according to the memorandum, to make levies for the church and appoint wardens. But as early at 1607 they supervised the accounts of the overseers of the poor, and in 1612 the overseers for the highways, who seem to have been called surveyors for the highways in 1657 and other later years.

The wardens were sometimes called "churchmasters," and at times it is difficult to follow their "accounts," which are anything but clear. To call them accounts is, in general,

to give them a wrong title, as they are rather statements of the proportions paid for expenses by Codnor, Heanor, and Shipley, or the amounts due to the wardens or from them to the parish. The first details of expenses are given by the wardens for 1646 (there were no wardens appointed in 1644 and 1645), and other details are given in 1653. The explanation of the bald statements of expenses and levies is that the accounts in detail were on loose papers, two of which remain (one of them being the accounts for 1674); and they appear to have been set down in summary at the meetings, the details then being considered of little value.

The times of passing the accounts were not confined to Easter; some were received in January, 158 $\frac{5}{6}$ , and the wardens for 1667 presented part of their accounts in August, 1668, the wardens for 1668 presenting theirs in June, 1669.

The election of the “ Sixteen ” appears to have been annual, although it is difficult to see whether at any time the term of office was or was not for a longer period. The lists are incomplete, referring to 1585, 1595, 1600-1607, 1609-1630, 1632-1634, 1636-1642, and 1717. The failure of the old routine in 1643, and the voidance of the churchwardens’ office in 1644 and 1645, imply that the troubles of the period were keenly felt in Heanor, which, there is reason to believe, was a strongly puritan parish.

The following extracts indicate that the various members were responsible for their own districts, as well as sharing in the responsibility for the whole parish:—

1636. “ Thomas Roe Cunstable for Codnor & Loscowe.

“ Vpon the accompts of the said Thomas taken vp by *pte of the Sixtenn of Codnor &c* and it did apeare by his acompts to be behind wt . . . Codnor and Loscowe the some of 1li 10s 3d

“ Vpon the acompts taken vp by the sixteen between Codnor and Heanor, and it did apeare by the same acompts y<sup>t</sup> codnor was indebted vnto Heanor xs vijd ob to be paid by Tho: Roe out of the some of 1li 10s 3d Remaining to Codnor by Tho: Roe 19s 7d ob.”

A similar account is given in 1636, when William Stubbine was constable of Codnor and Loscoe.

1638. "Nicholas Coutts Costable of Codnor and Loscowe for mrs vickars vppon the accomptes of the said Nicholas Coates, *taken vp by pte of Sixtenn of Codnor and Loscowe*, and it Did appeare by his accompts soe taken vp yt the Inhabytants of codnor and Loscoe owethe vnto mrs Vickars the some of ffyve shillings and Towe pence & is Discharged.

"And vpon the accompts taken vp by the Sixtenn of Codnor and heanor and it Did apeare by the same accompts so taken vp yt heanor was indebted vnto Codnor and Loscowe 8s 1d, out of wh some of 8s 1d wee allow a debt of 4s 11d, due vnto them of heanor since Tho: Clifton of Codnor was Constable Anno Dmi 1633, and 1s. allowed them since William Stubine was Constable, 1636 and 2s 2d paid in and so this accompts is pfected."

There is no list of pains and penalties, but one or two notes are made of resolutions on this matter.

1595. "It is agreed vppō by ye xvi the day aforesayd" (*i.e.* xxii April) "that if any of ye sayd nūber of ye sixteene shalbe absent: at the day of appointme<sup>nt</sup>: having warning before but vii dayes: that then thoes pties being absent & making such default shall at every such time forfait — xii<sup>d</sup> to be pd to . . ."

In the list of this year, 1595, "heanry Oustone" appears as the fifth for Codnor and Loscoe; but his name has been deleted, and opposite to it is written, "for his absence, xii<sup>d</sup>."

1599. "Henery Vston for not comige to meatinge (of the) sixteane accordinge to or order sett Down for his negligence and cōtempt we Do p<sup>re</sup>sent him for his Default to the pore mas box . . . I say  $\begin{matrix} \mathcal{L} \\ 2 \\ 2 \text{ iiij} \end{matrix}$  . . ."

This appears to be £2, but as it would be a most exorbitant fine, it should be probably read as 2s. The whole passage, however, is somewhat difficult to decipher.

In 1625 the following note was made, and afterwards deleted by two crosses:—

"It is ordered by the Sixteene if anie man of the Sixteene shall heareaf<sup>t</sup> vpon Tewsdaye in Easter weeke, willfullye or contemptuously absente himselfe shall forfait vid for the firste offence, and for the second another be put in his place."

For a great number of years, particularly in the earlier portion of the book, there are no accounts of money, but merely lists of officials. In 1637 are the first "autograph" signatures; before then, whatever accounts were signed have all the signatures in one handwriting. Until well into the

eighteenth century, the signatories were members of the “ Sixteen,” or, later, such as would be qualified by their position to be members; but it is probable that the later signatures are those of unofficial parishioners, the government of the “ Sixteen ” having gradually died of inanition, assisted by the upheaval of order in the parliamentary struggle.

Of the levies, little is said, the rate and proportion being made to meet the annual expenses, and only accounted for as such in the summaries.

1 May 1592. “ Md that there is a Laie made at this accompt for wh(ole) pisshe for Codnor xxxvs for henor & Langley xxvs for S(hipley) xx<sup>s</sup> And the same is to be Collected betwext this & mids(ummer).”

This gives the proportions paid by the three districts.

The rate of the levy is twice given.

1657. “ A sessment agreed on *for the poore* after the rate of 2d the Pound by vs whose names are aboue written.”

“ Robert Smith Churchwarden for the yeare 1674

1 s d.

“ Sessment came to 4 16 10 at 2d. the pound rent.”

The purpose of the levies is given thus:—

1586. “ Md that there was a lay made about midsomer last for the castinge or bels anewe vz for Codnor viili henor & langley vli and for Shipley iiijli.”

1591. “ Md that ther is a lay made at this accompt towards the payment & discharge of all Reckenings thorowe the parrisshe and to the further repayr of the Churche in this sorte iiijli vz for Codnor (some words have been deleted here) xxxvs for heynor xxvs for shippley xxs.”

The following note shows that in the days of Elizabeth it was not always easy to obtain payment of the levies, and from it is gathered the interesting fact that the “ Sixteen ” were, not only in official position, but in practical parochial life, superior to the churchwardens, and took up the unpleasant task, afterwards the duty of wardens, of enforcing payment.

1599. “ It is so that whearas Henery Walker<sup>1</sup> at ye request of ye sixteane Did sue Nicholas hardy of Loscow for his Layes (cōserninge ?) the church & and that ye said Nicholas . . . was contented to put

---

<sup>1</sup> One of the “ Sixteen,”

his matter to fowre men whose names are heare vnder written & they awarded the said nicholas hardy (? to) pay all layes to ye church for tow . . ox gange

"Mr Bowker of Demby minister

"John Draycott of Draycott

"John Sutton of pentridge

"George Biddell of Demby

"Allso Jt cost Codnor & Loscow in suinge the said nicholas hardy in Chardges xxxs . . . heanor & Langley nor shippely would not be any wayes contributory towards p(aying) our chardges but codnor & Loscow did pay all chardges them seelves."

When the "Sixteen" were appointed in 1717, after a lapse of seventy-five years (so far as the book testifies), their relationship to the churchwardens was expressed somewhat naively:—

"Memorand these 16 are Chosen to be inspectors into the Churchwardens buiseness for the ensuinge yeare."

There appears to have been a certain independence attaching to the three districts forming the parish, the wardens, as in the case of the "Sixteen," being responsible for the districts they represented. This is illustrated by the entries:

1636. "The accompts of Phillipp Darbyshire Churchwarden for Codnor & Loscowe and it Did appeare by his accompts to be behinde wth Codnor and Loscowe the some of 2s. 5d. ob."

1653. "Charges for wine for Codner and Heanor (*Shipley buying wine for themselues*)

"Codner part is ... .. 0 14 0

"Heanor part is ... .. 0 10 0

"layed out besides by codner for 2 men goeing  
to Darby about the tenths ... .. 0 3 0

"layed out besides by Heanor for 2 men going  
to Darby about the tenths ... .. 0 3 0"

The expenses of the wardens' office were defrayed by the wardens, but whether out of their own pockets or out of the church funds is not quite clear, but possibly the former is intended.

1637. "It is ordered by the Sixten yt from the day of the accompts taken vp yt ye new Churchwardens shall defray all Charges Conc'ninge the office."

As a parish record, it is a matter for regret that the details of expenses are not given. Usually £5 to £9 was ample to

cover the needs of the parish, and it is disappointing not to know the special work calling for £20 to £30. Apparently the larger amounts were not always judicious, for in 1720, when the amount raised was £24 2s. 1d., there is a note, “ but we thinke very unjust.”

A curious feature in the presentation of accounts before 1642 by churchwardens, overseers, and constables, is that in nearly all instances they are signed by those, or some of those, members of the “ Sixteen ” representing the district to which they refer. The accounts of the whole parish are seldom given in one sum.

The two following references to the constables’ accounts are of interest :—

1613. “ Md yt it is ordered the day aboue-sayd by the sixteene that ever hereaftr the Conestables shall give there accompts the sunday next before the qtr Sessions at Michaelms.”

1641. “ The accompts of Randolphe Aldred Constable for Codner and Loscowe and it appeare by his accompts that Codnor and Loscowe was Indebted vnto the said Randolphe the sume of 2-8-3-ob of wh said sume he hath receyved the sume of 3s from Shipley *from the high Constable* 10s 8d and is to be accountable for 8s 2d the wh he was indebted to the said Townes vppon his accompts taken vpp Anno Dni 1639 and soe there Remaine to him the said Randolphe the sume of 1-6-5-ob.”

The constables’ accounts refer only to Codnor and Loscoe.

Several instances in the seventeenth century show that the old custom of appointing officers, not according to fitness and ability, but according to “ houses,” prevailed in the parish, and men undertook the duties when they fell to the turn of widows.

There is no scale of fees given, and the only references to this point are :—

1610. “ Md. yt. Isabell Clercke is to pay for her buryall in the church.”

This is repeated in the year 1611; but the former had a further notice, afterwards deleted, to the effect that Charles Tyler had to pay for a burial in church, and that one Challenge (?) had given his word for the said payment.



A different fee is mentioned in 1693 :—

"It is agreed by us whose names are subscribed That Heanor Churchwarden shall pay the Court Fees, Books, &c."

Another reference is made in a note relating to the paving of the church floor, which is given later.

There are a number of references to the church which are more or less interesting.

The decision as to seats was somewhat vague, when, in 1604,

"It is agreade vpon by the xvi and the churchemast(ers) that all the seates and de(sks) should stand and rest as the are setled and and (*sic*) if any man doe list to moue or s . . . ep . . . his seate of his owne charge (may) ta(ke) his best cource."

On a page having entries relating to 1614 and 1615 are two lists of books. The first is at the top of the page, and may, therefore, be dated 1614 at latest.

"The names of all the Churche bookes belonging to the parishe Churche of Heynor

"Jnβmis two bibles of the largest volume

"Jtm̄ the paraphrasis of Erasmus.

"Jtm̄ Juell & Harding

"Jtm̄ Ma lenutt exposition of Mathew

"Jtm̄ Apostill or exposition of the gospels

"Jtm̄ the booke of comon prayer

"Jtm̄ the tome of homylies

"Jtm̄ the Register booke

"Jtm̄ the booke of Jniuccons."

After the dated entries is :—

"Exposition of the gospell Jowell and Hardinge thomelie booke the booke of Canonnes (?) heminges epistoles."	}	lent to Mr Howkewort
--	---	-------------------------

This doubtless refers to Josias Hawksworth, Vicar of Heanor, 1633 to 1650. This loan *may* account for the disappearance of these books, for Mr. Hawksworth appears to have been a singularly slovenly and careless man.

As already stated, a levy was made in 1585 for the recasting of the bells. It is possible that the bell bearing two stamps (bell No. 3 prior to the recent recasting of the bells) was a remnant of this work.

In 1603 the following note is given with respect to the churchwardens' accounts :—

“ Ther acavntes taken savinge they are to paye and (? discharge) the belfounder of all mony deawe to hime for cast(ing) the beles they haue the mony in ther handes.”

The bellfounder was probably George Heathcote, of Chesterfield, to whom may be attributed the old No. 4 bell, which bore the inscription, “ Gloria in excelsis. I. H. S. G. H.”

In 1687 a separate account is given, thus :—

“ The Bell.		
15	17	8
<hr/>		
6	18	11 $\frac{3}{4}$
4	19	3 $\frac{1}{4}$
3	19	5”

The first line gives the cost of the bell, and the others are the proportions paid by the three districts in the parish. This bell had a curious and beautiful inscription, which has not hitherto been accurately given in print, although the inaccuracy in the *Journal* for 1898, vol. xx., p. 18, arose through no fault of the writer. Between the words of the inscription were small crosses, which produced a wonderfully effective appearance. The inscription was :—

“ I tole the tyne that dvlfvll is  
to svche as livd amisse  
bvt sweete my sownd seemes  
vnto them who hope for  
ioifvll blisse.”

“ Geo Westwood 1686 ”

George Westwood was the vicar of the parish.

“ Aprill the eighth 1672

“ Agreed ye day and yeare aboue-said that the old bell ropes shall be sold euery yeare and ye money conuerted to ye use of ye parrish.”

Certain regulations as to ringing the bells were made in 1678.

"Memorandum that where as greate and vnNessecary Chardges hath beene brought vpon our pish by ye Church Wardens ALowing and pay ing Ringers at seuerall tymes in ye yeare for Ringing wee there fore, to preuent ye Like for tyme to com doe hereby Agree to ALow the ffollowing Churchwardens to giue the Ringers the 5th Nouember 00 - 02 - 06 Lykewise on Christmas Day ... .. 00 - 01 - 06"

Another item, which is deleted, was: "And vpon the 29 May, 00-01-06."

In 1647 it was agreed that the clerk, John Dale, in addition to his ordinary duties, should set and keep the church clock, receiving for the extra work 7s. 6d. a year; but in 1667 he received 10s. "for looking to ye clocke."

In the former year, 1647, it was arranged that William Morton should receive annually 2s. 6d. "for the smith's work that the said clocke shall stand in need of." It would appear from this that the clock was erected in the church about that time; there appears to be no earlier mention of one.

In 1653 four shillings were spent in mending the "beire."

There is a curious note relating to the paving of the church:

1688. "Memorandum yt ye floore of ye parrish Church of He(anor) was paued the year last past with stone fetcht from Lynbie ye charge whereof was ... .. 5 08 11

"Now whereas there is six shillings eight pence to be paid to ye churchwardens for ye use of ye parrish for ye repairinge ye church floor whenever it is broken up for vpon ye accompt of a funerall by them who cause it to be broken up. Now know ye that we whose names are subscribed do consent so far as concernes our selues yt Geore (*sic*) Westwood minister of our parrish of Heanor shall have ye benifit of breakinge up ye said floore for seauen yearres next ensuinge if he ye said George Westwood so longe liue: so as he ye said George Westwood doe lay down ye stones againe euen and hansom & put in new stones when any of them are broken."

In 1615 the following note occurs:—

"Mr yt is agreed that no Collecon vpon fres patents shall be made for the pore but att the Church & Chancell dores & that for ringing no allowance & for any strange preacher no allowance except hired by yeare or quarter."

It is probable that the chancel door here referred to was the door leading from the nave to the chancel through the rood-screen. If that be so, the screen escaped destruction in the reform movement of the sixteenth century.

Apparently the only reference to the payment of preachers is in 1653: “ Charges when the Ministers preached, 0—9—4.” But as this was during the Commonwealth, it may have a meaning very different from the payment of the preachers, and, in any case, it cannot refer to the memorandum of 1615.

With reference to “ letters patents,” one shilling is accounted for in 1653 “ for paying the money that was gathered for Mr. Collier and an acquittance.”

13th Oct., 1680. “ Paid then to Mr. Archdeacon Brown at his own house in Wirksworth ye summe of four pounds sixteen shillings and two pence weh was collected in our parish of Heynor towards ye redemption of ye poor English Captives in Turkey. weh summe we testify was then and there paid by us

George Westwood, Minister.

John Wilson, Churchwarden.”

By the eighteenth century “ letters of request ” had apparently become annoying, and so, on April 18th, 1715,

“ It was then agreed vpon by the Consent of the Churchwardens and seaverall of the Jnhabitants that the Churchwardens hence forward shall not give to or Relive any person with any Letter of Request.”

In what way authority was claimed in the following cases it is not easy to see.

1679. “ It is agreed that ye Church Wardens shall not spend any of ye parish mony vpon the parritors ” (apparitors).

1607. “ for the gate next Yormans ... .. 0 1 8

“ for wood and workmanship for the stile next the hall ... 0 5 4

“ for the Viccarid windowes ... .. 0 4 0

1652. “ 4<sup>s</sup> & 1d was expended for window shutt beardes & Benches in the vicarage house.”

1705. “ Vincent Wylde doth promise to make a Door to the Stairs yt leads to his House and to keep it in repair.”

## APPENDIX.

The years in which there are lists of the "Sixteen" are 1585, 1595, 1600-1607, 1609-1630, 1632-1634, 1636-1642, and 1717. The following is a list of the members, "being of the most substantial men in the parish," with the years in which they held office.

## CODNOR AND LOSCOE.

Thomas Boswell, 1585.

John Clarke, yeoman, 1585, 1595, 1600-1607, 1609-1630,  
1632-1634, 1636-1641.

Richard Bonsall, 1585, 1595, 1600.

John Smalley, 1585.

George Dawson, 1585.

Robert Day, 1585.

Thomas Cooke, 1585.

Mr. Draycott, 1595, 1600-1603.

Jasper Draycott, gent. (probably the same person as the last), 1604-1607, 1609, 1611-1630, 1632-1634.

Robert Wyld, 1595, 1600-1602.

Matthew Downing, 1595, 1600-1607, 1609-1611.

Henry Walker, 1595, 1600-1607, 1609, 1610.

William Hardy, yeoman, 1595, 1600-1607, 1609-1628.

Henry Ouston, or Uston, a defaulter, 1595.

Mr. Throckmorton, 1601, 1602.

John Piggen, yeoman, 1603-7, 1609-1630, 1632-1634, 1636-1642. (From 1618 called John Piggen the elder.)

Richard Wilmot, 1603-1607, 1609-1617.

John Draycott, gent., 1610-1630, 1632-1634, 1636-1638.

William Wyld, yeoman, 1612-1630, 1632-1634, 1636-1642.  
(From 1632 called William Wyld, senior.)

Thomas Johnson, gent., 1618-1630, 1632-1634, 1636, 1637,  
1639-1642.

Thomas Wilson, yeoman, 1629, 1630, 1632-1634, 1636-1642.

Thomas Vicars, 1636, 1637, 1642.  
 Thomas Draycott, gent., 1638-1642.  
 Benjamin Clayton, gent., 1638-1642.  
 Richard Clayton, 1717.  
 Obadiah Wawin, 1717.  
 John Wyld, 1717.  
 Francis Tantum, 1717.  
 Henry Shepardson, 1717.  
 Samuel Oldknow, 1717.  
 John Milward, 1717.

HEANOR, LANGLEY, AND MILNHAY.

Richard Hardstaff, 1585, 1595, 1600-1602.  
 Thomas Roper, 1585.  
 William Swain, 1585.  
 Robert Sterland, 1585.  
 John Broughton, 1585, 1595, 1600-1607, 1609, 1610.  
 William Rose, 1595, 1600-1603.  
 William Stevens, 1595, 1600-1607, 1609.  
 Thomas Walker, 1595.  
 Mr. Thwaytes, 1600-1607.  
 Mr. Anthony Thwaytes (probably the same person as the last), 1609-1618.  
 Robert Dodson, yeoman, 1601, 1604-1607, 1609-1630, 1632, 1634, 1636-1642.  
 Mr. Henry Hides, 1603-1607, 1609, 1610.  
 Thomas Lowe, 1610-1617.  
 Edward Bloodworth, yeoman, 1611-1613, 1615-1630, 1632-1634, 1636-1639.  
 Peter Morton, 1612-1614.  
 Mr. Jervis Dodson, 1611, 1614-1618.  
 John Crowshaw, yeoman, 1618-1630, 1632-1634, 1636.  
 John Thwaytes, gent., 1619-1630, 1632-1634, 1636-1642.  
 Sampson Colclough, gent., 1619-1628.

John Hyde, gent., 1629, 1632-1634, 1636.

Clement Clifford, 1630.

John Greene, 1637-1642.

William Greene, 1637, 1638.

Henry Stainsby, 1639-1642.

John Smedley, 1640-1642.

John Wilson, 1717.

Mr. Shepard, 1717.

John Aldred, 1717.

Peter Eaton, 1717.

#### SHIPLEY.

No names are given for 1638.

John Millington, 1585.

Robert Priest, 1585.

Francis Deane, 1585.

Thomas Blake, 1585.

Roger Nield, 1595, 1600-1607, 1609-1615.

Humphrey Palmer, 1595, 1600-1607, 1609-1615.

Christopher Falcon, 1595, 1600-1607, 1609-1618.

Thomas Rowe, 1595, 1600.

George Rowe, 1601-1607, 1609-1611, 1618.

Thomas Ridge, 1612-1617.

Mr. Ireland, 1616.

Joseph Worden, yeoman, 1617-1625.

Robert Hardy, yeoman, 1618-1630, 1632-1634, 1636, 1637.

Henry Falcon, yeoman, 1619-1630, 1632-1634, 1636, 1637,  
1639-1642.

Thomas Rowland, yeoman, 1620-1630, 1632-1634, 1636,  
1637, 1639, 1640.

Roger Nield, yeoman (possibly the same as mentioned above),  
1626-1630, 1632-1634, 1636, 1637, 1639-1642.

Richard Nield, 1639-1642.

William Rowland, 1641, 1642.

Henry Godkin, 1717.

Joseph Mather, 1717.

George Roe, 1717.

Samuel Brentnall, 1717.