

## ‘A GOOD AND SUFFICIENT MAINTENANCE’: THE AUGMENTATION OF PARISH LIVINGS IN DERBYSHIRE, 1645–1660

By RICHARD CLARK

One of the projects in the Long Parliament’s programme of ecclesiastical reforms was the provision of sufficient incomes for the parish clergy. Its aim was perhaps best expressed in the ‘Declaration of the Houses on Church Reform’ of 8 April 1642,

‘They will therefore use their utmost endeavour to establish learned and preaching ministers, with a good and sufficient maintenance, throughout the whole kingdom, wherein many dark corners are miserably destitute of the means of salvation, and many poor ministers want necessary provision’.<sup>1</sup>

This was not an expression of idle hope. Legislation was enacted to permit the provision and payment of augmentation grants to poor parishes, and successive executive committees tried to put it into effect by granting and administering such augmentations.<sup>2</sup> Despite the efforts to transform the parochial structure, the changes effected were impermanent. After the Restoration the augmentations disappeared, it seems, without any controversy or much discontent. In 1660 there were long debates in Parliaments and an act on how to deal with the problem of ejected and usurping ministers and their conflicting titles to the parish livings they claimed, but the only significant reference to poorly-endowed parishes was in a royal proclamation of August 1660 which expressed a pious hope that the newly-restored bishops and deans and chapters would increase the stipends of poor ministers in their appropriated livings.<sup>3</sup> This essay is an attempt to explain why the intentions of the Long Parliament and its successors were so easily overlooked at the Restoration by examining the impact of the augmentation of parish livings in one county—Derbyshire.

During this period there were few rich livings in Derbyshire and numerous poor ones. When the Parliamentary commissioners surveyed the parishes of the county in 1650 they recorded the annual value of 112 benefices (including donatives and perpetual curacies). The distribution of these annual values is shown in Table 1.<sup>4</sup>

Many Derbyshire benefices were supplemented by parochial chapelries and chapels of ease. In 1650 the Parliamentary Commissioners listed nearly 80 chapels in use, but, unfortunately, recorded the annual incomes of only 17 curates serving them. These were

<i>Annual Value of Livings</i>	<i>Vicarages, Donatives and Perpetual Curacies</i>	<i>Rectories</i>	<i>Total</i>
£0–£9	6	0	6
£10–£19	20	1	21
£20–£29	13	2	15
£30–£39	7	5	12
£40–£49	7	5	12
£50–£59	4	8	12
£60–£69	1	8	9
£70–£79	0	3	3
£80–£89	0	9	9
£90–£99	0	1	1
£100–£150	1	8	9
over £150	0	3	3
			112

Table 1 Value of Derbyshire benefices before augmentation

as follows: Parwich £6 13s. 4d. a year; Atlow 4s. a year; Hognaston £6 13s. 4d. a year; Measham £15 a year; Wilne £12 a year; Baslow £3 13s. 4d. a year; Longstone £45 10s. 0d. a year; Chelmorton £7 a year; Monyash £7 a year; Denby £12 a year; Alvaston £6 13s. 4d. a year; Taddington £11 3s. 4d. a year; Edale £10 a year; Hayfield £5 a year; Mellor £8 a year; Brimington £3 6s. 8d. a year; Cauldwell £5 a year. What is clear from these examples, which are probably representative of the whole group, is that most chapelries were even more poorly endowed than the poor benefices.

The incomes of the majority of Derbyshire parish livings were well below the levels considered by contemporaries as sufficient. The 1649 Act 'for the maintenance of preaching ministers and other pious uses' enacted that ministers in appropriated livings should receive an annual stipend of £100. As early as the reign of Queen Elizabeth £100 per annum had been regarded as a sufficient stipend for a learned, preaching minister and £30 per annum as the bare minimum for one to survive on. By 1624 the House of Commons considered £50 a year as the minimum.<sup>5</sup> In 1650 only 41 per cent of the benefices in Derbyshire, and probably none of the chapelries, rose above the £50 a year level, and only 12 per cent were worth £100 a year and more. It is apparent that considerable reforms were needed in Derbyshire in order to fulfil the intentions of the Declaration.

Most of the Derbyshire parishes, which procured augmentations, received them during the years the Committee for Plundered Ministers controlled the making of augmentation grants (1645–50). Twelve parishes received grants from the committee in 1645 and 45 in 1646. Although the records for 1647 are incomplete, it is possible to trace augmentation orders for six livings which had not received grants before. During 1648 two more livings were augmented by the committee, and in 1650 three livings.<sup>6</sup> After 1650 it is possible to trace only six Derbyshire parishes, not augmented before, in the records of the Committee for the Reform of the Universities and the Trustees for the Maintenance of Ministers, for which augmentation grants were procured.<sup>7</sup> In all orders for the augmentation of 74 Derbyshire livings have been traced. As 66 benefices in 1650 were below the annual value of £50, let alone the 80 or so chapelries, it is apparent that the supply of grants ran out before poor parish livings. Because not all the poor livings were augmented three questions have to be answered. Were the financial resources available inadequate to effect a complete reform? Why were certain livings augmented and others not? On what bases were the augmentation grants, which were made, calculated?

The funds for the grants came mainly from two sources. The first was the reserved rents of episcopal and capitular estates. These rents had been exempted from the sale of the ecclesiastical hierarchy's lands specifically for the better maintenance of preaching ministers. The second source of income came from the impropriated rectories sequestered from delinquents and Papists. Not only were the sources of income limited but there was also little chance of improving them. The reserved rents stemmed from leases, often on generous terms, made by the bishops and the deans and chapters on their property. In the Parliamentary Survey of capitular lands the leased prebendal estates of Sawley-cum-Wilne were valued at £637 6s. 8d. a year over and above the reserved rent of only 100 marks.<sup>8</sup> Once the leases ran out potentially there would have been much more money available for augmentations, but such were the financial needs of the state that the estates of the ecclesiastical hierarchy were sold. Delinquents were eventually allowed to compound for their estates, and so the revenue from sequestered, impropriated livings was not necessarily guaranteed for the purposes of augmentations. There were no plans to use other impropriations for augmentations. The state neither had the resources to buy in lay impropriations nor the willingness to force all lay impropriators to provide the clergy with more adequate stipends through the force of the law, as Archbishop Laud had intended.<sup>9</sup> It remains to be seen how well the limited resources were used.

The resources of the Committee for Plundered Ministers were no less limited than those granted later to Queen Anne's Bounty, but the latter's funds were still used to aid poor clergy up to 1947 whereas the former's were soon exhausted. This contrast is accounted for by the different financial methods each used. Under its second charter of

1714 Queen Anne's Bounty was permitted to make grants of £200 to the poorest parishes to be invested in permanent endowments. The augmentations by purchase resulted in a small annual increase of income.<sup>10</sup> The scheme allowed financial flexibility as the income of the bounty was not committed permanently to certain parishes, but the aim of ensuring an adequate stipend for every parish minister was necessarily long-term. The Committee for Plundered Ministers granted larger pensions payable annually on specific funds. It adopted this method to produce results more quickly. The disadvantages were first that future income became committed to pensions and second that the assumption was made that the committee's revenues would be forthcoming and constant each year. By promising to match any donation of £200 or over from private persons to poor parishes with £200 from its own funds Queen Anne's Bounty encouraged the laity to join its task of reducing clerical poverty. The Committee for Plundered Ministers and its successors offered no such stimulus.

Even though the resources available for augmentations were limited and the methods used inflexible, the question still remains why certain parishes were augmented and others not. The first Derbyshire grant makes it clear that political loyalty was a consideration. £100 was settled on the corporation of Derby for the poor ministers of the borough,

'As in these times of distraction the inhabitants of Derby have expressed great fidelity to Parliament by assistance and contributions to the defence of religion, laws and liberty, invaded and endangered by a popish and malignant party; and as the labours of the ministers there have been the chief means of upholding the people's affections, and yet their maintenance is very small ...'<sup>11</sup>

However, at first the political allegiances of the officiating clergymen were not always considered before a grant was made to a parish. Thomas Taylor, rector from 1638 to 1678 of Sutton-cum-Duckmanton, a living augmented in 1648, was noted by the Parliamentary Commissioners of 1650 as a 'royalist and scandalous'.<sup>12</sup> Later, procedure was tightened up. The Ordinance which set up the Triers in 1654 enacted that clergymen receiving augmentation grants should be approved by the Triers. Thereafter the records of the Trustees for the Maintenance of Ministers made careful note that their recipients had such approval. Therefore the ministers receiving grants in the 1650s were those willing to accommodate themselves with the Cromwellian régime.<sup>13</sup>

Poverty was a more important qualification than political loyalty. With the exception of two cases not one Derbyshire living above the annual value of £50 was augmented, but there is no evidence of any system designed to improve the finances of the livings most in need. The curacy of Atlow, worth a little over £10 a year, was never augmented, whereas the vicarage of Bradbourne, worth £40 a year, was granted an augmentation annuity of £40.<sup>14</sup> Out of the seven livings valued at £20 a year in the Parliamentary Parochial Survey only two ever received augmentation grants.<sup>15</sup> The failure to provide for the poorest livings is illustrated in Table 2. This shows the distribution of the values

<i>Annual Value of Livings</i>	<i>Vicarages, Donatives and Perpetual Curacies</i>	<i>Rectories</i>	<i>Total</i>
£0-£9	5	0	5
£10-£19	10	1	11
£20-£29	7	2	9
£30-£39	2	4	6
£40-£49	8	4	12
£50-£59	5	7	12
£60-£69	6	8	14
£70-£79	8	3	11
£80-£89	5	11	16
£90-£99	0	2	2
£100-£150	3	8	11
over £150	0	3	3
			112

Table 2 Value of Derbyshire benefices after augmentation

of Derbyshire benefices (based on the 1650 survey) after the most generous augmentation orders of those augmented have been taken into account. It must be stressed that the actual values of these livings in the 1650s are not shown because numerous orders, as will be seen later, were ineffective.

Even after the orders had been made 38 per cent of the benefices were still below the £50 a year suggested minimum stipend and only 13 per cent equalled or exceeded the £100 a year regarded as a sufficient stipend. This is the measure of the failure to effect a full reform of parochial endowments in Derbyshire between 1645 and 1660.

In the grants made to parishes by the Committee for Plundered Ministers there is little evidence of an organised system. Notes were sometimes made in the orders of the annual value of the livings to be augmented and the number of communicants in them as well as the value of the augmentations. It is therefore possible to analyse the methods, or lack of methods, used by the Committee in the assessment of grants.

A number of observations can be made from Table 3 which relates annual income to the number of communicants. First, the level of augmentations was not determined by the degree of pastoral responsibility each minister had, insofar as the communicant figures reflected such responsibility. On the contrary the ministers with more communicants received per capita less money. Second, there was no attempt to provide ministers with equal stipends, disregarding pastoral responsibility, by adjusting augmentation grants to the means ministers already enjoyed. The grants were usually made in amounts of round figures ranging from twenty marks at the lowest end through the gradations of £20, 30 marks, £30, 40 marks, £40, £50 and up to £60, but the amounts granted to various parishes seem arbitrary. The chapelries of Cauldwell and Turnditch according to their augmentation orders were both worth £5 a year, but the former received a grant of £50 a year whereas the latter had one of £30 a year.<sup>16</sup>

Even after augmentation the value of livings still varied considerably, for example between Turnditch and Bakewell (see Table 3). Because chapelries were so ill-endowed in the first place the financial divide between benefices and chapelries remained, and certain chapelries after receiving grants were still comparatively poor. After augmentation the chapelries of Ashford-in-the-Water, Wormhill, Chelmsorton and Sheldon were worth £18 6s. 8d., £26, £27 and £28 13s. 4d. a year respectively. There is, therefore, little evidence that the Committee for Plundered Ministers tried to reform systematically the whole parochial structure endowed in and inherited from the Middle Ages, so that it could meet the needs and expectations of the ministry in the 17th century.

<i>Parish</i>	<i>Communicants</i>	<i>Augmentation</i>	<i>Annual Income*</i>	<i>Income per Communicant</i>	
Cauldwell	100	£50.00	£55.00	£0.55	Chapelry
Allestree	150	£50.00	£55.00	£0.36½	Chapelry
Brimington	200	£26.66	£30.83	£0.15½	Chapelry
Chaddesden	200	£50.00	£54.00	£0.27	Chapelry
Turnditch	200	£30.00	£36.00	£0.18	Chapelry
Edale	250	£24.73	£36.73	£0.14½	Chapelry
Dore	300	£46.50	£46.50	£0.15½	Chapelry
Elmton	300	£40.00	£50.00	£0.16½	Benefice
Stoney Middleton	400	£40.00	£50.00	£0.12½	Chapelry
Belper and Heage	500	£50.00	£60.00	£0.12	Chapelry
Hayfield	500	£50.00	£56.00	£0.11	Chapelry
Pentrich	500	£30.00	£43.32	£0.08½	Benefice
Brampton	600	£40.00	£53.33	£0.08½	Chapelry
Youlgreave	800	£50.00	£70.00	£0.09½	Benefice
Bakewell	1000	£50.00	£90.00	£0.09	Benefice
Ashbourne	1200	£50.00	£70.00	£0.05½	Benefice
Tideswell	1700	£34.00	£74.00	£0.04	Benefice
Duffield	2000	£38.00	£68.00	£0.03½	Benefice

\*Annual income includes both traditional endowments and augmentation grants.

Table 3 The relationship of annual income to number of communicants

The committee seem to have tried to aid certain types of Derbyshire livings. Nearly all the vicarages and chapelries within the ecclesiastical hierarchy's appropriated livings were augmented. Of the eleven such livings which were not augmented five were minor chapels of ease; another was a private chapel with parochial rights; and the vicarage of Wirksworth was already wealthy enough, but there appears little reason why the livings of Chapel-en-le-Frith, Castleton, Hope and Wingerworth were not augmented when others were. Apart from St. Michael's, Derby and Wirksworth all the livings in the boroughs and market towns of Derbyshire were augmented. However, these two categories account for only half of the parishes which ever received grants. A complete explanation why augmentations were made to certain livings is still lacking.

The vital clue in the solution of this problem lies in the sources of the augmentation grants. All the grants came from appropriated and impropriated livings within Derbyshire. Revenue from livings outside the county was not used. Moreover in most cases parishes in Derbyshire received their grants from revenues arising within their own bounds or within the bounds of neighbouring parishes. All the vicarages and chapelries in the appropriated livings had their grants from the reserved rents from the livings themselves. Thus the two curates serving the prebendal churches of Sawley and Wilne were granted between them the rent of 100 marks reserved for the prebend. The curate serving the prebendal church of Sandiacre received rents from the parish reserved for the Dean and Chapter of Lichfield and the archdeacon of Derby.<sup>17</sup> A similar pattern is found in parishes augmented from impropriated tithes. The vicarage of Alfreton was granted £50 a year from its impropriated rectory.<sup>18</sup> Of all the parishes ever augmented only 17 had grants from sources beyond their immediate neighbourhoods. These parishes usually benefitted from an exceptionally rich impropriated living which could more than supply the wants of local churches. Grants were made from the revenues of Glossop rectory not only to the local churches at Glossop, Hayfield and Charlesworth but also to the livings of St. Peter's, Derby, St. Werburgh's, Derby, Repton, Chesterfield, Stoney Middleton and Osmaston much further away.<sup>19</sup> It is clear that the Committee for Plundered Ministers never attempted a redistribution of wealth on a national or even a comital scale, but was content to augment livings on an individual basis. Nor did its successors attempt any more.

Two reasons can be given for the failure to effect a redistribution of wealth. The committee's records show that attempts to augment one parish out of the impropriated tithes of another encountered local opposition. The vicarage of Dronfield received a grant of £50 a year from the sequestered rectory of Bolsover. Among the orders of June 1646 the following note occurs.

Upon the petition of the parishioners of Bolsover ... the committee do appoint to hear what cause can be shewn by the parishioners of Dronfield ... wherefore the former order of this committee for increasing the maintenance of the minister of Dronfield out of the impropriate rectory of Bolsover, sequestered from the earl of Newcastle delinquent, should not be revoked in regard the vicarage of Bolsover is worth but £10 a year.

The parishioners of Bolsover believed that the needs of their own living should be met out of revenues from the rectory of that living. It was a view to which the committee succumbed. A compromise was reached whereby an augmentation was granted to the vicar of Bolsover which had to be paid out of the impropriate rectory before the grant to the vicar of Dronfield.<sup>20</sup> In another case the committee was unable to resist the pressures from a dispute between different parts of one parish,

And the parishioners of the said parish [Bradbourne] complain that in regard of a subsequent order of the 8 May last £55 a year is granted out of the profits of the impropriate rectory of Tissington ... for the maintenance of the minister of Tissington aforesaid (Tissington in the said order expressed to be a parish church). For that this committee are now informed that Tissington is only a chapel of ease within the parish of Bradbourne and but a mile distant from the church of Bradbourne it is therefore ordered that the said £40 a year be paid unto the said minister of Bradbourne out of the said profits before any payment be made of the said sum of £55 a year to the minister of Tissington aforesaid'.<sup>21</sup>

These two examples show how dependent the Committee for Plundered Ministers was on local information in making grants. Such information enabled the committee to work

even if in a piecemeal and unsystematic way. By petitions parishioners could let the committee know how their needs could be met out of local impropriated and appropriated sources. The committee was unable to effect a fair but more complex distribution of augmentation grants because it lacked sufficient information to assess the needs of parishes independently of local claims. Apart from the out-dated Valor Ecclesiasticus a complete national survey of parish livings and their values was not available. It was only after most grants had been made to Derbyshire parishes that the Rump by an ordinance of 6 June 1649 empowered the Commissioners of the Great Seal to issue county commissions for surveys of parishes in order to acquire information about the number of parish livings, their values and the names and the characters of the ministers who served them. The survey of Derbyshire livings was taken between 8 and 18 June 1650.<sup>22</sup> By then it was too late to be of any significant use. The administrative cart had been put before the horse. In its eagerness to put the Long Parliament's intended reforms into effect the Committee for Plundered Ministers plunged into its task ignorant of the full needs of parishes and unaware of the administrative complexities required to make a complete and fair reform of the Derbyshire parochial structure. The result was a piecemeal reform, inadequate because so many Derbyshire livings were impoverished.

Even though the methods by which augmentations were made can be criticised, it nevertheless remains a fact that numerous parishes received grants on a scale unparalleled before. Therefore it is necessary to consider the effects of the orders. In its exuberance the Committee for Plundered Ministers often made orders which occur later in its records as 'fruitless'. Out of the fifty made in 1646 seven proved entirely and two partly fruitless.<sup>23</sup> In these cases alternative sources of an equivalent sum were sometimes, but not always, found. When the £50 annuity to the vicar of Crich from Thomas Pusey's tithes proved 'wholly fruitless' it was replaced by a grant of merely £12 a year.<sup>24</sup>

The records of the committee cite a variety of reasons why orders failed. In some cases the failure stemmed from the incompetence of the committee itself. A grant of £50 a year to the curate of Repton from the sequestered tithes of the rectory of Glossop failed because 'the said profits are otherwise disposed of'.<sup>25</sup> In other cases there was a failure of communications with the Committee for Compounding. In 1651 it was reported that the order granting £30 a year to the vicar of St. Werburgh's, Derby, from the impropriated tithes of Etwall 'is become fruitless by reason of the composition of Sir Edward Moseley for his delinquency from whom the said tithes were sequestered'.<sup>26</sup> Sir Edward had been allowed to compound without making any provision for this augmentation. The ministers of Newton Solney and Swarkestone received orders for augmentations from the tithes of Newton Solney sequestered from Sir Simon Every. His widow claimed that by a deed of 1641 the profits of these tithes had been reserved for the education of her younger children and were thus wrongfully sequestered. Grants from alternative sources were never made to the two ministers.<sup>27</sup>

There is considerable, if not always conclusive, evidence that other augmentation orders failed, even though their failure was not mentioned in the records of the committee and its successors. In the Parochial Survey of 1650 the Parliamentary commissioners recorded that only 37 parishes enjoyed augmentations, even though, by that time, orders for grants had been made to 67 parishes. Unfortunately the survey may not be an infallible guide. It does not mention the augmentation granted to the vicarage of Elmton, for which Sir Francis Rodes had made a settlement on his composition on 3 May 1650, a month before the survey was taken.<sup>28</sup> Other such obvious lapses in the survey are difficult to detect. The failure of augmentations in several parishes is the most probable explanation.

Again the 'fruitless' orders chiefly stemmed from the mishandling of the Committee for Plundered Ministers and from difficulties arising from compositions. In a number of cases the committee had granted augmentations of greater value than the source from which the pensions were to accrue. From the tithes of Elmton, valued at £60 a year in 1650, the committee made an augmentation of £40 a year to the vicar of Elmton and one of £33 6s. 8d. a year to the curate of Brimington.<sup>29</sup> From the 100 marks rent reserved to

the Treasurer of Lichfield Cathedral £30 a year was granted to the curate of Allestree, £28 13s. 4d. a year to the curate of Sawley and £38 a year to the curate of Wilne.<sup>30</sup> Such incompetence could only lead to the failure of orders, and, in the two cases cited, nothing more is recorded of the augmentations granted to Allestree and Brimington.

Other orders failed because the Committee for Compounding allowed delinquents to compound without making provision in their compositions for augmentations made from their impropriated livings. Indeed to make a settlement of impropriated tithes for augmentations was something of an option for delinquents. Fines could be substantially reduced by making settlements. John Freschville's fine was reduced from £595 16s. 8d. to £308 6s. 4d. after he granted tithes worth £30 a year on the chapel at Holmesfield.<sup>31</sup> But some delinquents did not care to take this option. Sir Aston Cockayne compounded in 1647 without reference to the augmentations previously made from his sequestered tithes. The Committee for Plundered Ministers were informed that the grants from these tithes to Ashbourne and Hayfield had become fruitless on account of this composition, and so the augmentations made to Belper and Heage, Chaddesden, Parwich, Turnditch, Hognaston and All Saints', Derby, also from Cockayne's tithes, had presumably failed as well.<sup>32</sup> Certainly none of these augmentations were mentioned in the Parliamentary Parochial Survey.

Even when delinquents made settlements not all the livings, previously augmented from their tithes by the committee, benefitted. From the earl of Scarsdale's sequestered tithes the committee made grants to the churches of Spondon, Hathersage, Sutton-cum-Duckmanton, Alfreton, Pentrich, Dore, Bolsover and Dronfield. In the survey of 1650 the augmentations of Hathersage, Alfreton, Pentrich, Bolsover and Dronfield were mentioned, whereas on 14 January 1651 Lancelot and Thomas Leake, the earl's executors, were allowed by the Committee for Compounding to enjoy the Scarsdale estates provided that they settled the tithes on trustees on behalf of the ministers of Sutton-cum-Duckmanton, Bolsover, Scarcliffe, Alfreton, Ault Hucknall and Tibshelf. In the tabular accounts of the Trustees for the Maintenance of Ministers for 1655-7 the livings benefitting from the Scarsdale settlement appear to have been Alfreton, Bolsover, Pentrich and Scarcliffe.<sup>33</sup> Nevertheless settlements of impropriated tithes did make augmentation grants more permanent. According to the Calendar of the proceedings of the Committee for Compounding nine delinquents made settlements affecting 16 parochial livings in order to reduce their composition fines.<sup>34</sup>

Grants from sequestered tithes and even settlements made on compositions could prove insecure because the revenue for them came from the estates of people whose best interest was to regain their sequestered estates at the least possible cost to themselves and to probe ways and means of avoiding permanent burdens, such as augmentation grants, on their estates. Some individuals resorted to devious lengths. Sir John Harpur tried (unsuccessfully) to establish that the £40 annuity he had settled on the curate of Ticknall was inclusive rather than exclusive of the £25 a year he had previously paid to him.<sup>35</sup> Other delinquents and Papists tried to free their estates from sequestration by collusive sales, the purchasers holding these estates as trustees for the 'previous' owners. Augmentations appear to have failed as a result of these sales. Mary and Henry Powtrell sold their interests in their estates to a Thomas Rogers. As a result the estates were freed *in the court of Exchequer* from the sequestrations and fines the Powtrells had suffered for their recusancy. Thereafter nothing more is recorded of the augmentation granted to the vicar of Spondon from the Powtrells' tithes and so it probably failed after a loyal citizen had 'bought' their estates.<sup>36</sup> Augmentations were made from the tithes of Church Gresley sequestered from John Allen, Papist and delinquent. His estates were freed from sequestration and his fines for recusancy dismissed when the court of Exchequer learnt that his son and heir was a minor and was being educated as a Protestant.<sup>37</sup> Again the augmentations in question disappear from record.

Some augmentations for sequestered tithes were more secure because certain delinquents did not choose to compound, and others were either not allowed or were unable to do so, and so the tithes remained sequestered. Unfortunately it is often difficult to trace the later history of the augmentations made from these tithes, but there is

evidence to show that at least some survived into the 1650s. A number of them were mentioned in the survey of 1650, for example, the £10 annuity to the vicar of Youlgreave from the Marquis of Newcastle's estates and the £9 a year to the vicar of Hathersage from Rowland Eyre's tithes.<sup>38</sup> Up to 1653 the Committee for Plundered Ministers confirmed previous grants to Dronfield, Stoney Middleton, Youlgreave, Buxton and Horsley out of tithes still sequestered, and, after the demise of the committee, the original augmentations of Horsley and Buxton can be traced until at least 1654 and 1658 respectively.<sup>39</sup>

The history of the augmentations from the appropriated livings of the ecclesiastical hierarchy is easier to trace as central supervision of them was closer. By an act of 1650 the Rump established the Committee for the Reformation of the Universities to review and amend existing augmentations and, wherever possible, to make new ones. Before this committee was dissolved in April 1652 it confirmed grants from appropriated sources to 21 of the 22 Derbyshire livings which had previously received them, but failed to make any more than two new grants.<sup>40</sup> One of the new grants failed immediately because the reserved rent assigned to it had already been used to augment another living.<sup>41</sup> The Committee for the Reformation of the Universities was succeeded (so far as the making of augmentations was concerned) by the Trustees for the Maintenance of Ministers. They approved ten of the grants from reserved rents. The other eleven ceased to exist. After 1654 they also made six new grants, but five were to parishes which had previously received augmentations. Thus during the 1650s fewer Derbyshire parishes than before received benefits from appropriated livings—22 parishes in 1650 and 16 in 1659—and twelve livings lost the grants they had once had.

Clergymen, who continued to receive augmentation grants from reserved rents during the 1650s, could have had little confidence in them. The Trustees for the Maintenance of Ministers made it clear that the grants could not be considered as permanent endowments of their respective parishes, because they insisted on confirming grants to successive ministers in a living.<sup>42</sup> In theory the Trustees could have refused to confirm augmentations to new ministers, although, in the case of Derbyshire ministers, they do not seem to have done so; but, because the grants were not permanent endowments, they were able to adjust them at will. In some cases augmentations were reduced in value. The vicar of Bakewell's grant was reduced from £50 a year to £46 13s. 4d. a year in 1651 and to £30 a year in 1658, while the curate of Brampton's grant was cut from £40 a year to £33 6s. 8d. a year in 1652.<sup>43</sup> Even when the Trustees made new grants their promises did not always come up to original expectations. The curate of Wilne was granted a further £18 a year in addition to his previous augmentation, but by 1654 'in regard the revenue is at present charged beyond what the same can bear' the £18 was reduced to £12 a year.<sup>44</sup> Early in 1659 the Trustees gave a grant to the vicar of Duffield, but by October of the same year they were informed that the vicar 'had failed to receive the full benefit'.<sup>45</sup> The extravagance of the 1640s was succeeded during the 1650s by retrenchment. Between 1645 and 1650 the Committee for Plundered Ministers made grants totalling £636 16s. 8d. a year to Derbyshire ministers from the reserved rents from appropriations. By 1655–7 £310 0s. 8d. a year was being paid by virtue of the same grants and another £162 a year on grants made after 1650.<sup>46</sup>

In this assessment of the augmentations of parish livings a great deal has been said about the deficiencies and inefficiencies of the grants. The achievements should not be under-estimated. More Derbyshire livings were substantially augmented than ever before, and it was not until the foundation of Queen Anne's Bounty that another attempt on such a scale was made to deal with clerical poverty. Nevertheless, in the case of Derbyshire, the grants were too few to eradicate poor livings because the financial resources available were too limited, badly managed and insecure. Nearly 150 livings in Derbyshire were worth less than £50 a year, and thus were thought insufficiently endowed. Of these 74 received orders for grants, but, at the most, only 42 livings were still enjoying augmentations, even if sometimes reduced in value, in 1659. The augmentation grants were paid out of the tithes from the estates of the defeated—Royalist, Papists, the higher clergy—who only accepted such a situation because they



were powerless to do otherwise. After the Restoration this was no longer the case. Moreover there was little or no opposition against them resuming their tithes because in 1660 the loss of augmentations did not seem too high a price to pay for the return of the King. Since 1645 the reform of the parochial structure by augmenting poor livings had been piecemeal. The loss of grants affected individual ministers rather than the ministry as a whole, and so even the ministry did not form a united front against the loss of the grants. The Puritan regimes had failed to bind the parish clergy to them with financial ties. During the 1650s the way in which grants had been reduced in size and number also could not have endeared ministers to these governments. However, for the more orthodox clergy there were more important factors alienating them from the regimes of the 1650s. Most ministers did not receive augmentation annuities, but nearly all of them depended on traditional sources of ecclesiastical income from tithes, dues, offerings, surplice fees and glebelands, income which the more radical elements associated with these governments wished to abolish completely or in part. The lower clergy had also to face during the 1650s the spread of sectarianism, rampant anti-clericalism, the abolition of compulsory church attendance and the enforcement of religious toleration. By 1659 some Derbyshire ministers were so disillusioned that they were active in Booth's Rising.<sup>47</sup> At least after the Restoration the traditional incomes of the clergy appeared more secure, and soon after there were attempts to curb sectarianism, but there were also other fundamental problems to be solved—the question of the type of church settlement, the degree either of toleration or comprehension possible with the restoration of episcopacy, the reform of the liturgy, the re-establishment of uniformity of worship, the question of the validity of non-episcopal orders. The abolition of clerical poverty became overtaken by the events of the English Revolution. Thus in 1660 the limited achievements which had been made in this field in Derbyshire since 1642 were easily, quickly and quietly undone.

## REFERENCES

- <sup>1</sup> S. R. Gardiner (ed.), *The constitutional documents of the Puritan Revolution 1625–1660* (Oxford, 3rd ed., 1906), 247.
- <sup>2</sup> For the relevant legislation see C. H. Firth and R. E. Rait (eds.), *Acts and ordinances of the Interregnum* (London, 1911), 142, 369, 855, 1000.
- <sup>3</sup> J. H. Pruett, *The parish clergy under the later Stuarts: the Leicestershire experience* (London, 1978), 98.
- <sup>4</sup> C. Hill, *Economic problems of the Church from Archbishop Whitgift to the Long Parliament* (Oxford, 1956), 110–2, considered that the valuations of the Parliamentary parochial surveys of the 1650s were over-estimated because they included the value of ministers' houses. J. H. Pruett, on the contrary, has suggested that the values of livings in the surveys reflected the dislocation and violence of the 1640s, and were considerably below their pre-Civil War values; see J. H. Pruett, *op. cit.*, 106–7. On a comparison of the valuations of Derbyshire livings in the survey of 1650 (Lambeth Palace Library, Comm XIIa/6, 348–478) with those in the registers of orders of the Committee for Plundered Ministers (Bodleian Library, Bodley MSS 322–3, 325–9) and in episcopal visitation records of 1639 and 1665 (Lichfield Joint Record Office, B/V/1/64, 72) no discernible, constant trend, either of over or under-estimation, could be detected. Therefore it has been concluded that the figures in the survey are reliable for a general guide on the poverty of Derbyshire livings.
- <sup>5</sup> Firth and Rait, *op. cit.*, 142; Hill, *op. cit.*, 205, 245.
- <sup>6</sup> Orders for augmentations have been traced in the following sources: Bodleian Library (Bod.L.), Committee for Plundered Ministers, Registers of orders, Bodley MSS 322–3, 325–9; Public Record Office (P.R.O.), Committee for Plundered Ministers, Order books, SP22/1, 2A, 3.
- <sup>7</sup> Lambeth Palace Library (L.P.L.), Committee for the Reformation of the Universities, Register of orders, Comm VIa/1–3; Trustees for the Maintenance of Ministers, Register of orders, Comm VIa/4–13.
- <sup>8</sup> L.P.L., Parliamentary survey of the estates of the Dean and Chapter of Lichfield, Comm XIIa/2, 189.
- <sup>9</sup> Hill, *op. cit.*, 322–6.
- <sup>10</sup> G.F.A. Best, *Temporal pillars: Queen Anne's Bounty, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners and the Church of England* (Cambridge, 1964), 86–7.
- <sup>11</sup> *Calendar of the Committee for Compounding 1643–1660 (C.C.C.)*, 22.
- <sup>12</sup> P.R.O., Bishops' certificates to the First Fruits and Tithes Office, E331/Coventry and Lichfield/16, 21; L.P.L., Parliamentary parochial survey 1650, Comm XIIa/6, 464.
- <sup>13</sup> Firth and Rait, *op. cit.*, 855.
- <sup>14</sup> L.P.L., Parliamentary parochial survey 1650, Comm XIIa/6, 364–5; Bod.L., Committee for Plundered Ministers, Register of orders, Bodley MS 323, 67.
- <sup>15</sup> The augmented livings were Chellaston and Tideswell and the unaugmented ones were Barton Blount, Dalbury, Sutton-on-the-Hill, Elvaston and Hope. L.P.L., Parliamentary parochial survey 1650, Comm XIIa/6, 352, 357, 375, 396, 430.

- <sup>16</sup> Bod.L., Committee for Plundered Ministers, Register of orders, Bodley MSS 322, 27; 323, 67.
- <sup>17</sup> Bod.L., Committee for Plundered Ministers, Register of orders, Bodley MSS 323, 64v; 325, 56v.
- <sup>18</sup> Bod.L., Committee for Plundered Ministers, Register of orders, Bodley MS 322, 27.
- <sup>19</sup> P.R.O., Committee for Plundered Ministers, Order book SP22/3, 139–40, 568, 574, 583, 591; Bod.L., Committee for Plundered Ministers, Register of orders, Bodley MS 328, 194.
- <sup>20</sup> Bod.L., Committee for Plundered Ministers, Register of orders, Bodley MS 323, 64r and v.
- <sup>21</sup> Bod.L., Committee for Plundered Ministers, Register of orders, Bodley MS 325, 56.
- <sup>22</sup> W. A. Shaw, *A history of the English Church 1640–1660* (London, 1900), ii, 249; L.P.L., Parliamentary parochial survey 1650, Comm XIIa/6, 347, 360, 371, 389, 410, 450.
- <sup>23</sup> Bod.L., Committee for Plundered Ministers, Register of orders, Bodley MSS 325, 57v (Newton Solney and Swarkestone), 58 (Crich); 326, 78 (Hayfield); 327, 212 (Ashbourne); 328, 128 (Pentrich), 130 (St. Werburgh's, Derby), 153–4 (Dronfield); P.R.O., Committee for Plundered Ministers, Order book SP22/1, 146v (St. Peter's, Derby).
- <sup>24</sup> Bod.L., Committee for Plundered Ministers, Register of orders, Bodley MS 325, 58.
- <sup>25</sup> Bod.L., Committee for Plundered Ministers, Register of orders, Bodley MS 327, 154.
- <sup>26</sup> Bod.L., Committee for Plundered Ministers, Register of orders, Bodley MS 328, 130.
- <sup>27</sup> Bod.L., Committee for Plundered Ministers, Register of orders, Bodley MS 324, 58.
- <sup>28</sup> L.P.L., Trustees for the Maintenance of Ministers, Register of orders of augmentations granted out of sequestrations, Comm VIa/13, 46, 59; Parliamentary parochial survey 1650, Comm XIIa/6, 462.
- <sup>29</sup> Bod.L., Committee for Plundered Ministers, Register of orders, Bodley MS 323, 67v.
- <sup>30</sup> Bod.L., Committee for Plundered Ministers, Registers of orders, Bodley MSS 323, 68; 325, 56v.
- <sup>31</sup> C.C.C., 1049.
- <sup>32</sup> C.C.C., 1677; Bod.L., Committee for Plundered Ministers, Registers of orders, Bodley MSS 323, 63v, 65v, 66r, 66v, 67; 326, 78; 327, 154.
- <sup>33</sup> Bod.L., Committee for Plundered Ministers, Registers of order, Bodley MSS 322, 27; 323, 64r, 64v, 40; 325, 57; L.P.L., Parliamentary parochial survey 1650, Comm XIIa/6, 401, 438–9, 453–5, 462; Tabular account c. 1655–7, Comm VIb/1; C.C.C., 1356.
- <sup>34</sup> C.C.C., 1021, 1031, 1049, 1060, 1132–3, 1356, 1488, 1509, 2105.
- <sup>35</sup> C.C.C., 1021.
- <sup>36</sup> C.C.C., 2058; P.R.O., Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer's memoranda roll, E368/672; Bod.L., Committee for Plundered Ministers, Register of orders, Bodley MS 322, 27.
- <sup>37</sup> Bod.L., Committee for Plundered Ministers, Registers of orders, Bodley MSS 322, 47; 323, 66v, 68v; P.R.O., Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer's memoranda roll, E368/672.
- <sup>38</sup> L.P.L., Parliamentary parochial survey, Comm. XIIa/6, 428–9, 438–9.
- <sup>39</sup> Bod.L., Committee for Plundered Ministers, Registers of orders, Bodley MSS 327, 157; 328, 129, 142, 152–4; 329, n.p.; P.R.O., Committee for Plundered Ministers, Order book SP22/3, 327; L.P.L., Trustees for the Maintenance of Ministers, Register of orders, Comm VII/2, 141.
- <sup>40</sup> L.P.L., Committee for the Reformation of the Universities, Registers of orders, Comm VIa/1–2.
- <sup>41</sup> L.P.L., Trustees for the Maintenance of Ministers, Register of orders, Comm VIa/3, 528; 4, n.p. (Melbourne).
- <sup>42</sup> For examples see L.P.L., Trustees for the Maintenance of Ministers, Registers of orders, Comm VIa/7, 571–2; 8, 38; 9, 588.
- <sup>43</sup> L.P.L., Committee for the Reformation of the Universities, Register of orders, Comm VIa/3, 529, 531; Trustees for the Maintenance of Ministers, Comm VIa/9, 382.
- <sup>44</sup> L.P.L., Committee for the Reformation of the Universities, Register of orders, Comm VIa/3.86; Trustees for the Maintenance of Ministers, Register of orders, Comm VIa/6, 148–9.
- <sup>45</sup> L.P.L., Trustees for the Maintenance of Ministers, Register of orders, Comm VIa/10, 36.
- <sup>46</sup> L.P.L., Tabular Account c. 1655–7, Comm VIb/1.
- <sup>47</sup> R. Clark, *Anglicanism, Recusancy and Dissent in Derbyshire 1603–1730* (Oxford D.Phil thesis, 1979), 195–6.