

ART. XII – *Troutbeck Chapel of Ease from its foundation to 1800*

By M. PARSONS

THE history of Troutbeck's chapel of ease reflects vividly the outlook and composition of its inhabitants. Given the modest resources of most of them, it was often difficult to find the necessary financial support. Growing economic inequality resulted in numerous petty squabbles, and these provided opportunities for intervention from the ecclesiastical authorities which, although sometimes welcomed, were more often resented. The independent attitude of the inhabitants not only led them on occasions to resort to the Common Law to evade external control: they were even prepared to cite Magna Carta in defence of their freedom of action.¹

Given the extent of the area under the control of their ecclesiastical superiors, frequent and effective interference in the affairs of the chapel was difficult. Even the parish of Windermere, to which the chapel of ease owed both financial and administrative support, covered a large area. It incorporated not only the township of Troutbeck but also the townships of Applethwaite, Undermilnbeck and the part of Ambleside known as Ambleside below Stock. Diocesan control was exercised in theory by the bishop of Chester after the creation of that diocese by Henry VIII in 1541. This diocese was over 10,000 square miles in extent² and Troutbeck lay on its northernmost boundary.³ In practice it was the commissary of the archdeacon of Richmond, appointed by the bishop, who exercised most of the administrative control over the archdeaconry,⁴ of which Troutbeck had always been a part.⁵ His consistory court ranked equally with that of the bishop at Chester and appeals from it went not to Chester but to the court of the archbishop of York.⁶ Despite the extent of the archdeaconry⁷ the commissary did make an effort to supervise the affairs of this small and remote chapel.

The origins of the chapel are obscure. It is possible that before its foundation the inhabitants of Troutbeck worshipped in the chapel of St Katherine at Applethwaite. If any place of worship existed in the valley in the 14th century it was far more likely to have been in Applethwaite, which had 80 tenements in 1324,⁸ than in Troutbeck where there were only 19.⁹ These few tenants would be unable to provide a stipend for a priest, without which a licence for the foundation of a chapel would not be forthcoming. Nor was there a resident lord to finance the operation. In the early 15th century Troutbeck shared in the impoverishment "by failure of crops, murrain and other causes" afflicting the Cumbrian deaneries of the Archdeaconry of Richmond.¹⁰ In 1442 the thatching of their mill was out of repair and several tenants were called before the manorial court of Windermere for having defective or ruinous tenements.¹¹ It is most likely that the chapel was built in the latter part of the 15th century. This was a period of economic expansion in most of Cumbria¹² and there are indications that the economy of Troutbeck, based predominantly on pasture farming, was prospering and the tenants' feeling of communal identity strengthening. Not only were they sufficiently active in making coalpits to arouse the anger of their lord;¹³ by 1492 they had erected a mill "pro ferro triando".¹⁴ By 1505

they had built a new fulling mill to replace an earlier one that had collapsed.¹⁵ The cornmill at Limefitt had begun to take over the grinding of the tenants' corn from the parish mill at Applethwaite.¹⁶ In 1492 the rents and farms owed by the tenants to the Countess of Richmond totalled £26 7s. 6d. a year and they were paying £25 6s. 8d. for the agistment of animals in Troutbeck Park.¹⁷ There was a great deal of building activity in the 15th century in areas producing cloth or wool¹⁸ and Troutbeck was closely involved in the Kendal cloth industry. It was probably in the later 15th century that the neighbouring chapels of Ambleside and Kentmere were erected.¹⁹ The chapel at Troutbeck was certainly in existence by 1506.²⁰ By 1563 its origins were considered to be sufficiently remote for it to be described as "anciently seated"; a place where divine exercises are "accustomed" to be done.²¹ The chapel, regarded with pride as "decently builded",²² was probably a joint undertaking by the inhabitants of both Troutbeck and Applethwaite. It was sited conveniently for both townships at the bottom of the valley, and the petition, sent to the Bishop of Chester in 1562 seeking greater powers for the chapel, was made by both townships.²³ In fact neither he nor Archbishop Parker, in the following year, made any distinction between the two townships: they both refer to the township of Troutbeck and Applethwaite.²⁴ The chapel of St Katherine must have been abandoned by the time that the chapel was built at Troutbeck.²⁵

The religious upheavals of the 16th century left the chapel relatively unscathed. John Dixon, who was its minister in 1554 during the reign of the Catholic Queen Mary²⁶, was still in office in 1566²⁷ despite the change to Protestantism. The chapel does seem to have shared in the widespread decay of village churches revealed by the archiepiscopal visitation of 1578²⁸ but the inhabitants of the chapelry had taken steps to remedy the situation before Elizabeth's order to Bishop Downham in 1568 to deal with deficiencies in the diocese.²⁹ In fact the rebuilding that was under way by 1557³⁰ was probably due, at least in part, to the need of increased accommodation resulting from a growth in population. By 1560 Troutbeck alone had 61 tenants³¹ and a chancel was now added to the chapel.³² The fact that the repairs and rebuilding were still proceeding in 1566 indicates the scale of the work.³³

In 1562 the two townships of Troutbeck and Applethwaite sought and obtained from William Downham, Bishop of Chester, not only the unusual dedication of their chapel to Jesus but also the status for their chapel of a parochial chapelry. No longer would they have to carry their babies to be baptised or their corpses to be buried all the three miles to the parish church of Windermere; their minister could henceforth perform the necessary rites.³⁴ Unlike many ministers of chapels of ease³⁵ theirs had to be canonically ordained. The whole financial burden was to be borne by the inhabitants of the chapelry: they were to pay the minister, repair the chapel and ensure that it was "decently adorned". Any opposition offered by the rector of Windermere to the loss of his rights was hopefully forestalled by underlining the continuation of most of the financial obligations to the parish church. Future trouble, however, may have been envisaged by Archbishop Parker when he insisted, in the following year, whilst in the course of granting his own licence for a parochial chapelry, that the inhabitants of the chapelry should not "of any malignant men" be "hindered or restrained".³⁶ The inhabitants of the chapelry were not the only ones in the vicinity to seek greater independence from their parish church in the latter part of the 16th century: the archiepiscopal visitation of York in 1590-1 noted that some

of the inhabitants of Overstaveley, Netherstaveley and Hugill had refused to go to the parish church of Kendal for weddings, burials and christenings.³⁷

The geographical proximity between Troutbeck and Applethwaite failed to produce harmony between the two townships and, in 1571, seven inhabitants of Applethwaite made an agreement with the inhabitants of Troutbeck in which the former insisted that they were not to be forced by any former award to "have dealings with anything pertaining to the said church". If they so wished they could come to the chapel and in that case they were to pay for their seats as they had always done. It was to be left to Troutbeck to find a priest, keep the chapel in repair and have the profits.³⁸ Although this suggests that Applethwaite surrendered its participation in the administration of the chapel this was not in fact the case. Only the lower part of Applethwaite did this; henceforth the chapelry comprised Troutbeck and the High End of Applethwaite or Applethwaite above Castlehow. The inhabitants of the lower part of Applethwaite apparently went to the parish church of Windermere. It was not unusual for townships to be divided in their ecclesiastical allegiance:³⁹ at least in this case both parts of Applethwaite were subject to the same parish church.

Immediate control over the affairs of the chapel lay with the meeting of the chapelry where decisions had to be approved by all its inhabitants.⁴⁰ The dominant voice, however, was that of the 12 jurymen. It was they who laid down the financial regulations of 1583 for the chapel and who had, in the 16th century, the right to assign the coveted seats in the chancel.⁴¹ It was these same men who, as representatives of the township of Troutbeck, made presentments to the manor court of Windermere, arbitrated in disputes within Troutbeck and took the oath of township officials. They were therefore leading figures both in lay and ecclesiastical affairs. Whether there was any clear distinction between the meetings of the chapelry and the township is unlikely. The salarymen, who were chosen by the inhabitants of the chapelry, were ordered, in 1583, to be compelled, if reluctant, to take their oath to the "officers" and this probably refers to officers of the township. The churchwardens exercised both lay and ecclesiastical responsibilities. It was, of course, usual in the parish for lay and ecclesiastical responsibilities to be exercised by the same body. Here the position was complicated by the inclusion of some of the inhabitants of Applethwaite in the chapelry. In 1583 the finances of the chapel were reported to have deteriorated, "the township not knowing how".⁴² The two terms "township" and "chapelry" were certainly used in apposition to each other in the early 18th century⁴³ and this did not mean that Applethwaite had ceased to participate in the running of the chapelry. Applethwaite above Castlehow, throughout most of the period under consideration, continued to participate in the choice of the minister and appoint one of the three salarymen. It is possible that the inhabitants of this part of Applethwaite were summoned to the township meeting only when affairs concerning the chapel had to be dealt with.

There is no evidence in the 16th century that the meeting of the chapelry was presided over by the minister, though he probably had the right to do so. It is doubtful if, given the small resources of the chapel, it was possible to acquire a well-educated minister: pluralism and inadequate standards of education were common even in parish churches.⁴⁴ The financial orders of 1583 were witnessed by the jurymen; there is no mention of the minister being present on such an important

occasion. But the salarymen had to take their oath to the minister and this was probably done at the meeting of the chapelry.

Financial problems – a constant preoccupation for the chapelry – were intensified in the late 16th century by inefficiency. The only sum originally available to pay the minister was the “form salary” or the payment for seats to provide his income.⁴⁵ Tenants with holdings in the chapelry paid between 10d. and 20d. for seats in the nave, the cost decreasing from front to back.⁴⁶ Seats in the chancel were charged at a flat rate of 2s.⁴⁷ The charges varied more widely at Ambleside – from 4d. to 3s. 4d.,⁴⁸ probably reflecting greater social differences. The payments in the Troutbeck chapelry brought in only £4 12s. 3d. a year⁴⁹ far less than the £8 0s. 0d. at Ambleside.⁵⁰ Some additional income was available from burial charges: 3s. 4d. for one in the chapel or chapelyard; 4s. for one in the chancel.⁵¹ Otherwise the chapel had to rely on gifts or bequests from the faithful to make up the church stock. Given the modest holdings of most of the tenants these were never likely to be large.⁵²

By 1583 the financial situation had become critical. Not only was it proving difficult to collect the form salary, the minister therefore having to accept a salary which “doth fall or rise” but it had been impossible to ensure the repayment of loans from the church stock which in consequence was suffering from “waste and decay”. The jurymen, backed by the meeting of the chapelry, now threatened those failing to pay their form salary with the seizure of goods worth double the value of the debt. All those borrowing from the church stock not only had to mortgage land as security; they also had to produce two guarantors for the repayment of the loan. A careful account was to be kept of all those holding church stock and of all money coming in to the chapel.⁵³ These orders, although indicating earlier inefficiency, point to a real attempt to rectify the situation. The chapel does not seem to have suffered from the degree of indifference among its inhabitants suffered by many chapels in the nearby parish of Kendal in the later 16th century.⁵⁴ Reluctance to pay their form salary must at least have arisen partly from limited resources: the prohibition placed on loans below 10s. is indicative of the small scale borrowing of tenants finding it difficult to make ends meet. In 1592 the church stock still amounted to only £20 5s. 4d..⁵⁵ creating financial stability was no easy task.

Immediate control over the finances of the chapel lay with three officials known as “sawders”, salarymen or trustees. They had to take an oath to the minister to “order all for the wealth and benefit of the church”.⁵⁶ It was they who, as their name implies, had to collect the minister’s salary. They also had to look after the chapel stock in order to finance the maintenance of the fabric and the provision of ornaments.⁵⁷ Unlike the situation in the parish church, where the immediate responsibility for the nave lay with the churchwardens, and that of the chancel with the rector or impropiator of tithes,⁵⁸ these tasks were given to the salarymen. The churchwardens only assumed responsibility for repairs if ordered to do so when defects were discovered at a visitation. The office of salaryman was regarded as a customary one⁵⁹ and like all such offices was held in turn by those holding land in the chapelry.⁶⁰ Two were appointed from Troutbeck and one from Appleshwaite each year. They were nominated by their predecessors and approved by the meeting of the chapelry, rendering their account to the meeting at the end of their year of office.⁶¹ Unfortunately the same reluctance to take office is evident in the case of the salarymen as with the other customary offices in Troutbeck⁶² and the jurymen in

1583 insisted that those refusing to take their oath were to be compelled to do so by the officers. This order and the nature of the financial crisis of 1583 makes it clear that the salarymen had been far from efficient in carrying out their responsibilities. But since the other officers – overseers, constables etc. – were guilty of a similar reluctance there could be no certainty that the order would be effective.

Relations between the chapel and its parish church at Windermere seem to have been harmonious for most of the late 16th century. Inhabitants of the chapelry asked the rector to be a supervisor of their wills;⁶³ he was called upon to settle land disputes;⁶⁴ he helped to settle the controversy with Applethwaite in 1571.⁶⁵ The fact that the inhabitants of the chapelry were able to choose their own minister, even though they had to submit their choice to the rector,⁶⁶ limited his chances of interference. Apart from the loss of minor payments such as those for burials, he suffered no financial deprivation from the grant to the chapel of the status of a parochial chapelry in 1562; in fact the continuance of the financial obligations of the chapel was clearly emphasised. Before the end of the century, however, a move was made by the chapelry, as in many other areas,⁶⁷ to commute some of the tithes. In 1591 a petition on behalf of Elizabeth Heard, who farmed at Troutbeck Park, against John Lindeth, rector of Windermere, was brought before the Exchequer Court.⁶⁸ The Court ruled that those tenants holding a five cattel tenement or paying 6s. 8d. rent should be allowed to pay 11d. in lieu of the tithes of corn, grain and hay, and 9d. for every lamb tithe. The desire to keep their food and fodder for their own consumption was probably the result of a growing population and may also have been in part a by-product of enclosure.⁶⁹

The inhabitants of the chapelry nevertheless made no attempt to question the principle of their administrative and financial obligations to the parish church. The nature of these reflect, in a number of ways, the close and long-standing relationship between Troutbeck and Ambleside. The two were recorded as a paired settlement in the Lay Subsidy of 1332⁷⁰ and the Troutbeck overseers, as late as 1755/6, were seeking legal opinion regarding the manor of Troutbeck and Ambleside.⁷¹ This close secular link helps to explain their shared obligations to Windermere church. Whereas the other two townships of the manor of Windermere – Applethwaite and Undermilnbeck – each provided eight of the 24 sidesmen for the parish church; the duty of providing the other eight was shared between Troutbeck and Ambleside, Troutbeck sending five and Ambleside the other three.⁷² Similarly Applethwaite and Undermilnbeck each financed $\frac{1}{3}$ of the cost of the upkeep of the parish church; the other $\frac{1}{3}$ being shared between Troutbeck and Ambleside on a 2:1 ratio.⁷³ It was the latter two townships who made common cause against Applethwaite and Undermilnbeck in 1628 to oppose an additional rate levied for the parish church against their wishes.⁷⁴

Troutbeck also supplied two of the seven churchwardens of the parish church.⁷⁵ They were presumably appointed at the meeting of the chapelry but those leaving the office at the end of their year's tenure had to take the names of their successors to the meeting of the Windermere Twenty-Four for approval.⁷⁶ It was one of the tasks of the churchwardens to raise an annual assessment in the township to provide Troutbeck's share of the upkeep of the parish church. In 1640/1 it amounted to 6d. from every tenement of five cattels.⁷⁷ They also carried out both lay and ecclesiastical responsibilities for the chapel and township.⁷⁸

There appears to have been little supervision of the chapel by the higher ecclesiastical authorities in the late 16th century. The minister did attend an episcopal visitation in 1554⁷⁹ but visitations carried out on behalf of the archbishop of York hardly touched the parish of Windermere.⁸⁰ The decision made by the Consistory Court of Richmond in 1680, that the orders made by the inhabitants of the chapelry in 1583 and 1609 concerning the collection and disposing of money and the provision of the minister's salary, were not to be regarded as obligatory as they had not been made or confirmed by "lawful authority",⁸¹ and indicates clearly the degree of self-reliance to which the inhabitants were accustomed. The problems arising from the size of the diocese and even of the archdeaconry⁸² were compounded by poor communications, a scattered population and the absence of a powerful patron through which influence could be asserted.⁸³

Financial problems continued to haunt the chapelry for much of the 17th century. The task of extracting the form salary remained difficult,⁸⁴ even some of the more prosperous tenants being reluctant to pay their dues.⁸⁵ There was a substantial increase in the chapel stock in the first few decades: it had risen from £20 5s. 4d. in 1592 to £143 0s. 0d. by 1629.⁸⁶ This enabled the chapel to grant £66 13s. 4d. in 1637 for the foundation of a school. Thereafter, however, the salarymen found it difficult to make ends meet. By 1647 there had been some additions to the stock, which had grown again to £93 13s. 5d. But either because of the after-effects of the plague of 1623-4⁸⁷ or the uncertainties of the Civil War period not enough borrowers could be found and the salarymen noted that £39 13s. 5d. of the stock "lyes dead". Even in this apparently remote part of the country trouble was being experienced from clipped coinage and the salarymen in 1648/9 only received £14 4s. 6d. from the £22 0s. 4d. of clipped coin they had received from their predecessors.⁸⁸ No regular assessment was levied⁸⁹ and in 1657/8 the salarymen had to fall back on capital and use over £20 of the stock to cover their expenses. The situation improved only marginally after the Restoration. By 1670 the stock amounted to £109 – a small enough increase in a couple of decades – and the interest charged on loans was only 5%. A few shillings a year was now received from the lease of waste around the chapel⁹⁰ and some small legacies did a little to ease the position⁹¹ but in 1683/4 the salarymen had a surplus of a mere 1s. which was to be added to the chapel stock "unless someone had a claim to it".⁹²

These financial problems made it difficult both to find a suitable minister and to maintain the fabric of the chapel effectively.

Doubtless aware that the poverty of a living usually made the appointment of ignorant clergy inevitable, the inhabitants attempted to increase the income of their minister. By 1633 the chapel stock was being used to boost his salary to £7 15s. 0d.⁹³ When the school was built it was hoped that the minister would also act as schoolmaster and in 1639 it was agreed that if he undertook to do so he would be paid £10 0s. 0d. a year.⁹⁴ William Robinson duly assumed both responsibilities⁹⁵ though it is doubtful if he was fit for the tasks involved, because payments were being made in 1639/40 to others for delivering sermons.⁹⁶ In the unsettled period of the 1640s when their financial problems were intense the inhabitants had great difficulty in finding a minister.⁹⁷ Francis Bainbridge was receiving the £10 a year in 1651 but was ejected in 1655 because his ignorance made him unfit for the ministry.⁹⁸ Dudley Walker became schoolmaster in 1662 before his appointment as

minister in 1664.⁹⁹ He had delivered sermons while acting as schoolmaster¹⁰⁰ but the chapel was still paying for the delivery of some sermons by itinerant preachers in 1663/4.¹⁰¹ Dudley Walker usually received £10 a year but in 1668 the three salarymen were cited before the Consistory Court of the Archdeacon for spending the minister's wages on other uses.¹⁰² Loss of income was liable to be particularly serious in a chapelry where there was neither glebe nor priest's house available.¹⁰³ The minister drew only a small additional sum for "writing all such things as concerned the church"¹⁰⁴ in the absence of a clerk. To Dudley Walker the loss was less severe than might be imagined. He was – or became – a man of some substance and at his death in 1725 his goods were worth £345 13s. 10d.¹⁰⁵ There is no indication why he was replaced by John Grisedale in 1694 but this appointment was accompanied by specific instructions to the minister to undertake the job of schoolmaster.¹⁰⁶ No longer was he to have any choice in the matter.

Despite the shortcomings of some of their ministers the inhabitants of the chapelry, unlike those in many other parts of the Archdeaconry,¹⁰⁷ remained loyal to them. They even continued to pay Francis Bainbridge for a further two years after his ejection.¹⁰⁸ The doctrinal controversies of the early 17th century left the chapelry, like most of the region,¹⁰⁹ virtually untouched. After the Restoration a new Communion Book, Book of Articles and new communion plate were duly purchased¹¹⁰ and the notable inroads made by non-conformity in the neighbourhood¹¹¹ at this stage failed to undermine the loyalty of most of the chapelry. Margaret Cookson was the only Quaker living in Troutbeck in 1674.¹¹² The metropolitan visitation of the Archbishop of York in 1669-70 recorded 14 Quakers in Ambleside and a similar number in Staveley. All was apparently well in Troutbeck.¹¹³

Although financial stringency made major building operations impossible in the 17th century the chapelry somehow contrived to maintain the existing structure in a reasonable state of repair. The chapel does not seem to have shared in the long-standing indifference and neglect evident in many parishes of the Archdeaconry in 1663.¹¹⁴ The growth of the chapel stock made possible the purchase of a new bell in 1631 and, despite the loss of funds resulting from the foundation of the school, a sundial was set up in 1641/2; more importantly, the walls and roof were attended to in the 1640s. The salarymen were apparently prepared to use capital for the maintenance of the fabric in 1657/8 and the loss of wages suffered by the minister in 1668 may have been due to the use of the money for the same purpose. The tower was limed in 1661/2 and again in 1670/1. A new font was bought in 1662/3 and considerable work was carried out on the windows in the 1670s; three new ones being installed in 1674/5. The salarymen may have had difficulty in balancing their budget in 1683/4 but further work was carried out on the windows in the 1680s and three new gates were made. The steeple was repaired in 1696 and the chapelyard wall in 1690/1 and 1699/1700. Money was also found to buy new communion plate and furniture in 1662/3 and a new communion table and cloth in 1685/6.¹¹⁵ There is no evidence that any assessment was raised to finance these undertakings but occasional gifts from the inhabitants contributed to payment of the costs.¹¹⁶ At the turn of the century the chapel, chancel and chapelyard were all reported to be in good repair.¹¹⁷

Immediate control over the affairs of the chapel was still exercised in the 17th

century by the meeting of the chapelry in which the 12 jurors, "elected and appointed by the consent of all or most of the inhabitants",¹¹⁸ continued to play the dominant role.¹¹⁹ Before 1680, however, the salarymen had taken over the right of the jurymen to assign "the most substantial persons" to vacant places in the chancel¹²⁰ – a task fraught with difficulties as ambitious tenants rivalled each other to achieve this recognition of their economic status.

In the 17th century, and probably earlier than this, the churchwardens had important responsibilities not only towards the parish church but also to the higher ecclesiastical authorities. Moreover they exercised important administrative functions for both the township and the chapelry. It was they who were the link between the chapel and the ecclesiastical authorities. They had to read and answer the Book of Articles preparatory to the visitation and make their presentments to the visiting authority.¹²¹ Their frequent lack of thoroughness in this respect¹²² has unfortunately deprived us of much we would like to know and casts doubt on the reliability of visitation reports. It was the task of the two churchwardens to raise an assessment within the chapelry if this was necessary to remedy defects discovered in the course of the visitation,¹²³ and it may have been for this reason that they drew up a list of inhabitants for the Commissary in 1676-7.¹²⁴

As was the custom in the parish, the churchwardens exercised an important administrative role in the township. They helped in the administration of poor relief and, in 1640/1, they were paying 15s 9½d. to the surveyor for the destruction of "noysome fowle and vermin" and 4s. 4d. to the High Constable for "solder money".¹²⁵ They had to present an account not only to the parish church of Windermere but also to the township of Troutbeck.¹²⁶ Moreover they exercised a good deal of administrative responsibility on behalf of the chapel. It was they who sought suitable candidates to be minister¹²⁷ and who played a leading role in deciding the size of the minister's salary.¹²⁸ They also had to work with the minister to find a schoolmaster if the minister refused to act in that capacity.¹²⁹ In 1696 they drew up a terrier and made a transcript of the register of births, marriages and deaths.¹³⁰ The dividing line between their responsibilities and those of the salarymen was not always clear. Although the salarymen were supposed to "provide all for the wealth of the church" and the cost of the communion bread and wine was included in their accounts, it was the churchwardens who were held responsible for providing these at the visitation of 1703.¹³¹

During the 17th century the attitude of the chapel towards the mother church at Windermere was somewhat ambivalent. The rector could be a useful intermediary between the chapel and the bishop or commissary¹³² but the inhabitants were reluctant to accept an arbitration they disliked and determined to keep their financial obligations to the minimum. The Consistory Court at Richmond insisted, in 1676, that the rector should have the final say in controversies over seating¹³³ but four years later it had to make provision for defiance of the rector by allowing referrals to its own court.¹³⁴ The attempt, in 1628, by Applethwaite and Undermilnbeck, who between them exercise a majority vote in the Twenty Four, to levy additional assessments for the repair of the parish church and an increase in the clerk's stipend, was bitterly opposed by Troutbeck and Ambleside. The latter two townships claimed that they were only responsible for the usual share of the repairs, the raising of 1d. per household towards the clerk's wages and "voluntary" gifts of

wool etc. A lengthy legal battle followed, as a result of which the principle that Troutbeck and Ambleside were jointly responsible for a third of the repairs was upheld, and the stipend of the clerk was ordered to be 3d. per household, though it could be paid in three separate assessments. Provision was made for any default in payment to be made good from church stock. The customary nature of tithes was also confirmed.¹³⁵ It is clear that by this stage the interests of most of Applethwaite lay with the parish church rather than the chapel at Troutbeck. The claim by Ambleside and Troutbeck that tithes were "voluntary" was so outrageous that it can only emphasize their bitterness over the issue and their continued reluctance to shoulder an additional financial burden to the support of their own chapels. The arrangements for payment from church stock in case of default is indicative of the difficulty expected in extracting the demands, and the dual responsibilities of the churchwardens to both Troutbeck and Windermere could not have been easy to reconcile.

Although technically a chapel of ease, the chapel at Troutbeck regarded itself as a church, and the 17th century accounts of the salarymen always refer to the church rather than the chapel stock: the inhabitants liked to think they controlled their own affairs. In view of the remoteness of the chapelry and the size of the diocese and archdeaconry this must have been the case as far as the day to day administration was concerned. But this small chapel was far from being ignored by the bishop and his commissary in the 17th century. It was even included occasionally in archiepiscopal visitations though the brief returns suggest that little effort was made to collect a full presentment.¹³⁶

In many cases the bishop was content, as would be expected, to intervene only when called upon to give support. When arbitration was carried out in 1629 over the distribution of seating by the rector of Windermere, his patron Christopher Philipson and the 12 jurymen, it was agreed that anyone contravening the order was to be called before the ordinary by the salarymen.¹³⁷ In 1637 the bishop, at his visitation at Lancaster, having heard the evidence concerning further trouble over seating, left the inhabitants of the chapelry to decide the issue themselves, offering to confirm their decision but also allowing an appeal to the Consistory Court in case of further trouble.¹³⁸ There were occasions, however, when the bishop not only enforced his existing authority with every means in his power but even attempted to increase his hold over the chapel. It was the bishop who, with the praiseworthy intention of improving the condition of the parish church, ordered the three assessments to be raised for the support of the parish clerk in 1628. In an attempt to secure a favourable verdict Troutbeck and Ambleside called the case from the Bishop's Court to the Court of King's Bench. When the case was recalled to the Bishop's Court they appealed from this to the Consistory Court of the Archbishop of York. But the authority of the Bishop was not easy to evade and the final arbitration was made by him.¹³⁹ Appeals to the bishop could be dangerous. The petition made in 1639 by the churchwardens and 50 inhabitants, to the Bishop, to approve the arrangements for paying the minister and schoolmaster resulted in the Bishop claiming that it was his right to appoint and dismiss the minister.¹⁴⁰ This was a clear contravention of the episcopal licence of 1562 which gave the inhabitants the right to appoint, if not to dismiss, the curate. No attempt, however, seems to have been made to follow up this claim and the inhabitants of the chapelry continued to

elect their minister themselves.¹⁴¹ In view of the scant attention that the bishops of Chester apparently gave to their deaneries in the 17th century¹⁴² it is surprising to find even this degree of interest in the small and distant chapel at Troutbeck during the early part of the century.

The evidence of the latter part of the century indicates that at least in this period the commissary was attempting to keep some degree of regular supervision over the chapel. The records of the Comperta Books¹⁴³ and Churchwardens' Accounts¹⁴⁴ show that visitations were carried out nearly every year between 1665 and 1690, though the few defects noted suggests that the co-operation of the churchwardens was far from wholehearted. Continued disputes over seating gave the commissary other opportunities to intervene. In 1680 it was he, rather than the bishop, who claimed the right to settle these cases if the rector was unable to do so.¹⁴⁵ Although in the same year he ordered the salarymen to carry out their ancient responsibilities, he also asserted that orders formerly made by the chapelry were not obligatory as they had not been confirmed by a lawful authority.¹⁴⁶ It may not be mere coincidence that it is in this period that the salarymen are described for the first time as being "sworn".¹⁴⁷ Was the commissary insisting on this customary officer taking an oath to himself, rather than the minister, which had previously been the case?

Financial problems continued to cause difficulties for the chapel in the 18th century and, despite the occasional levy of an assessment, these became so great in the early part of the century that it proved difficult to find enough money to pay the minister and impossible to maintain the fabric adequately.

The minister was still chosen at the meeting of the chapelry by a majority vote although a dominant minority faction managed to prevent Thomas Martin from taking office after 1783.¹⁴⁸ Given the fact that the resources of the chapel were still "very mean and inconsiderable",¹⁴⁹ the task of finding a satisfactory candidate was real enough. John Grisedale, who acted jointly as minister and schoolmaster,¹⁵⁰ usually received £10 per annum¹⁵¹ though he complained to the Bishop, in 1715, that his income fell short of that amount¹⁵² and, in 1717, the living was reported to be worth less than £10.¹⁵³ There was still no glebe or house.¹⁵⁴ Despite the fact that the township was apparently "very populous",¹⁵⁵ the inhabitants were reluctant to give generously to their chapel. In 1735 George Browne of Beckside described himself as giving to the chapel "in a more considerable manner than has happened for a long time before".¹⁵⁶ But the chapel failed to benefit from the £200 he bequeathed to it: disappointed relatives instigated a successful suit in Chancery to overturn the will.¹⁵⁷ Any suggestion to augment the income of the minister was opposed by tenants such as Benjamin Birkhead, anxious to avoid any greater financial commitment.¹⁵⁸ No increase in the minister's salary followed the grants in the early part of the century from Queen Anne's Bounty.¹⁵⁹ Although the curate was receiving £10 a year in 1755,¹⁶⁰ William Thompson, who was acting both as minister and sole salaryman, had caused the stock to diminish to £78 4s. 0d. by failing to take adequate securities for loans from it.¹⁶¹ Yet he continued to take funds from the stock to make up his salary and it was feared that there would soon be nothing left. A proposal was made to remedy the situation by raising an assessment but there is no evidence that this was done. William Thompson was still paying himself £10 per annum in 1777.¹⁶²

Shortage of resources did not always preclude the appointment of a suitable

minister if visitation records can be believed. John Grisedale, who was appointed in 1694 and remained in office until 1722, was described at the visitation of 1703 to be of a "sober and exemplary life and behaviour".¹⁶³ Although many parochial chapels were served in the early 18th century by "tailors, cloggers and butter print makers",¹⁶⁴ Troutbeck chapel was faithful to its foundation mandate and John Grisedale was in Holy Orders.¹⁶⁵ The only complaint that the inhabitants had against him was that he did not back them against external interference¹⁶⁶ and for that reason they threatened to eject him. His successor, William Langhorn, was sufficiently well-educated to draw up wills¹⁶⁷ and carry out his duties as schoolmaster.¹⁶⁸ He was replaced, in 1735, by Christopher Atkinson, the son of Dr. Atkinson of Troutbeck Bridge¹⁶⁹ and a graduate of Queen's College, Oxford.¹⁷⁰

The reliability of visitation presentments, as a guide to conditions, is brought seriously into question in the case of William Thompson. The churchwardens, in 1743, claimed that the minister, who was in Holy Orders and episcopally ordained, was "of a sober and exemplary behaviour in his conversation and was conformable to the rubric in his administration of all church ordinances".¹⁷¹ Orthodox he may have been; "sober and exemplary" he certainly was not. William Thompson, appointed in 1737, not only mishandled the chapel's finances;¹⁷² he was frequently drunk, terrorising the inhabitants by shooting off his flintlock at random round the township. If he did sometimes get to the chapel to take services he went straight off to the local inn where he could still be found on Monday morning sitting in "a strange posture".¹⁷³ Nor did he carry out his duties as schoolmaster.¹⁷⁴ It is hardly surprising that in 1778 in a township of 70-80 houses there were only 40 communicants.¹⁷⁵ Yet William Thompson was still in office when he drowned in the shallow stream of Corfoot Beck in 1783.¹⁷⁶

Troutbeck chapel, therefore, appears to have shared in the decline in standards evident in many Anglican foundations in the late 18th century. Bouch argues that the church was probably in a worse condition then than at any other period apart from immediately after the Reformation.¹⁷⁷ Matters did not improve in the chapelry after the death of William Thompson. John Brownrigg, appointed in 1784, had eloped by 1788.¹⁷⁸ The chapel not only suffered from non-residence, like Ambleside¹⁷⁹ and many other poor foundations;¹⁸⁰ they had, in Robert Lambert, a minister lampooned as "a merchant in cassocks and silk, a nimble retailer in old buttermilk",¹⁸¹ who involved himself in his commercial activities to the exclusion of his duties in the chapel. This time the inhabitants threatened to oust him or become "Mahometans, pagans or Jews". By 1799 he was reported to have lived away from the chapelry "for some years past", refusing to pay anyone to do his work. For the last 12 months he had lived at a curacy in Askrigg, Yorkshire and not even visited the chapelry for six months.¹⁸²

However praiseworthy the ministers of the early 18th century appear to have been they were either unable or unwilling to see that the chapel was kept in good repair. Here again the presentments of the churchwardens are misleading. These were supposed to be drawn up in consultation with the minister¹⁸³ but it is hard to escape the conclusion that defects were not always reported. The churchwardens claimed, in 1703, that the fabric was sound, the chancel and churchyard were in good repair, and there was a stone font with a cover, a communion table with a carpet and linen covering, a reading pew, pulpit, and register book.¹⁸⁴ Five years later an assessment

had to be raised to remedy the defects found in the visitation and these were not inconsiderable. The floor of the chapel had to be flagged, a policy that the commissaries had been trying to enforce for long enough,¹⁸⁵ wood had to be bought to make forms and, despite the fact that the surplice was apparently satisfactory, in 1703, cloth was purchased and made up for a new one.¹⁸⁶ The fact that evening prayers were being held in the chapelyard in 1709¹⁸⁷ may have been the result of the work on the chapel floor but in 1710 the chapelyard gates were broken, there were no locks on the doors, brawling was taking place in the chapel and no accounts were being sent to the archdeacon.¹⁸⁸ Some of these troubles were the outcome of the crisis arising from the attempt to move the reading desk and pulpit.¹⁸⁹ A number of inhabitants, fearful that their contribution to the assessment would be used to this end against their wishes, refused to pay.¹⁹⁰ A meeting was called by "some persons" in 1709 to discuss how the chapel might be repaired¹⁹¹ but the indifference of those responsible is underlined by the fact that no chapelwardens and only one salaryman turned up. A few people appeared but there is no mention of the minister.

No effective action was taken at this stage and throughout the 1720s and early 1730s complaints by the archdeacon's court of defects in the fabric of the chapel continued. In 1724 the roof was in decay, plaster had come off the walls, the walls of the steeple broken and ready to fall, the chapelyard gates were missing and its wall had collapsed. Swine were pasturing there. Next year the windows were reported to need urgent repair.¹⁹² Yet nothing had been done to improve matters by the time of the visitation of 1735.¹⁹³ Reluctance to take action was not apparently due to any lack of doctrinal support for the chapel: in 1715 the minister and his chapelwardens¹⁹⁴ reported to the Bishop of Chester that there was "neither now nor was in man's memory either papist, presbyterian or quaker or any dissenter whatsoever".¹⁹⁵ It was probably partly due to indifference – George Browne of Beckside argued that he was prevented from helping to repair the chapel by his fellow churchwarden Thomas Braithwaite in 1726.¹⁹⁶ But economic stringency may well have lain at the root of this attitude. Wool prices were low¹⁹⁷ and a number of tenants now held only very small tenements.¹⁹⁸ It was hardly surprising in these circumstances that no assessment was raised after 1708 for 26 years.¹⁹⁹ At least the problem was not ignored, though the inhabitants, in 1728, were wasting time arguing whether repair was possible or a rebuild was needed, and effective action was further delayed.²⁰⁰

The rebuilding that was finally undertaken in 1735 was financed partly by a heavy assessment of 10s. per tenement in the chapelry, raising £47 18s. 0d. A further £2 7s. 0d. came from those living outside the chapelry who had seats in the nave. Some inhabitants, notably George Browne of Beckside who donated £100, made generous contributions.²⁰¹ The preparedness of the inhabitants to take action at last may well have been helped by an increase in population.²⁰² A gallery was built in the nave and seats allotted in it.²⁰³ The task of rebuilding was carried out thoroughly over a six year period and little of the earlier chapel remained.²⁰⁴ Future financial problems were eased by successive grants from Queen Anne's Bounty: £200 in 1747, and a similar sum in 1756 and again in 1773. A gift of a like sum was also received from the dowager Countess Gower in 1773.

Events in the early 18th century threatened the position of the salarymen. In 1710 the inhabitants were still claiming for them their traditional powers.²⁰⁵ Their right to appoint to seats in the chancel was now well established²⁰⁶ and it was they who

assigned any vacant seat in the nave.²⁰⁷ The responsibility for collecting the payment for the new seats erected in the gallery in 1735 was likewise given to them.²⁰⁸ Their status as customary officials, however, was threatened in the course of the controversy over the movement of the reading desk and pulpit, which erupted in 1707. The insistence by the Commissary that the inhabitants, under threat of excommunication, should agree to the salarymen taking an oath to him as chapelwardens was countered by an appeal to the Court of Common Bench.²⁰⁹ This apparently succeeded but was far from halting the threat to the office. It was the churchwardens who assumed the title of chapelwardens and gradually took over the responsibilities of the salarymen.

The title of chapelwarden had begun to be used by the churchwardens by the beginning of the 18th century²¹⁰ and was being applied to the churchwardens by the Consistory Court as early as 1680.²¹¹ It was increasingly used by the churchwardens as they assumed more of the responsibilities of the salarymen in the early 18th century. This was doubtless done with the encouragement of the Commissary to whom they traditionally took an oath and who now tried to make them take a double oath both as chapel- and church-wardens.²¹² The distinction between the responsibilities of the churchwarden and salarymen was never clear-cut.²¹³ The presentments of the two chapelwardens in 1703 included the claim that they were responsible for providing the bread and wine for communion, a traditional task of the salarymen.²¹⁴ In 1710 Thomas Wilson and Robert Gurnell were described by the Commissary as wardens "sive oeconomicis" of the chapel²¹⁵ implying that they, rather than the salarymen, were responsible for the financial affairs of the chapel. It was as chapelwardens that George Browne of Beckside hoped that George Birkett and James Longmire would succeed him so that action could be taken to repair the chapel.²¹⁶ The decline of the office of salaryman was due at least in part to indifference and corruption. Only one of the three turned up to the meeting summoned in 1709 to deal with the repairs needed in the chapel.²¹⁷ In 1737 the current salarymen admitted that the interest on £44 10s. 0d. had been misapplied before they "tooke the Book".²¹⁸ They were still apparently in control of the finances of the chapel at this stage but William Thompson, appointed minister in 1737, acted as his own salaryman, rendering only scrappy accounts until 1755 and making serious inroads into the resources of the chapel.²¹⁹ In 1754/5 the chapelwardens impressed on the Bishop their concern about the church stock, and the accounts of 1755/6 make it clear that control of the stock had now passed into their hands.²²⁰ There are no payments of form salary, however, recorded in their accounts and it is probable that this was paid direct to the minister.²²¹ The chapelwardens, therefore, in the latter 18th century were exercising in the chapel the traditional role of the churchwarden of the parish church, controlling its finances, caring for its fabric and playing a leading part in its administration. It was the chapelwardens who reproved the minister Robert Lambert in 1795 for neglecting divine service and threatened to look for a replacement for which he would have to pay.²²²

The increased responsibility of the chapelwardens for the chapel was accompanied by a decline in their activities in the parish church. In 1710 Troutbeck was still providing two of the seven churchwardens of Windermere church²²³ but by 1718/9 there were only four churchwardens at Windermere²²⁴ and it is unlikely that any of these came from Troutbeck. The sequestrators of the parish church at

this stage were appointed by the four churchwardens and Benjamin Browne of Townend,²²⁵ and it appears that the main administrative link with Windermere was kept through Mr. Browne who was a sidesman of the parish church. It was he who was urged, in 1719, to sue the tithe defaulters of Troutbeck in the spiritual courts.²²⁶ The obligation to raise assessments and to pay tithes remained but the assessment in the 1740s was recorded by the chapelwardens as being paid to the Windermere churchwardens rather than to Windermere church.²²⁷

Although the financial obligations towards the parish church remained they were increasingly difficult to realise. Resentment against the imposition of tithes increased as they were now demanded on virtually everything: not only on agricultural produce and on all animals including bees but also on gardens and even smoke!²²⁸ The wool tithe – the most important in a predominantly pastoral community – was still demanded in kind and bitterly resented. Failure to pay it in 1719/20 “notwithstanding any usage before” resulted in the order to Benjamin Browne by the rector to sue the offenders in the spiritual courts.²²⁹ Complaints of non-payment of tithes continued throughout the first half of the century²³⁰ but Benjamin Browne, as a sidesman and member of the 24, carried out his duties conscientiously for the parish church. In 1725 he collected 66 stones of wool for tithes, 20 of which came from Troutbeck.²³¹ Other less conscientious sidesmen were condemned by him for their negligence.²³² There were still five representatives from Troutbeck on the 24 in 1737²³³ but after 1746, when the rector claimed the sole right to appoint the sidesmen²³⁴ the representation from Troutbeck probably declined. A link, however, would obviously be useful to assist tithe collection and George Browne was attending the meetings of the 24 in 1755.²³⁵ In the latter part of the century it proved impossible to insist on the payment of the wool tithe in kind²³⁶ and this may have been due to the decline in the number of sidesmen, but some of the wool tithes were still being paid in kind as late as 1834.²³⁷

As in previous centuries there was no question of the rector interfering in the ordinary administration of the chapel. The key to any effective control lay with the right to appoint the minister and it was not until 1823 that the rector acquired this right. Nor did the rector apparently have an administrative link through the churchwardens in the later part of the century. He had to be content with being used to arbitrate in disputes, usually over seating in the chancel.²³⁸

The keen interest shown in the state of parish churches in the Archdeaconry of Richmond in the early 18th century by ecclesiastical authorities, ranging from archbishops to commissaries²³⁹ is also evident in the case of the chapel at Troutbeck. Yet the effectiveness of these authorities, however elevated, was limited both by lack of co-operation on the part of local officials and by strong local opposition from the ordinary inhabitants. Even archiepiscopal visitation itineraries sometimes included Troutbeck²⁴⁰ but the ecclesiastical authorities rarely got nearer than Kendal²⁴¹ and had to be satisfied with presentments that were inaccurate or incomplete.²⁴² The inhabitants of the Troutbeck chapelry were prepared to fight lengthy legal battles, helped by the secular courts, in their determination to preserve the “pleasing of ourselves”.²⁴³

Only four years after Thomas Waite, the Commissary of the Archdeaconry of Richmond, had visited and apparently found all was well in the chapelry,²⁴⁴ Archbishop Sharp, in 1707, ordered the Commissary to visit on his behalf, the see of

Chester being vacant. The time he spent at Troutbeck must have been limited since he visited Burneside and travelled the 28 miles to Keswick on the same day.²⁴⁵ He did, however, order the chapel to be flagged and this was duly carried out.²⁴⁶ His further order – to remove the reading desk and the pulpit to the south side of the chapel – created bitter controversy in the chapelry.

There was nothing unusual in the order: similar ones for the rearrangement of the pulpit and reading desk were issued to many parish churches in the 18th century.²⁴⁷ Nor did the order initially cause trouble in the chapelry. After several meetings the inhabitants agreed and the removal was duly carried out in November 1708.²⁴⁸ Some, however, subsequently changed their minds and after the minister refused to move the furniture back to the north side of the chapel took the law into their own hands and removed the pulpit from its new position.²⁴⁹ The following February the chapelwardens were ordered by the Commissary to erect another pulpit on the south side with an adjoining reading desk or else appear before the Consistory Court at Kendal at the next visitation. They did neither.²⁵⁰ Meanwhile Benjamin Browne of Townend had taken the opportunity afforded by the removal of the reading desk from the chancel to erect a pew for himself there,²⁵¹ securing his authorisation from the Commissary and the Archbishop.²⁵² Places in the chancel were reserved for the more prosperous²⁵³ but he rightly argued that he had “a good mansion and a considerable estate”.²⁵⁴ Some of the inhabitants were so enraged by his actions that they broke into the chapel at night and hacked down the offending pew.²⁵⁵

The degree of anger evinced by the inhabitants was due essentially to the fact that Benjamin Browne had appealed to an external authority in a matter which they regarded as their own affair. It was, after all, the task of the salarymen to assign seats in the chancel. These seats, unlike those in the nave, were only given for life: Benjamin Browne should therefore have waited until one was assigned to him.²⁵⁶ Moreover some ancient seats in the chancel were pulled down to make room for his pew.²⁵⁷ This contravention of a much cherished custom not only led William Birkett to make the astounding assertion that neither the Archbishop, Lord Bishop of Chester nor his Commissary “had anything to do with the ordering of our chappell”;²⁵⁸ he was also sufficiently erudite to cite Magna Carta in defence of the inhabitants’ liberties.²⁵⁹ George Wilson “publicly and in a great passion” denied any right of the Queen as well as the Bishop to intervene.²⁶⁰ When Benjamin Browne appealed for the offenders to be called before the Bishop,²⁶¹ the inhabitants sued for a writ to prohibit the ecclesiastical court at Chester from proceeding;²⁶² all matters concerning the government of the chapel, they claimed, belonged to the temporal courts.²⁶³ But in view of George Wilson’s outburst it is not surprising that the court of Common Bench, to which they appealed in 1710,²⁶⁴ regarded Benjamin Browne as of “good repute” and the inhabitants as plaintiffs who were “very litigious, quarrelsome and obstinate”.²⁶⁵

It was this furore that led the Commissary Thomas Waite to attempt to increase his influence over the chapel. Not only did he try, in 1710, to insist on the salarymen taking an oath to himself as chapelwardens; he also threatened the churchwardens, who were still regarded as being appointed “for the parish church,” with excommunication unless they agreed to be sworn as wardens of the chapel as well. The aim behind these moves, the inhabitants argued in the Court of Common Bench, was to subject the chapel of ease to his correction and government.²⁶⁶ There

were also financial implications. The churchwardens would then have to make two presentations at visitations and these cost 6s. 8d. each!²⁶⁷ The Commissary claimed that it had been the accepted practice in the parishes of both Grasmere and Windermere since the Restoration for the chapelwardens to make separate presentations from the churchwardens²⁶⁸ but there is no evidence that this was the case in Troutbeck. A chapelry in which the assessment ordered by the Commissary in 1708 was described as being made under the "threats" of that official²⁶⁹ was not likely to welcome the increased pressure in 1710. The churchwardens, having refused to take the oath as chapelwardens, were summoned before the Consistory Court, failed to appear, and were duly excommunicated and placed under arrest.²⁷⁰ Their resistance could not have been to the use of the title of chapelwarden which, as we have seen, they had generally assumed by this date. At this stage, however, they were increasingly regarding themselves as officials of the chapel rather than of the parish church and in the former capacity regarded themselves as answerable to the meeting of the chapelry as did the salarymen.

The resistance encountered by the ecclesiastical authorities in the first decade of the century did not end their interest in Troutbeck chapel. The annual visitations of the Commissary continued and the Bishop visited in 1733, 1743 and 1756. The minister and churchwardens sent the Bishop a report in December 1715 on the size of the minister's salary and the following February one on the amount paid to him as schoolmaster.²⁷¹ The Bishop showed concern in 1756 over the depredations caused to the chapelstock by William Thompson.²⁷² But that interest was spasmodic and often ineffectual. The officials of the chapel would not accept sole responsibility for the long delay in taking action over the decay of the fabric in the early part of the century. Reports of the situation were constantly being sent to the Archdeacon's Consistory Court and, in 1724, the chapelwardens complained that the officials of the Court had taken no action to improve matters.²⁷³ William Thompson had been in office 17 years before the Bishop showed concern over the chapel stock and despite the minister's behaviour²⁷⁴ he held the living for 46 years and died in office. Nor was anything effective done to rectify the problem of Robert Lambert. A letter of reprimand was sent in 1795²⁷⁵ but the minister was reported, in 1799, to have lived away from the township for years.²⁷⁶ The chapel claimed the right to dismiss as well as appoint their minister²⁷⁷ and the ecclesiastical authorities were not prepared to challenge those claims at this stage. The independent attitude of the inhabitants of the chapelry had been made clear enough and had been underlined by their failure to apply for a faculty before building the gallery in 1735.²⁷⁸ The scandals in the chapel in the late 18th century were symptomatic of a widespread malaise in the Anglican Church and were therefore unlikely to be effectively dealt with.

The attitude of the inhabitants of Troutbeck towards their chapel was at once possessive and hard-headed. The effectiveness of the authority of the bishop and archdeacon's commissary proved limited; the link with the mother church at Windermere weakened. Even the influence of Applethwaite above Castlehow must have lessened with the decline of the power of the salaryman. The increasing involvement of the church/chapelwardens in the life of the chapel rather than the parish church was of crucial importance in lessening contact with the church at Windermere but economic demands made on tenants, whose resources were often very limited, caused bitter resistance. The tenants were never enthusiastic about

parting with their money even for their own chapel though the more prosperous among them sought avidly for a seat in the chancel which offered public recognition of their economic prosperity. Their doctrinal orthodoxy appears to have stemmed more from indifference rather than strong conviction: a minister reluctant to do their bidding was more at risk than a frequenter of taverns. Social tensions could not be kept out of the chapel but the chapel lay at the heart of the community and when its material existence was threatened or external pressure exerted against their will, the vast majority of the inhabitants formed a united front to preserve not only the building but their control over its government.

Notes and References

- ¹ Cumbria Record Office (Kendal) hereafter C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 2/VI/25.
- ² J. Addy, "Bishop Porteus' Visitation of the Diocese of Chester, 1778", *Northern History*, XIII (1977), 175.
- ³ See map in J. Addy, *Life and Administration in the Archdeaconry of Richmond, 1541-1836* (Unpublished thesis, University of Leeds, 1963).
- ⁴ J. Addy, *op. cit.*, 5.
- ⁵ The Archdeaconry of Richmond was transferred from the diocese of York in 1541 to form, with the Archdeaconry of Chester, the new diocese of Chester (*ibid.*, 4).
- ⁶ *Ibid.*, 3, 4.
- ⁷ The Archdeaconry included the West part of the North Riding, a few West Riding parishes and large tracts of Lancashire, Cumberland and Westmorland.
- ⁸ W. Farrer and J. F. Curwen, *Records of the Barony of Kendal II* (Kendal, 1924), 60.
- ⁹ *Ibid.*, II, 43
- ¹⁰ A. J. L. Winchester, *Landscape and Society in Medieval Cumbria* (Edinburgh, 1987), 44.
- ¹¹ P.R.O. SC2/207/121.
- ¹² A. J. L. Winchester, *op. cit.*, 51.
- ¹³ C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 3/IX/16.
- ¹⁴ Sizergh MSS.15; P.R.O. SC6/877.
- ¹⁵ P.R.O. Min. Accts 21/2 H.7. 877
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁷ Sizergh MSS.
- ¹⁸ R. Morris, *Churches in the Landscape* (1989), 353.
- ¹⁹ C. M. L. Bouch, *Prelates and People of the Lake Counties* (Kendal, 1948), 162.
- ²⁰ P.R.O. SC6/877.
- ²¹ C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 1/III/4.
- ²² *Ibid.*
- ²³ *Ibid.*, 1/III/3.
- ²⁴ *Ibid.*, 1/III/3, 4.
- ²⁵ Machell, writing in the latter 17th century, notes that the chapel of St Katherine was then used as a dwelling house, Jane M. Ewbank, *Antiquary on Horseback*. CW Extra Series XIX (Kendal, 1963), 122.
- ²⁶ G. Browne, "The Advowson and some of the Rectors of Windermere since the Reformation", *CW2*, ix, 43.
- ²⁷ Lancashire Record Office (hereafter L.R.O.) WRW/K. Will of Thomas Birkhead.
- ²⁸ J. Addy, *op. cit.*, 62. In the parish of Kendal it was reported that there were divers chapels where no service was being said because "ther resorteth ther no company".
- ²⁹ H. Gaythorpe, "Walney Chapel", *CW2*, xx, 97.
- ³⁰ L.R.O. WRW/K.
- ³¹ W. Farrer and J. F. Curwen, *op. cit.*, II, 50.
- ³² L.R.O. WRW/K. In 1566 Thomas Birkhead bequeathed 6s. 8d. towards "ye setting forth of ye quere of Troutbecke chappell".
- ³³ *Ibid.*

- ³⁴ C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 1/III/3. Burials were taking place in the chapelyard at least by 1568 (L.R.O. WRW/K: Will of Thomas Rolandson).
- ³⁵ E.g., the chapel at Ambleside, which was served by a deacon ("Chester Clergy List for 1691", *Cheetham Society*, LXXIII, 19); Bishop of Barrow-in-Furness, "Readers in the Chapelries of the Lake District", *CW2*, v, 89-105.
- ³⁶ C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 1/III/4.
- ³⁷ Borthwick Institute of Historical Research (hereafter B.I.H.R.) V 1590-1, CB2.
- ³⁸ C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 24/4. The surviving document is only a copy.
- ³⁹ R. Morris, *op. cit.*, 233. Part of Ambleside belonged to the parish of Windermere and part to Grasmere.
- ⁴⁰ C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 4/XIV/105.
- ⁴¹ *Ibid.*
- ⁴² *Ibid.*
- ⁴³ Gastrell's Notitia, Chester Record Office 268-9.
- ⁴⁴ J. Addy, *op. cit.*, 141.
- ⁴⁵ C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 1/III/2, 7/F95.
- ⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 24/4.
- ⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 31.
- ⁴⁸ Payment for seats was also made at Ambleside and Askham although C. M. L. Bouch and G. P. Jones, *The Lake Counties* (Manchester, 1968), 188, argue the practice was unusual.
- ⁴⁹ C. M. L. Bouch, *op. cit.*, Appendix XIII.
- ⁵⁰ *Ibid.*
- ⁵¹ C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 24.
- ⁵² P.R.O. E178/3130. In 1574 38 of the 56 tenants had holdings of only five catells.
- ⁵³ C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 4/XIV/105. At Ambleside security was taken to ensure the payment of form salary rather than threatening subsequent seizure of goods for non-payment M. L. Armitt, "Ambleside Town and Chapel", *CW2*, vi, 39.
- ⁵⁴ B.I.H.R. 1578-9 CB3 f. 93.
- ⁵⁵ C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 23.
- ⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 1/III/78.
- ⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 7/F145.
- ⁵⁸ J. Addy, *op. cit.*, 53.
- ⁵⁹ C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 7/F145.
- ⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 24/4.
- ⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 2/VI/25; 4/XIV/105.
- ⁶² M. A. Parsons, "Pasture Farming in Troutbeck", *CW2*, xciii, 120.
- ⁶³ E.g., J. Rolandson, 1568; George Browne, 1558.
- ⁶⁴ C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 6/1.
- ⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 24/4.
- ⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 1/III/10. the same practice was followed at Ambleside.
- ⁶⁷ J. Addy, *op. cit.*, 198. He argues that the progress of enclosure caused a reluctance to pay tithes.
- ⁶⁸ P.R.O. E 134/32 Eliz.
- ⁶⁹ M. A. Parsons, *op. cit.*; J. Addy, *op. cit.*, 198.
- ⁷⁰ C. M. Fraser, "Cumberland and Westmorland Lay Subsidies 1332", *CW2*, xvi, 144.
- ⁷¹ C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 24.
- ⁷² *Ibid.*, 23: Terrier 1746; 3/X/53.
- ⁷³ *Ibid.*, 1/III/74; 24.
- ⁷⁴ C.R.O.(K) WPR 61/126.
- ⁷⁵ *Ibid.*
- ⁷⁶ C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 2/VI/23; B. L. Thompson, "The Windermere Four and Twenty", *CW2*, liv, 52. The responsibilities of this body were originally purely ecclesiastical.
- ⁷⁷ C.R.O.(K) WPR 62/W1.
- ⁷⁸ *Vide infra.*
- ⁷⁹ G. Browne, *op. cit.*, 43.
- ⁸⁰ B.I.H.R. There was no entry for the parish of Windermere in 1578-9 or 1595-6. There was a single entry for Windermere in 1590-1 but nothing concerning Troutbeck.
- ⁸¹ C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 24.

- ⁸² See note 7.
- ⁸³ J. Addy, *op. cit.*, 175. The lordship of the manor of Troutbeck lay with the Crown who leased out the manor to absentee aristocrats.
- ⁸⁴ In 1629 the rector and patron of the parish church of Windermere with the 12 jurymen ordered a schedule to be drawn up of those failing to pay. Defaulters were threatened with seizure of their goods by the bailiff (C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 4/XIV 101).
- ⁸⁵ In 1649/50 George Browne of Townend failed to pay his form salary for his tenement at the Fold (*Ibid.*, WPR 62/W1).
- ⁸⁶ *Ibid.*
- ⁸⁷ There were 77 burials in Troutbeck in 1623-4 compared to nine in the previous year.
- ⁸⁸ C.R.O.(K) WPR 62/W1.
- ⁸⁹ In 1735 Miles Atkinson was described as being liable to assessment "when occasion requires" the repair of the chapel (B.I.H.R. Trans. CP 1735/3).
- ⁹⁰ C.R.O.(K) WPR 62/W1.
- ⁹¹ J. Addy, *op. cit.*, 72, claims that by the 17th century the custom of leaving money in a will for repairs to the church had died out. This was not so in the Troutbeck chapelry, though the legacies were small: Thomas Atkinson left 4s. in 1680/1 and his namesake from Longgreenhead £1 10s. 0d. in 1694/5 (C.R.O.(K) WPR 62/W1).
- ⁹² *Ibid.*
- ⁹³ *Ibid.*, WD/TE 23.
- ⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 4/XIV/97. Otherwise £5 was to be given to whoever the parson and churchwardens nominated as schoolmaster.
- ⁹⁵ He was paid £10 in 1639/40 (*ibid.*, 31) and in 1644 he was owed £2 5s. 0d. for school wages (*ibid.*, HK 659).
- ⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, WPR 62/W1.
- ⁹⁷ In 1643/4 various payments were made to different men for holding services. There was still no regular minister in 1644/5 and in 1645/6 they continued their search for a curate. It was 1647 before Christopher Rawlinge was appointed (*ibid.*).
- ⁹⁸ CW2, xxiv, 72.
- ⁹⁹ B.I.H.R. V 1662-3; H. Prideaux, "The Visitation of Nicholas Stratford", *Cheetham Soc.*, LXXIII, 54.
- ¹⁰⁰ C.R.O.(K) WPR 62/W1.
- ¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁰² L.R.O. ARR/15.
- ¹⁰³ C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 1/III/82. Dudley Walker lived at Matthew Howe 1663-94 G. H. Joyce, *Some Records of Troutbeck* (n.d., Staveley), 9.
- ¹⁰⁴ C.R.O.(K) WPR 62/W1.
- ¹⁰⁵ C.R.O.(K) H.K. 680
- ¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, WD/TE 4/XIV/92.
- ¹⁰⁷ J. Addy, *op. cit.*, 377.
- ¹⁰⁸ The last payment to him was made in September 1657 (C.R.O.(K) WPR 62/1).
- ¹⁰⁹ J. Addy, *op. cit.*, 152.
- ¹¹⁰ C.R.O.(K) WPR/62 W1.
- ¹¹¹ B.I.H.R. In 1669-70 there were 14 Quakers in Ambleside and 32 in Hawkeshead.
- ¹¹² L.R.O. ARR/15.
- ¹¹³ B.I.H.R. V 1669-70.
- ¹¹⁴ J. Addy, *op. cit.*, 74. He notes that half of the parishes had defects ranging from minor items to a state of complete decay.
- ¹¹⁵ C.R.O.(K) WPR 62/W1.
- ¹¹⁶ In 1636 Robert Birkett bequeathed £11 4s. 4d. (L.R.O. WRW/K).
- ¹¹⁷ C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 1/III/82.
- ¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 4/XIV/101.
- ¹¹⁹ The arbitration over seats in 1629 was carried out by the rector, his patron and the 12 jurors, with the consent of the rest of the inhabitants (*ibid.*).
- ¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, 1/II/250; 1/III/28.
- ¹²¹ *Ibid.*, 24/1; B.I.H.R. 1662-3.
- ¹²² In 1633 their presentment was criticised as being "imperfect" (B.I.H.R. V. 1633). Similar criticisms were levelled against incomplete presentments in 1666 and again in 1668 (L.R.O. ARR/15).

- ¹²³ C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 1/III/59.
¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, WPR 62/W1.
¹²⁵ *Ibid.*
¹²⁶ *Ibid.*
¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, 1645-6.
¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, WD/TE 4/XIV/97.
¹²⁹ *Ibid.*
¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, 24/1.
¹³¹ *Ibid.*, 1/III/82.
¹³² In 1622 the rector was authorised by the Bishop of Chester to absolve Adam Birkett from his excommunication, E. J. Nurse, *The History of Windermere Parish Church* (1908), 19.
¹³³ C.R.O.(K) W/TE 1/II/250.
¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, 1/III/26.
¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, WPR 61/126.
¹³⁶ The entry of "omnia bene" in 1669/70 is suspicious. The only entry for 1685 refers to the failure of Dudley Walker to show his licence (B.I.H.R. V 1669-70; 1684-5).
¹³⁷ C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 4/XIV/101.
¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, 7/F95; 4/XIV/103.
¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, WPR 61/126.
¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, WD/TE 4/XIV/97.
¹⁴¹ *Vide infra.*
¹⁴² C. M. L. Bouch *op. cit.*, 328.
¹⁴³ L.R.O. ARR/15
¹⁴⁴ C.R.O.(K) WPR 62/W1.
¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, WD/TE 24.
¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 2/VI/102; 3/IX/15.
¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 31.
¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 3/XI/73.
¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 2/VI/104.
¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 1/III/82.
¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, WPR 62/W1.
¹⁵² *Ibid.*, WD/TE 23.
¹⁵³ Gastrell's Notitia (J.L.C 1800-1).
¹⁵⁴ C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 1/III/82.
¹⁵⁵ Gastrell's Notitia. The assessment of 1735 indicates that there were 100 tenants (*vide infra*).
¹⁵⁶ B.I.H.R. Trans CP 1/35/3.
¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 1735/3.
¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*
¹⁵⁹ The chapel received £200 in 1747 and a similar amount in 1756.
¹⁶⁰ C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 24/4.
¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*
¹⁶² Nicolson and Burn, I, 187.
¹⁶³ C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 1/III/82.
¹⁶⁴ J. Addy, *op. cit.*, 179.
¹⁶⁵ C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 1/III/82.
¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 2/VI.21.
¹⁶⁷ B.I.H.R. Trans CP 1735/3.
¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*
¹⁶⁹ G. H. Joyce, *op. cit.*
¹⁷⁰ B.I.H.R. Trans CP 1735/3 note. 98.
¹⁷¹ C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 24/1.
¹⁷² *Ibid.*, WPR 62/W1.
¹⁷³ *Ibid.*, WD/TE 24.
¹⁷⁴ James Birkett was appointed in 1772 (*ibid.*, 2/VI/25), Mr. Asbridge in 1775 (*ibid.*, 8/5) and Benjamin Dockray in 1776 (*ibid.*).
¹⁷⁵ Gastrell's Notitia (Chester 124-5; Leeds 322-3).
¹⁷⁶ C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 8/5. The inhabitants appear to have had the right to dismiss their minister in the

early 18th century (*ibid.*, 7/F145).

177 C. M. L. Bouch, *op. cit.*, 367.

178 C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 8/5.

179 M. Armitt, "Ambleside Town and Chapel", *CW2*, vi, 59.

180 C. M. L. Bouch, *op. cit.*, 367.

181 C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 31.

182 *Ibid.*, 24. In 1790 he was living at Philip Dixon's at High Fold but by 1795 he was already neglecting to perform evening services (*ibid.*, 7/F94).

183 *Ibid.*, 24/1.

184 *Ibid.*, 1/III/82.

185 *Ibid.*, J. Addy, *op. cit.*, 70.

186 C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 1/III/29, 59.

187 L.R.O. ARR/15.

188 *Ibid.*, 15/80.

189 *Vide infra.*

190 C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 1/III/59.

191 B.I.H.R. Trans CP 1735/3.

192 L.R.O. ARR/15.

193 C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 1/III/83.

194 The churchwardens were using the title of "chapelwardens" at this stage (*vide infra*).

195 C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 2/VI/104.

196 B.I.H.R. Trans CP 1735/3.

197 J. Addy, *op. cit.*, 265.

198 M. A. Parsons, *op. cit.*, 125.

199 B.I.H.R. Trans CP 1735/3.

200 *Ibid.*

201 C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 31.

202 The township of Troutbeck was described as "very populous" in 1717 (Gastrell's Notitia J.L.C. 1800-1; C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 2/VI/104).

203 C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 24.

204 The new tower replaced an earlier one which was often referred to as a steeple. The illustration in Jane M. Ewbank (*op. cit.*, 124), makes it clear that a tower existed in the late 17th century.

205 C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 7/F145; 2/VI/23.

206 *Ibid.*, 1/III/2.

207 *Ibid.*, 1/III/27. These could be passed on by inheritance.

208 *Ibid.*, 24.

209 *Ibid.*, 2/VI/29.

210 A letter from George Elleray to Mr. Lancelot Simpson in 1710 notes that the inhabitants "have got chapelwardens for about 9-10 years (*ibid.*, 7/F149)". The assessment for repairs made in 1708 is described as being made by two chapelwardens (*ibid.*, 1/III/59) and the former churchwardens refer to themselves as chapelwardens after 1705 (*ibid.*, WPR 62/W1).

211 *Ibid.*, WD/TE 24.

212 *Ibid.*, 7/F240.

213 *Vide supra.* Both undertook the responsibility at different times for seeing that the surplices were washed and occasional entries for minor repairs are included in the churchwardens' accounts (*ibid.*, WPR 62/W1).

214 *Ibid.*, WD/TE 1/III/82.

215 L.R.O. ARR/12.

216 B.I.H.R. Trans CP 1735/3.

217 *Ibid.*

218 C.R.O.(K) WPR 62/W1.

219 *Ibid.*, WD/TE 24.

220 *Ibid.*, WPR 62/W1.

221 *Ibid.*, 62/W2.

222 *Ibid.*, WD/TE 7/F94.

223 *Ibid.*, 2/VI/23.

224 G. Browne, *op. cit.*, 56.

- 225 C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 1/III/59; L.R.O. ARR 15/77-8.
 226 *Vide infra*.
 227 C.R.O.(K) WPR 62/W1.
 228 *Ibid.*, WD/TE 23: Terrier 1746.
 229 *Ibid.*, 3/XI/86.
 230 *Ibid.*, 4/XIV/83d., 84d., 85, 87d., 91.
 231 *Ibid.*, 8/3.
 232 B. L. Thompson, "The Windermere Four and Twenty", *CW2*, liv, 155.
 233 C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 3/X/53.
 234 E. J. Nurse, *op. cit.*, 27.
 235 C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 8/5.
 236 *Ibid.*, 20/5.
 237 By 1823 neither Troutbeck nor Ambleside was represented at the meeting of the 24 (B. L. Thompson, *op. cit.*, 157).
 238 C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 24. The arbitration of 1728 was made with the help of the vicar of Kendal. The church of Windermere was originally subject to Kendal.
 239 J. Addy, *op. cit.*, 83.
 240 E.g. 1707. This visitation, however, was carried out during a vacancy in the bishopric (*vide infra*).
 241 C.R.O.(K) WPR 62/W1.
 242 B.I.H.R. Trans CP 1735/3; C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 1/III/83.
 243 C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 7/F194.
 244 *Ibid.*, 1/III/82.
 245 L.R.O. ARR 13/5/5.
 246 C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 3/IX/14.
 247 J. Addy, *op. cit.*, 90.
 248 L.R.O. ARR 13/5/5/.
 249 *Ibid.*
 250 *Ibid.*
 251 C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 7/F145; F151.
 252 *Ibid.*, 7/F152; 2/VI/15.
 253 *Ibid.*, 1/II/250.
 254 *Ibid.*, 7/F153.
 255 *Ibid.*, 2/VI/15.
 256 *Ibid.*, 2/VI/81.
 257 *Ibid.*, 7/F145 .
 258 *Ibid.*, 2/VI/16.
 259 *Ibid.*, 2/VI/25.
 260 *Ibid.*, 2/VI/49. Longmire also claimed that the ordinary was trying to undermine the rights and privileges of the chapel (*ibid.*, 2/VI/60).
 261 *Ibid.*, 2/VI/18.
 262 *Ibid.*, 7/F145.
 263 *Ibid.*, 2/VI/25; 7/F240.
 264 *Ibid.*, 2/VI/25.
 265 *Ibid.*, 2/VI/48.
 266 *Ibid.*, 2/VI/29.
 267 *Ibid.*, 7/F240.
 268 *Ibid.*, 4/XIV/87.
 269 *Ibid.*, 2/VI/29.
 270 *Ibid.*, 7/F240.
 271 *Ibid.*, 2/VI/ 23, 104.
 272 *Ibid.*, 24.
 273 B.I.H.R. Trans CP 1735/3.
 274 *Vide supra*.
 275 C.R.O.(K) WD/TE 7/F94.
 276 *Ibid.*, 24.
 277 *Ibid.*, 7/F145.
 278 L.R.O. ARR/15.