

ENCLOSURE AND BENEFICE INCOMES IN DERBYSHIRE, 1772–1832

By M. R. AUSTIN
(Derby Lonsdale College)

Much has been written about the economic effects of enclosure in 18th century England, but comparatively little research has been conducted into their effect on clergy incomes. This effect was very considerable and, together with other economic factors related to enclosure, did much to raise the social status and expectations of the clergy at a time when the mass of the population, rural as well as industrial, was becoming even further alienated from organised religion. Whatever 'secularization' was or is the increased economic security and rising social status of the clergy in this period was crucial in its development. This paper looks in detail at the effect of the enclosure movement on Derbyshire benefice incomes. From further research there is little doubt that its general conclusions hold good for other counties in the Midlands.

Allotments made to the clergy

In 1785, Robert Wilmot, rector of Morley, concluded the year's entries in his parish register with the words:

'In the Parish of Morley nothing remarkable happened but THE ENCLOSURE OF THE COMMONS'

Unremarkable as it may have seemed, Wilmot and his successors did well out of the enclosure. As rector, Wilmot was entitled to all great and small tithes and the enclosure Act protected his tithe rights on all ancient and new enclosure. As the owner of the glebe he was one of only four people named as entitled to right of common and as such he received a substantial allotment in the new enclosure. The Act also enabled him to farm his glebe more efficiently for

whereas the Glebe lands belonging to the said Rectory are situated in different Lots, and lie at a considerable Distance from each other, to the great Inconvenience and Detriment of the Rector; Be it further Enacted, That it shall be lawful ... for the Commissioners ... to exchange any of the said Glebe Lands and the Buildings thereon ... with the Consent and Approbation of the Lord Bishop of the Diocese, the Patrons of the said Rectory, and of the Persons so making such Exchange.

Wilmot's allotment in respect of his glebe was fenced by the other proprietors and he was empowered to lease his allotments for any period not exceeding 21 years. He was excused any expenses arising from the enclosure. These could be very considerable, Arthur Young indicating that the average cost of an enclosure might go as high as £10 per acre.¹ Thus income from Wilmot's allotments would have been immediate. Five hundred acres of commons and waste came into cultivation at Morley and the benefice income rose from £160 p.a. in 1772² to £600 in 1824³ and to £680 in 1832 by which time he was receiving £152 p.a. from land in rentals and £527 16s. in compositions for his tithes.⁴

The Morley Act is one of sixty Derbyshire enclosure Acts and awards passed in this period which have been examined for the purposes of this paper. It is obvious from a study of them that the rights of the clergy were very carefully preserved and their interests protected. For example, twenty-eight of the sixty Acts enclosed land which did not contain open-field arable. Of the twelve Acts which specifically preserved the incumbents' rights to tithe rather than commute it by allotment of enclosure, nine enclosed non-arable waste or commons. These were, with the dates of the Acts, Hulland Ward (1771), Buxton (1772), Hasland (1779), Ashover (1779), Matlock (1780), Morley (1784), Wormhill (1803), Kirk Ireton (1803) and Wirksworth (1802). The reason why the Acts for non-arable enclosure should preserve tithe in such a large proportion of the cases is probably that the clergy believed that they would receive a higher return more

quickly from tithe than from long leases on previously uncultivated commons and waste. Although the Wirksworth and Matlock Acts empowered the commissioners to exempt from tithes for seven and eight years respectively any land 'on account of its Barrenness', the Matlock Act specified that 'the Part or Share to be subject to the immediate Payment of Tythes be set out on the most valuable Part of the ... Commons and Waste grounds and ... not contain less in Quantity than Three Hundred and Fifty Acres.'

Where tithes were extinguished, the valuation in allotments in lieu was handsome, and allotments of new enclosure to compensate for loss of right of common in respect of glebe were equally generous. Under the Boylestone Act of 1783 the rector received an allotment in extinguishment of all tithes arising from newly enclosed land only. Tithes from ancient enclosures were to continue as usual except that, all parties agreeing, further allotments could be made to the rector in lieu at some later date. Here, the rector, Carter Fletcher, received the largest single allotment of the open-fields equal to one seventh of the new enclosure after deductions for roads, etc. At Ashover in 1779 the rector, Laurence Bourne, received allotments for all ancient moduses of hay tithe and for hay tithe only arising from new enclosure. For this he received over ten acres in subsequent award. All other tithes were to be paid as usual on ancient and new enclosure. The Ashover enclosure award gives the total area of commons and waste to be enclosed as 3,684 acres. Bourne, as by far the largest single proprietor of land was to receive allotments of the new enclosure appropriate to his one-third share of the manor of Ashover. These allotments amounted to 209a or 33p.⁵ It is of interest that this is the only Act of those studied which makes provision for the squatters or 'Poor Persons' on the common. They were allotted land as 'it would be very injurious and hurtful to such Persons to have the same laid open again' even though they had no legal right to the land which they had enclosed. As the largest proprietor Bourne must have insisted on this provision, or at least agreed to its insertion.

Eleven of the Acts examined stipulated that the incumbents' allotments should be of sufficient acreage to produce a specified clear annual income. The money valuation was probably high, though from what we know of current rents⁶ the allotments themselves were, generally speaking, not over-generous. At Osmaston-by-Derby in 1789 the Act stated that the allotment was to be of the clear value of £24 p.a. At Chaddesden (1790) the vicar of Spondon (Chaddesden was a chapelry of Spondon) was to receive an allotment which would produce £33 p.a. In the subsequent award he was allotted 21a 2r 30p in lieu of all vicarial tithes and 3r 10p in respect of his glebe rights.⁷ The Stanley Act (1792) laid down that the allotment to the vicar of Spondon was to be of the value of £11 p.a. At Spondon itself (1788) the vicar was to receive an allotment in lieu of his small tithes of the clear annual value of £28. At Mickleover (1790) the vicar was to receive an allotment worth £20 p.a. in addition to allotments equal in value to specified proportions of new enclosure. The Hartington Act (1798) gave the vicar an allotment in lieu of all tithes of the annual value of £50 and a further allotment of the value of £7 3s. 4d. in extinguishment of a modus of that sum. The Act for enclosing lands in the townships of Great and Little Longstone and Wardlow (1810) concerned two incumbents—those of Bakewell and Hope—and they shared an allotment in lieu of all tithes of the clear value of £30 p.a. The vicar of Bakewell also received an allotment worth £30 p.a. in extinguishment of his tithe rights at Baslow (1823), the subsequent award granting him no less than 138a 3r 23p.⁸ The Youlgreave Act (1815) allowed to the vicar an allotment in lieu of tithes of the clear yearly value of £25 'in the least'. He was awarded 21a 1r 19p.⁹ In 1823 the archdeacon of Derby recorded that the vicar had received 56 acres on enclosure, which would have included his allotment in lieu of glebe common rights.¹⁰ The vicar of Dronfield received an allotment worth £15 p.a. for the loss of his small tithes of pigs, geese, hemp and flax and for all payments in lieu of tithe in his Holmesfield chapelry by the Holmesfield Act of 1816, the enclosure commissioners allotting him 21a 1r 28p.¹¹ The Barlow Act of 1817 gave small allotments of the annual value of £4 to the rector of Staveley and the perpetual curate of Barlow. In the award they received allotments of 4a 3r 38p and 1a 2r 16p respectively.¹² The Boylestone Act (1783) gave the second largest landowner in the parish, Thomas Manlove (vicar of Spondon) an

allotment of the annual value of £5. With the similar provisions in the Chaddesden, Stanley and Spondon Acts, Manlove seems to have insisted that all enclosure Acts under which he was likely to benefit should have a financial guarantee written into them. It is little wonder that a contemporary should say of him that Manlove was 'a shrewd-talking respectable-looking old Parson but deeply tainted with what *ought* to be an anti-Parsonic vice, Meanness.'¹³

Another group of enclosure Acts specified the proportions of open-field, meadow, pastures and commons which were to constitute the allotments of the clergy. At Ockbrook the impropratrix, Mary Lane and Joseph Collier were granted under the Act of 1772 one seventh of the open-fields, meadows and commons in lieu of their tithes, this allotment to be divided between 'Tillage Parts and Grass Parts' together with a further allotment equal in value to one tenth of all yards, gardens, orchards, homesteads and old enclosed lands subject to tithes in kind, these allotments to be divided between Mary Lane and Joseph Collier in the proportion of 3 to 1 in favour of the impropratrix. The award gave the vicar and the impropratrix 48a 3r 13p and 110a 1r 26p respectively.¹⁴ At Findern (1780) the vicar of Mickleover, being owner of one third of the great tithes and all the vicarial tithes received two fifteenths of the residue of the open-fields, one eighth of the commons and one twentieth of the common pastures. The two fifteenths proportion also obtained at Spondon (1788). The Melbourne Act (1787) gave to the vicar, John Middleton, and to Lord Melbourne, according to their estates and interests, allotments equal in value to one tenth of the commons, wastes, meadows, pastures and ancient enclosures subject to tithe, and one seventh of the common fields. Here the vicar played an important part in the promotion of the enclosure. A writer in 1800 declared that the Act was not designed 'for the advantage of the proprietors at large that were interested therein ...' and that 'the purport was to injure, and not to aid them.'¹⁵ The opposition of the smaller proprietors to the proposed compensation of two acres of new enclosure for every message possessing right of common was overcome by

the assiduous and intense diligence of the vicar and others, that went from house to house to obtain the suffrage of each proprietor, and encountered them singly when unprepared with either a competent knowledge of the bill, or argument to combat the act.

Thus

the acquiescence of many of the proprietors were [sic] obtained without any stipulative compact whatever, and the bill was passed into law as it now stands.¹⁶

The devisees of the lessee of the great and small tithes of Sawley, and the Prebendary of Sawley in Lichfield Cathedral received allotments, at the expiration of the lease, equal in value to two thirteenths of the arable open-fields, one eighth of the common meadows and one tenth of the common pasture. At Mickleover the proportions must have been even more difficult to compute. The vicar, owning one third of the corn tithes received allotments equal in value to two forty-fifths of the open-fields subject to tithe, one twenty-fourth of the commons and one sixtieth of homesteads, yards and gardens, in addition to the other allotments already noted.

The situation at Hollington (1817) was most complicated. Hollington fell in the parishes of Brailsford and Longford. The rector of Brailsford and George Wibberley (who was entitled to half of the great tithes of parish lands in Hollington) shared allotments equal in value to one fifth of the open-fields and one tenth of all other lands and grounds in Hollington. At Longford there was a sinecure rector and a vicar. The rector, Wenman Henry Langton received allotments equal in value to one sixth of the open-fields and one thirtieth of all other lands in Hollington, and Frederick Anson, the vicar, received allotments equal in value to one thirtieth of all lands in Hollington which fell in the parish of Longford. In the subsequent award Anson received 30a or 22p and Langton received 77a or 13p.¹⁷

A third group of enclosure Acts compensated the extinguishment of tithes with a corn rent. At Eckington (1795) the rector, Christopher Alderson, received allotments in extinguishment of all tithes on new enclosure and a corn rent in lieu of his great tithes on old enclosure. This latter was to be computed on the average price of marketable wheat

for a period of fourteen years.¹⁸ The award is dated 1804, and under it the corn rent was set at £349 0s. 5d. p.a. Alderson's allotments amounted to 249 acres.¹⁹ By 1823 the rector of Eckington was receiving £1,500 p.a. 'principally corn rent in lieu of tithe.'²⁰ This income compares with the £400 which Lloyd gives for the rectory in 1788.²¹ In 1832 however the rector was anticipating that his income would be reduced by £200 p.a. in the future, the payment of the corn rent in that year being the last payment based on an assessment made in 1819. In each year since 1819 he had received £582 in corn rents.²² The Beighton Act (1796) gave impropriator and vicar allotments equal in value to one eighth of commons and waste in lieu of tithes arising from new enclosure, and substituted a corn rent for all tithes from old enclosure. Two fifteenths of the annual value of the old enclosed lands was to be paid yearly as a corn rent, the enclosure commissioners to ascertain what quantity of marketable wheat according to the average of the previous 21 years was to be equal in value to each proprietor's corn rent charged on their respective ancient enclosures. The award dated 1799 valued the old enclosures at £2,615 2s. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ d. p.a., two-fifteenths of which was £348 13s. 8 $\frac{3}{4}$ d. One-quarter of this, or £87, was given to the vicar as a corn-rent and three-quarters, or £261, to the impropriator. In addition, the vicar received a corn rent of £90 p.a. from the township of Hackenthorpe in his parish, making a total of £177.²³ Lloyd gives the Beighton benefice income as £20 p.a. in 1788,²⁴ and Archdeacon Butler returns it as £320 in 1823 of which £290 was by corn rent in lieu of tithes.²⁵ Thus the vicar's income from this corn rent had increased by £113 or 64 per cent between 1799 and 1823.

At Whittington (1821) the corn rent substituted for all tithes was to be paid twice yearly and computed on the average price of wheat for the 14 years preceding March 1822. The award, dated 1825, set this corn rent at £269 2s. p.a.²⁶ The Snelston Act (1824) based the corn rent on the average price of wheat for the five years preceding March 25th 1824, this much shorter period perhaps reflecting the farmers' fears of the falling market. The corn rent provisions were obviously popular with farmers in times of a boom in corn prices, and popular with the clergy in times of slump. Generally speaking however although a corn rent assured the parson of a regular income and suffered from few of the disadvantages of tithe collection, the latter was far more profitable in the boom conditions which operated for three-quarters of this period.

The economic effect of enclosure on benefice incomes

It is difficult to disentangle the effect of enclosure upon benefice incomes from the effect of the general rise in glebe rents and tithe income and, for the poorer parishes, the effect of augmentation by the Queen Anne's Bounty Board commissioners. Such evidence as there is falls into three classes;

(a) direct evidence, i.e. where the income of a benefice after an enclosure award shows an increase which can be directly traced to that award. In 1772 the vicar of Church Broughton, John Dimott, put his income at between £60 and £70 p.a., but 'I expect y^e Allotment to me on y^e Enclosure will considerably increase its Value.'²⁷ The Church Broughton enclosure award is dated 1775, and as early as October 1782 Dimott's successor, Charles Chawner, answering the Bounty Board's articles of enquiry put his income at £140 3s. 7d. made up of £53 p.a. rent on land allotted at the enclosure, £52 p.a. arising from a composition for tithes agreed upon at the enclosure and sundry other sums arising from debentures and Easter dues.²⁸ The vicar's allotment in lieu of tithes on open fields and commons was 82a 1r 7p²⁹ raising his glebe acreage to 102a 1r 7p. Thus the immediate effect of this enclosure was to double the benefice income. A similar dramatic increase took place at Chaddesden. Notice has already been taken of the award there of an allotment worth £33 p.a. In 1792 this acreage produced £38 p.a. and in 1816, £80 p.a.³⁰ Even more dramatic was the increase in the Alvaston benefice income effected by an enclosure award dated 1805. The income was returned as £25 12s. p.a. in 1787 and rose to £114 in 1809 'from Land allotted in lieu of Small Tythes from a Late Inclosure.'³¹

(b) evidence which establishes that the enclosure commissioners compensated for tithe and glebe rights of common by a handsome valuation in land allotment, the effect of

which was to raise the benefice income substantially in the short term. An assumption has to be made in assessing this evidence about the rentals which such allotments would be likely to produce. Fortunately there is considerable information about Derbyshire rentals throughout the period. W. Bray in his *Sketch of a Tour in Derbyshire and Yorkshire* published in 1778 quotes rents for land between £1 1s. and £2 10s. per acre.³² In 1796 William Marshall said that average rent throughout the Midlands was about £1 per acre for enclosed lands.³³ Various rent rolls for Derbyshire estates for this period confirm this. J. L. Newton's rent roll for his Mickleover estate³⁴ lists nine tenants of lands ranging from 11 to 157 acres in extent who paid just over £1 per acre p.a. on average.

By the middle years of the Napoleonic wars, the effect of the war had been to raise rents and prices dramatically. J. Farey observed in 1811 that in Derbyshire rents of lands near to principal towns were high: from 40s. to 60s. per acre near Buxton and 47s. near Stapenhill, while at Kirk Ireton £1 was the average falling to 16s. at Ashover and 10s. to 14s. for new allotments at Newhaven in the parish of Hartington,³⁵ these last being well away from centres of population. By the close of our period rents of lands near to principal towns had risen to 70s.–120s. per acre with whole farms being let at 40s. to 60s. per acre p.a.³⁶ Evidence of the rents received from land purchased with Queen Anne's augmentation monies confirms this.³⁷ It seems safe to assume therefore that, depending upon area, average rents on church lands in the early years of the period of between 10s. and £1 would have been asked, by the close of the Wars, £1 to £2, and by the close of the period, £2 to £3 per acre p.a.

On this assumption many enclosure awards had a dramatic effect on the income of poorer benefices. For example the Elton and Winster Act of 1809 gave to the perpetual curate of Elton an allotment in lieu of his glebe rights and further allotments in lieu of his half share of a hay tithe modus. These allotments amounted to 47 acres.³⁸ In 1810, before the award was made, his income was returned to the Bounty Board commissioners as between £35 and £40 p.a.³⁹ His income more than doubled to £90 10s. by 1817.⁴⁰ The 47 acres would most probably have been let for about £1 per acre p.a. The Bolsover award of 1779 gave the vicar 22a or 23p in lieu of vicarial tithes.⁴¹ He returned his income to the bishop as £50 p.a. in 1772⁴² and as £102 16s. to the Bounty Board in 1812.⁴³ By 1832 his income was £111–£112 p.a. of which £42 'arose from land appropriated at the time of an Inclosure in lieu of small tithes.'⁴⁴

In 1772 the vicar of Ilkeston returned his income as £20 p.a.⁴⁵ In 1782 it was returned as £24 16s. of which £5 was derived from tithe in kind.⁴⁶ The enclosure award of 1798 allotted the vicar no less than 35a 2r 32p in lieu of these tithes, which at current average rents would have produced about £40 p.a.⁴⁷ In 1815 his income was £108 p.a.⁴⁸ and in 1824 it had risen to £177 including £27 from land purchased with Queen Anne's Bounty augmentation monies in the 1790s. His glebe amounted to 40 acres—a little more than his allotment on enclosure.⁴⁹ In 1832 his lands were producing £144 16s. 6d. p.a.⁵⁰

The vicar of Hathersage returned his income in 1772 as £40 p.a.⁵¹ and to Queen Anne's Bounty in 1813 as £49 6s. 9d. of which £24 was derived from land and £25 6s. 9d. from small tithes, compositions, surplice fees and Easter dues.⁵² By 1823 his income had risen to £100 as a result of augmentation by Queen Anne's Bounty and parliamentary grant totalling £1,200 in 1813 and 1814.⁵³ An enclosure award in 1830 (Act 1808) compensated the vicar's tithes by an allotment of 104a 2r 35p.⁵⁴ As early as 1831 the vicar could compute his average income for the previous three years as £126 p.a.⁵⁵ Previous to the award being made his glebe had totalled some 1½ acres. A less well-documented example is that of the vicar of Mickleover where forty years after an enclosure the benefice income was £586 p.a. all arising from land granted in lieu of tithes.⁵⁶

There are other examples—Crich, Chelmorton, Barlow and Boulton—which all suggest that, for the poorer benefices at least, the immediate effect of an enclosure was to double benefice income. Perhaps the clearest examples in this class are those benefices already noted where tithes were compensated for a corn rent. Dramatic as these increases were however they would have been even more substantial had there been no

compensation by allotment or corn-rent. This can be seen from the third class of evidence of the effect of enclosure.

(c) evidence obtained by comparing the benefice incomes of those parishes which were the subject of an enclosure award with those which were not.

Statistics of benefice income in Derbyshire are available for the years 1772, 1823-4, and 1832; for 1772 from the articles of enquiry for the Bishop of Lichfield's primary visitation, for 1823-4 from the articles of enquiry for the Archdeacon of Derby's visitation and for 1832 from the returns to the Ecclesiastical Revenues Commissioners. Some 81 benefices appear in all three lists. Of these 81 benefices, thirty were rectories, and of these seventeen were affected by enclosure awards and thirteen were not. The percentage increase in income between 1772 and 1824 for those rectories subject to an enclosure award was 238 per cent, and between 1772 and 1832, 223 per cent. For the rectories not subject to enclosure the percentage increases were 257 per cent and 254 per cent respectively. It would appear that the average income of those rectories subject to enclosure in this period, though initially higher than the others (£151 compared with £119) improved less quickly than those not subject to enclosure and when the slump came in the 1820s the decline in benefice income for the recently-enclosed rectories was more acute. When the vicarages are similarly analysed the differences between the two classes is even more dramatic. In 1772 the average income of the eighteen vicarages subject to enclosure was £59 p.a. and for those vicarages not subject to enclosure it was £49 p.a. By 1824 average incomes had risen to £196 and £199, or 232 per cent and 306 per cent respectively. By 1832 the percentage increase over the 1772 figure was 217 per cent (£187) for those subject to enclosure, and 320 per cent (£206) for those not affected by enclosure. Too much must not be made of these figures. Two of the rectories had most of their great tithes impropriated, and one vicarage was endowed with rectorial tithes. Some vicarages were assisted by Bounty and parliamentary augmentations.

Nevertheless these statistics suggest that tithe income increased at a faster rate than income from land allotted in lieu of tithe. This is only to be expected. As tithe was a tax on the profits and efficiency of the farmer, the more the farmer produced the more the tithe owner received, both sharing in the profits accruing from efficiency on the farm and high prices in the market. When these tithes were commuted for land on enclosure, the incumbents leased allotments for periods of up to twenty-one years at a fixed rent, at least in the years preceding 1815. The statistics suggest that although tithes may have been compensated for very handsomely on enclosure to the extent of doubling the incomes of many poorer benefices in the short run, with immediate social and pastoral consequences, in the long term this advantage was more than off-set by increasing efficiency and high prices.

Thus it may be said that in the long run enclosure had a slightly depressing effect on the rate of increase of benefice incomes. The real profits of enclosure of course lay in the disposability of the allotments so acquired. The tithes of Hartington for example were worth at the most £120 p.a. prior to an enclosure in 1799, yet before 1811 the tithe-owner had sold the allotment made to him in lieu of these tithes for £28,000 after ring-fencing, the advance having been calculated at £1,280 p.a.⁵⁷ In such profits as these the clergy could not share. Enclosure did have a very marked effect on benefice incomes. The effect was immediate. Almost over-night many incumbents became substantial land-owners, and within a few years new, and much larger, parsonage houses witnessed to their new social status. Nevertheless had they rested content with their tithes their incomes would have increased more in the long term. Tithe and land allotment in lieu in any case concerned only the rectors and vicars. The effect of the increase in tithe income and of enclosure on the very large numbers of the poorest incumbents, the perpetual curates, was negligible, those who were affected by enclosure receiving only a few acres in lieu of glebe rights of common. The credit for so substantially raising the incomes of these poorest livings belongs to Queen Anne's Bounty and the land investment policy it pursued.

REFERENCES

- ¹ A. Young, *An enquiry into the progressive value of money in England* (1812), vii. though recent research has shown this average figure to be somewhat excessive, the enclosure of Hollington Common and Kirk Ireton in Derbyshire cost much more. See W. E. Tate, 'Enclosure acts and awards relating to Derbyshire', *Derbyshire Archaeological Journal* (D.A.J.), lxx (1944-5), 25.
- ² Lichfield Joint Record Office (L.J.R.O.), B/V/5, Morley, art.9.
- ³ L.J.R.O., A/V/1/1, 517, art.65.
- ⁴ Church Commissioners (C.C.), file NB12/161.
- ⁵ Derbyshire Record Office (D.R.O.), Q/R1cl.
- ⁶ Further to this see p.92.
- ⁷ Derby Central Library (D.C.L.), Chaddesden enclosure award 1793, 67.
- ⁸ D.R.O., Q/R115: award dated 1826.
- ⁹ D.R.O., Q/R14/125: award dated 1818.
- ¹⁰ L.J.R.O., A/V/1/1, 301, art.66.
- ¹¹ D.R.O., Quarter Sessions records, 'Return of all land and money payments assigned in lieu of Tithes under Inclosure Acts, the Awards of which are enrolled with the Clerk of the Peace for the said county, stating the number of Acres and Amount of Money given in lieu of Tithes distinguishing the Amount assigned to Impropiators, Clerical Incumbents, Ecclesiastical Corporations and others', n.d.
- ¹² D.R.O., Q/R113: award dated 1820.
- ¹³ G. Galbraith, *The journal of the Revd. William Bagshaw Stevens* (1965) 103.
- ¹⁴ D.R.O., Q/R178: award dated 1773.
- ¹⁵ T. Dugmore, *Observations on inclosing the manor of Melbourne in the county of Derby, with some remarks on the Act of Parliament obtained for that purpose; and also on the proceedings subsequent thereto* (1800), v.
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 49. Stevens called Midaleton a 'twy-faced hypocrite', G. Galbraith, *op. cit.*, 59, 108.
- ¹⁷ D.R.O., Return of all land etc.
- ¹⁸ By this act too the requirement on the part of the rector to 'keep and maintain a Boar for the Use and Benefit of the parish' was set aside in favour of the rector paying an annual salary to the organist. On this, which shows the survival of an older interpretation of tithe, see C. Hill, *Economic problems of the church* (1963), 159.
- ¹⁹ D.R.O., Return of all land etc.
- ²⁰ L.J.R.O., A/V/1/1, 163, art.65.
- ²¹ J. Lloyd, *Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus* (1788), 157.
- ²² C.C., file NB12/96, articles of enquiry, arts.19, 28.
- ²³ D.R.O., Q/R13/148.
- ²⁴ J. Lloyd, *op. cit.*, 158.
- ²⁵ L.J.R.O., A/V/1/1, 119, art.65.
- ²⁶ D.R.O., Q/R14/522.
- ²⁷ L.J.R.O., B/V/5, Church Broughton, art.9.
- ²⁸ C.C., file F699, articles of enquiry dated 26 October 1782, art.5.
- ²⁹ D.R.O., Q/R1103.
- ³⁰ C.C., file F930, articles of enquiry dated 13 March 1792 and 22 July 1816, art.5.
- ³¹ C.C., file F90, articles of enquiry dated 1 January 1787 and 15 March 1809.
- ³² W. Bray, *Sketch of a Tour in Derbyshire and Yorkshire* (1778), 99.
- ³³ W. Marshall, *The rural economy of the Midland Counties* (1796), i, 17-8.
- ³⁴ D.C.L., Acc.8279, dated 1793-1802.
- ³⁵ J. Farey, *General view of the agriculture of Derbyshire* (1811), ii, 27-8.
- ³⁶ S. Glover, *History and Gazetteer of the county of Derby* (1829), i, 185.
- ³⁷ See M. R. Austin, 'Queen Anne's Bounty and the poor livings of Derbyshire', *D.A.J.*, xcii (1972), 78-89.
- ³⁸ L.J.R.O., A/V/1/1, 179 art.67. Gross income is given here as £100 p.a. 'in land'.
- ³⁹ C.C., file F1712, articles of enquiry dated 26 February 1810.
- ⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, articles dated 26 August 1817.
- ⁴¹ D.R.O., Q/R11/595.
- ⁴² L.J.R.O., B/V/5, Bolsover, art.9.
- ⁴³ C.C., file F508, articles of enquiry dated 15 June 1812, art.6.
- ⁴⁴ C.C., file NB12/25, art.9.
- ⁴⁵ L.J.R.O., B/V/5, Ilkeston, art.9.
- ⁴⁶ C.C., file F2537, articles of enquiry dated 26 October 1782, art.5.
- ⁴⁷ D.R.O., Return of all land etc.
- ⁴⁸ Parliamentary Papers (P.P.), 1818, XVIII, 104.
- ⁴⁹ L.J.R.O., A/V/1/1, 495, arts.65, 67.
- ⁵⁰ C.C., file NB12/131, art.16.
- ⁵¹ L.J.R.O., B/V/5, Hathersage, art.9.
- ⁵² C.C., file F2111, articles of enquiry dated 4 June 1813, art.6.
- ⁵³ L.J.R.O., A/V/1/1, p.199, art.65.
- ⁵⁴ D.R.O., Return of all land etc.
- ⁵⁵ P.P., 1835, XXII, 481.
- ⁵⁶ C.C., file NB12/141, art.15.
- ⁵⁷ J. Farey, *op. cit.*, ii, 79.