

## QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY AND THE POOR LIVINGS OF DERBYSHIRE — 1772-1832

BY M. R. AUSTIN

(Bishop Lonsdale College, Western Road, Mickleover, Derby)

Much has been written about the history of the central administration of Queen Anne's Bounty in terms of the acts of parliament which brought it into being in the early years of the 18th century, and of the Rules which governed its procedures,<sup>1</sup> but little is known of the way in which the Bounty Board's officers applied these Rules in its day-to-day business. In particular such questions as: Why were some parishes augmented and others, equally qualified, not? How closely did the Bounty keep to its Rules? What were the Board's relations with the clergy? and many others of a similar nature remain largely unanswered.

The extensive archives of the Church Commissioners contain, amongst a great deal of immensely important documentary evidence relating to the Church of England in the 18th and 19th centuries, what are known as the F. Augmentation files. These contain articles of enquiry and correspondence relating to the augmentation of every benefice upon which the chance of augmentation fell. The purpose of this paper is to indicate something of the scope of this material by reference to the 90 files for Derbyshire benefices which were augmented in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. The material available is too vast to allow for a summary of the Bounty's work in the county for the whole period of its operation and the period 1772-1832 is chosen because information as to gross benefice income is available for its opening and its close for most of the parishes of the county and because, at a time of very great economic and social change, these were the years of the Bounty Board's greatest activity.

### THE ECONOMIC EFFECT OF AUGMENTATION

In 1704, Queen Anne, in the words of Dr. G. F. A. Best in his *Temporal Pillars* (1964), 'stepped forward to save the English Reformation from reproach by returning to the use of the church the revenues from first-fruits and tenths, so long kept from it.' First-fruits and tenths were royal taxes charged on those preferred to any ecclesiastical benefice, from a parish to a diocesan see. First-fruits was the tax paid when a man was first preferred, and tenths, a much smaller but annually recurring amount. It is true that since the time of Elizabeth the very poorest benefices had been exempt from these iniquitous charges (originally papal taxes diverted to the royal exchequer by her father), but the great majority of the clergy continued to pay them until 1704 when Queen Anne, apparently at the suggestion of Bishop Burnet of Salisbury, and quite possibly for reasons which were as much temporal as spiritual, established Queen Anne's Bounty. By the act of parliament which set it up, first-fruits and tenths were still to be paid, but henceforth were to be appropriated to a fund from which the poor livings of the kingdom were to be augmented. It took some years before the machinery was set up, and the necessary surveys conducted to find out which benefices were poor (to begin with, those worth £10 per annum and less were augmented), and it was not until 1717 that the Bounty was beginning to work satisfactorily.

Augmentation was carried out, in general terms, along the following lines. From the list of poor livings under a certain sum (in the first instance £10 per annum) a number were selected at random or 'by lot'. These received a capital sum of £200 which, when invested, would give the living something of the order of £10 extra a year. The Bounty also met benefactions of £200 from private persons with a similar amount. Thus, if a parish priest could persuade his patron to give the benefice £200, he could become the

richer by the return on investment of £400. This last method was not dependent on the lot or random choice, for a benefactor could apply to augment at any time. There were thus two basic ways in which a benefice income could be augmented, by lot, or by means of benefaction. The latter of course produced twice as much capital for the benefice in question than the former. The Rules were somewhat more complicated than this in practice, and those interested may consult Best or Alan Savidge's *The Foundation and Early Years of Queen Anne's Bounty* (1955).

By slow and patient work throughout the 18th century, the Board of Queen Anne's Bounty, and its principal officer, the Secretary, began to work something of a revolution in the financial affairs of the clergy. But it was a very slow revolution. In the preface to the 1786 edition of the *Liber Regis*, John Bacon said:

it will be the Work of Ages before all the Small Livings entitled to an Augmentation can receive any Benefit or Share therefrom; and of many Ages more, before the Income of every Living will be so advanced as to afford a Competency for the Minister, supposing that Competency to amount to no more than 60 Pounds per Annum to each Living.<sup>2</sup>

The Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry's primary visitation articles for his Derbyshire benefices returned in 1773<sup>3</sup> indicate that 40 per cent of the livings were of £50 per annum and below. This percentage declined to about 6 per cent by 1832<sup>4</sup> witnessing to the effectiveness of the operations of the Bounty Board in securing such a modest 'Competency' for the incumbents of the poor livings.

A total of 233 augmentations were made to 89 Derbyshire livings from Queen Anne's Bounty in our period, and, after 1811, from the Parliamentary Grants Fund administered by the Board. The largest single grants were of £2,200 by lot of the Parliamentary Grant to Ripley in 1822 and of £2,000 from the same source to Darley Abbey in 1821, both to the perpetual curacies of new churches in developing industrial areas.

It can be seen from the accompanying table that augmentations from Bounty funds alone both in number and in amount reached a peak in the years 1781 to 1800. The benefits effected by the Parliamentary Grant are demonstrated by the fact that in the decade 1811 to 1820 augmentations from this source amounted to five-and-a-half times augmentations from the Bounty alone in its decade of greatest activity in the county between 1781 and 1790.

In 1811 the Board received discretionary power to give preference in distributing parliamentary grants to poor livings with large populations. Those worth no more than £150 per annum with populations up to, or exceeding, 1,000 being augmented first, the qualifying population total being reduced as the years passed. The sum of grants 1810-18 was £33,100 compared with £22,900 for the period 1819-27, witnessing to the success of the Bounty in administering this Grant in a county of increasing industrialization and growing population. The 1826 total of £6,800—the largest amount of the Parliamentary Grant applied in a single year—was divided between 14 parishes, of which eight were rural, demonstrating that by this time the larger industrial parishes had been augmented to a level then felt to be acceptable. The number and amount of augmentations throughout the period are set out in the accompanying table.

The sum of £9,210 was made to benefices by benefactions to be met with augmentations by the Bounty and the Grant. In place of a capital sum at Wilne in 1832 the living was endowed with a stipend of £30 per annum and this was met by a grant of £600. At Willesley in 1783 a rent charge of £20 per annum was accepted in place of a benefaction of £200. This represents the equivalent of a ten per cent return on capital and this appears to have been the return which the Bounty Board looked for on its investment in land. A study of all the augmentations of poor livings in Derbyshire together with the benefice income as declared on the articles of enquiry submitted prior to augmentation shows that in several cases the income of benefices rose by at least this percentage of the capital sum invested in land within a few years of augmentation. Whether this increase can be claimed entirely by Queen Anne's Bounty is uncertain in some of these cases, but it does seem that, particularly at times when rents were rising

rapidly, something approaching a ten per cent return on land bought with the original augmentation money was being achieved. Thus at Ashbourne the benefice income was returned at £45 per annum in 1813. In that year and in 1824 the benefice received augmentations totalling £600. In 1831 the benefice income was returned as £148 (the average for the preceding three years). Similarly at Dronfield, the income was returned as £99 per annum in 1810. In 1811 the benefice received a total augmentation by benefaction of £1,000. In 1824 the income was returned as £300 and in 1831 as £230 per annum. At Holmesfield the income was returned as £38 in 1772. In 1807 it was £54. In 1809 it received an augmentation of £400 following a benefaction and this had the effect of increasing the benefice income to £86 in 1815. The income of Kirk Hallam was £22 per annum in 1787. It was augmented with £200 in 1792 and returned its value as £71 in 1810. There were also parishes which, although they were augmented, seem to have increased their incomes hardly at all. In none of the cases cited here does an enclosure award appear to have affected the income. In most cases, however, the increase in income was much nearer five per cent of the grant.

TABLE 1

The number and amount of augmentations to poor livings in Derbyshire, 1772-1832

| * benefs. =<br>benefactions | Total number of augmentations |        |                     |        | Total amount of augmentations |        |                     |        |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|--------|---------------------|--------|-------------------------------|--------|---------------------|--------|
|                             | Bounty                        |        | Parliamentary grant |        | Bounty                        |        | Parliamentary grant |        |
|                             | to meet benefs.               | by lot | to meet benefs.     | by lot | to meet benefs.               | by lot | to meet benefs.     | by lot |
| Date                        |                               |        |                     |        | £                             | £      | £                   | £      |
| 1772-80 .. ..               | 3                             | 12     |                     |        | 600                           | 2,400  |                     |        |
| 1781-90 .. ..               | 5                             | 27     |                     |        | 1,000                         | 5,400  |                     |        |
| 1791-1800 .. ..             | 3                             | 26     |                     |        | 600                           | 5,200  |                     |        |
| 1801-10 .. ..               | 5                             | 13     |                     | 11     | 1,000                         | 2,600  |                     | 2,200  |
| 1811-20 .. ..               | 2                             | 17     | 17                  | 42     | 400                           | 3,400  | 5,100               | 30,600 |
| 1821-30 .. ..               | 2                             | 10     | 11                  | 23     | 400                           | 1,600  | 3,300               | 14,800 |
| 1831-32 .. ..               | 4                             | —      | —                   | —      | 800                           | —      | —                   | —      |

The articles of enquiry in the F. Augmentation files and the details of benefice income given in a complete set of visitation articles of enquiry completed by Samuel Butler, Archdeacon of Derby, in 1823-24,<sup>6</sup> contain detailed evidence of the effect of these augmentations on benefice income. In 1775 the income of Boulton was returned as £17 15s. per annum made up of £13 5s. rentals from land and £4 from parishioners in lieu of small tithes. By 1796 the income had risen to £27, composed of £6 in lieu of tithes and £21 from land, the increase in the latter effected by £200 augmentation in 1775.<sup>7</sup> The income of Baslow in October 1782 was £7 13s. 2d. per annum including £4 annual interest on the Bounty's grant of £200 made in 1770. In 1787 the income had risen to £21 13s. 11d. including £8 interest on Bounty grants in 1770 and 1775. Further grants of £200 were made in 1787 and 1789 and by 1810 the income stood at £52 11s. per annum. the Bounty grants had by now been invested in land and were producing £37 7s. per annum.<sup>8</sup> At Barlow the income in 1777 was £26 10s. per annum. In that year the Bounty Board met a £210 benefaction with a grant of £200. How the money was laid out is recorded by Samuel Pegge (rector of Whittington) in his *MSS Collections*, dated 6th February 1777:

on a second augmentation of Barlow, myself, Rev. Fletcher Dixon of Staveley, Joseph Hollingworth of Handley-wood, and Paul Smith of Whitelodge, certified about late Mrs Eliz. Gardiner's farm in occupation of Geo. Cowlshaw of Whittington, and lying in Whittington to be sold by her executors Jn. Woodyware and Revd. Jn. Bourne, Clerk

13 Acres. Pasture and Arable wth part of Spring-wood in Thorpe Spring. Arable is part Field Land, and part inclosed.

Lease has 16 years to come at L day next.  
 Rent 12£ 6. Tenant paying all Taxes.  
 Purchase to be 410£ of wch 200£ to be pd by ye Governors of the Bounty, and the rest by Rev.  
 Francis Gisbourne, R<sup>r</sup> of Staveley.  
 Mr Gisbourne, tho' not with us, ordered his Bro<sup>r</sup> in law, Fletcher Dixon to pay the Reckoning at  
 ye public House.<sup>9</sup>

This is of interest as it provides evidence of the type of property in which the Bounty Board would invest funds, the procedure by which it obtained it, and the amount of return it was prepared to accept on its investment. By 1811 the income of Barlow had increased to £53 10s.<sup>10</sup>

Other examples of the effect of augmentation, from the F. Augmentation files, are those of Hathersage which received Bounty and Parliamentary Fund grants totalling £1,200 in 1813 and 1814, the effect of which was to double the benefice income from £49 per annum in 1813 to £100 per annum in 1824;<sup>11</sup> Heanor, which received £2,000 in grants and benefactions between 1790 and 1824, the effect of which was to raise the benefice income from £18 in 1772 to £127 per annum in 1824;<sup>12</sup> and Buxton, which received £1,400 in grants between 1814 and 1826 which raised the benefice income from £54 per annum in 1815 (to which figure it had declined since 1810) to £105 per annum in 1832.<sup>13</sup>

Butler's visitation articles provide evidence from later in our period at a time when clerical incomes were being affected by the agricultural depressions. Brassington had received £600 by lot of the Bounty up to 1813. The benefice income at that date stood at £45 per annum, including £32 from lands purchased with augmentation monies.<sup>14</sup> By 1823 the benefice income stood at £60, the income from rents remaining the same at £30 per annum.<sup>15</sup> By 1825 the incumbent could report that, though the rents from land produced £32 per annum, £45 came from interest on £1,200 of the Parliamentary Grant at four per cent and £200 of the Bounty at two per cent, these grants having been made in 1813 and 1815.<sup>16</sup> At Cromford, where the income was £95 per annum in 1823, £1,200 in grants and benefactions invested in 22 acres was producing £45 per annum in the same year.<sup>17</sup> The effect of augmentation had been to double the benefice income between 1812 and 1823. At Brampton, £400 invested in 1724 was producing £24 per annum on land in South Normanton,<sup>18</sup> and a similar sum received by Beighton in 1733 was producing £28 per annum in 1823.<sup>19</sup> Grants and benefactions totalling £1,000 for Dethick between 1784 and 1810 were invested in 34 acres at Woolley and produced £42 per annum, or two-thirds of the benefice income of £66 10s. in 1823.<sup>20</sup>

At Pentrich, £200 received in each of the years 1767, 1786 and 1796 was invested in seven acres at Wirksworth let at £11 per annum, seven acres at Bonsall let at £8 per annum and six acres at Ripley let at £8 per annum. A grant from the Parliamentary Fund of £1,000 received in 1814 had not been invested in land and was producing £40 per annum interest in 1824. The effect of the rents had been to raise the income of this benefice from £30 per annum in 1772 to £80 in 1815, and, with the interest, to £120 by 1824.<sup>21</sup> The low income of £34 per annum at Temple Normanton in 1823 was made up of £10 per annum from the patron, W. A. Lord, and £24 in rents from land purchased with £200 of the Bounty in each of the years 1793, 1796 and 1810.<sup>22</sup> A further augmentation of £800 in 1825 brought the income up to £55 per annum in 1832.<sup>23</sup> At Barton Blount in 1824 more than half the rectory income of £50 per annum was provided by the rents of £29 per annum on 14 acres purchased with £200 of the Bounty in each of the years 1792 and 1817.<sup>24</sup>

Throughout the 1820s income derived from augmentation monies declined considerably. The perpetual curate of Sandiacre wrote in 1832 to the Ecclesiastical Revenues Commissioners to say that 'the purchase made with the sums from the Parliamentary Grants in 1822 for the next eight years following produced £43 4s. a year; which I was obliged afterwards to lower to £36. The same thing may happen again—And as to the lands purchased with the lots of Queen Anne's Bounty, it is doubtful whether they will not become waste and never again become productive.'<sup>25</sup>

Archdeacon Butler gives details of ten grants which had not been invested in land at the time of his visitation in 1823–24. These were for Chesterfield, where the £400 received in 1817 was producing four per cent interest;<sup>26</sup> Ault Hucknall, where £200 of the £800 Parliamentary Grant received in 1819 received interest at four per cent;<sup>27</sup> Belper, where the £1,200 received in 1811 and £500 grant and benefaction received in 1814 produced four per cent and the £600 Parliamentary Grant received in 1817 produced two per cent interest,<sup>28</sup> and Glossop, where the £400 received in 1817 had not been invested up to 1824.<sup>29</sup> The two grants of £200 received for Church Broughton in 1775 and 1792 had not been invested in land by 1823.<sup>30</sup> At Elmlton, where the gross value of the living was £35 per annum in 1823, £10 came in interest on £200 augmentation received in 1816 and £500 Parliamentary Grant and benefaction received in 1818 had not been invested in land.<sup>31</sup> The other parishes for which grants had not been invested in land by 1824 were Duffield, Mackworth, Pentrich and Tissington. Interest rates were kept low to encourage investment in land.<sup>32</sup> The principal reason for this failure to invest was the unavailability of land for purchase at a reasonable distance from the benefice.<sup>33</sup>

### THE BOUNTY AND ITS RULES

These examples illustrate the effect which the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty, applying the Royal Bounty Fund and the Parliamentary Grants Fund, had on the poor livings of Derbyshire. Yet there is no doubt that the clergy found the Board's regulations unnecessarily restrictive, and particularly the rule which separated chapelries from their mother churches on augmentation. Correspondence which passed between the Secretary of the Bounty, Henry Montague, and Ralph Heathcote, the rector of Morton, in 1755 and 1756 illustrates very well the difficulties which strict adherence to this regulation occasioned, certainly in the eyes of the clergy, until the rule was modified in 1796 under 36 Geo III c. 83. In a letter to Heathcote in December 1755, Montague pointed out that

every Curacy or Chappel augmented by the Governors must from thence forward at least become a perpetual Cure and Benefice of itself separate and distinct from its Mother Church to which it may formerly have belonged; and not only so, but the Rectors or Vicars of the Mother Church are by the same Act debarred and excluded from having or receiving directly or indirectly any benefit or Advantage from the Augmentation, and consequently such augmented Curacy or Chappel must forever afterwards be constantly supplied and served by a separate and distinct Minister or Curate of its own.

Montague therefore wanted to know whether, on the augmentation of the chapel of Holy Trinity in his parish, Heathcote was prepared, 'by proper Deed or Instrument . . . . to release and give up all right and Power to Officiate there and all other Right and Title Whatsoever to the said Curacy or Chappel of Trinity . . . .'. In addition, as there appeared to be no income attached to Holy Trinity chapel and as 'the Governors are apprehensive that the Income arising from their £200 alone (should they give it) would procure no very great Addition to ye ancient and accustomed Duty' (which at that time was four or five times a year) Montague wanted to know whether Heathcote would be prepared, 'in lieu of the ancient and accustomed Duty . . . . to charge the Rectory of Morton with the perpetual payment of any and what small yearly Stipend or Allowance to the Curate of Trinity Chappel and his Successors for ever'. Heathcote replied that as 'the Rector of Morton has nothing for that Chappel Service, it seems unreasonable to require the Rectory to buy off that Service with a Stipend which it has always performed gratis'. He was, however, prepared that the curate of Holy Trinity should be free of 'any Interference of the Rector of Morton' and suggested that the curate should serve the augmented chapel 'so many Sundays in ye Winter season (that being the Time when the Inhabitants are least able to come to the parish Church) as the Money would pay him for, at the rate of 7s 6d per Sunday, the Rector still performing the accustomed Sundays in the Summer season, till such Time as ye Curacy by future Benefactions might be able to support a constant Service and subsist of itself'. Montague replied that Holy Trinity could not be augmented until it 'should forever be severed and divided from its Mother Church of Morton'. Would the rector of Morton be prepared so to do?

Would he 'be more full and explicit' in his answer? Heathcote gave an assurance that he would sign a proper deed dividing the curacy from the rectory. But another problem remained. The augmentation would not support a resident curate, therefore who would visit the sick in the separated chapelry and who perform the private baptisms? 'The Township will be as much distressed one way as benefitted another by the Augmentation' for Heathcote could not make up the Bounty augmentation by a stipend, nor could he bind his successors to do so. He heard nothing in reply to this letter, and so wrote again in July 1756. He said that 'it is to be observed that in this County where parishes are very wide in their extent, and Chappels within them very numerous, unless those Chappels might be deemed capable of receiving the Bounty, this County could receive very little benefit from it, tho' perhaps few Countys of equal Bigness may really be said to stand in greater need of it'.<sup>34</sup> There was no reply to this letter either, and Holy Trinity, Morton, was not augmented until 1758.<sup>35</sup> Heathcote had pointed to a serious flaw in the working of the Bounty's regulations, and there must have been many parochial chapelries which, at least for a time, remained unaugmented for similar reasons.

A further 'kind of an Absurdity', as he put it, concerning this rule was revealed by Richard Chapman, the vicar of Bakewell, in 1786. On 2nd July he wrote to the Archbishop of York about the augmentation of the chapelry of Monyash in his parish. His case, he said, was 'simply this':

Apprehending myself and Family to be much injur'd respecting the Augmentation of a Chapel within my Parish, permit me, my Lord, with all Humility to state the matter in its proper light and to request the Favour of your Grace to lay it before a full Board of the Trustees, not doubting but your Grace as one of my Spiritual Fathers will also in this instance prove a Temporal one and do me that Justice which both Ecclesiastics and Laity think me fairly entitled to, viz., to allow me the Interest of the Augmentation up to this Date, or, if the Reverend the Bishops and others concerned cannot be prevail'd upon to comply with so humble, & so apparently equitable a Request, they will at least be pleas'd to reimburse me the money I have sunk in discharging the Commissioners Bills in consequence of an Inclosure, thro' the neglect of the late Curate in not having a Clause inserted in the Act for the Ring Fence being made by the Freeholders, as is customary in such Cases, a proportionable Quantity of Land belonging to the Church being deducted for the same.

My Case then, may it please your Grace is simply this: The Chapel of Monyash in the Parish of Bakewell & Deanery of Lichfield has been fortunate enough to have the Lot Money fall on it twice (once several years ago, & a second time at the last Drawing) the Benefit of which, as Mr Chester, Secretary to the Society for the Disposal of Queen Anne's Bounty informs me, I have been judged incapable of receiving by the said Corporation. The *Letter of the prohibitory Act*, it must be own'd seems to be rather against me, but I believe in *all Cases*, where the Letter may be departed from without Injury to any one, & a *real Benefit* may arise from such a Step, it has been done in a thousand Instances. Permit me, therefore, to ask with due Submission, my Lord, why it might not in this? Indeed if the vicar has not a power of this kind, he is in a much worse Situation than any of the Curates under him; because *They* can hold half a Dozen of these Chapels at ye same time, but the vicar is restrain'd from holding any. But further, if situated as I am at present, I can legally hold a Chapel that has already been augmented, what possible Reason can be assign'd why I may not hold the same upon a further Augmentation? The Act upon its present Construction, implies a kind of Absurdity, that a vicar may hold a Chapel, so long as it is not worth his Enjoyment, but as soon as it becomes a desirable object his Right to it ceases. How ridiculous, my Lord, pardon the Expression! does this appear? I am fully persuaded that the present Trustees of that Royal Corporation are of a more liberal Turn of Mind, than to admit of such contracted Ideas, or any mode of reasoning that shall be chargeable with such apparent absurdities. Perhaps the Act in its original Intention was meant to apply to such vicars, as have the Care of the several Chapels under them; or it might be designed to be confined to the *Time when* it was granted; or possibly it might be intended to guard against the avarice of Ministers who are for grasping everything themselves, without regard to their offices: one & all of these several Reasons have been maintained: But neither of them in the least affect me, being *neither concern'd with the Duties of the Chapels under me* as Vicar, & the Vicarage itself being an object of Augmentation as a Discharg'd Living, & under 50 £ pr ann. which I hope your Grace will take into Consideration. Add to this, that I have been upwards of 30 yrs in Orders, a laborious Minister of the Gospel, having never had less than the Care of two Churches, during the whole of that Period. And, which is worse than all, whilst I am straining every nerve in the support of a wife & a numerous Family, having had upwards of twenty Children, & in daily Expectation of an Increase, I have the Misfortune to see broken Tradesmen and broken Officers, robbing the legitimate Children of their Bread. These things, my Lord, excuse my Warmth, surely ought not so to be . . . .

The Secretary of the Bounty wrote on the back of this letter, 'Wrote 1st Sept woud lay this Letter before the first Board in Novr but cod not give him hopes that his request

would be complied with'.<sup>36</sup> And it seems that it was not. In 1807 Chapman again wrote complaining that he was not 'indulg'd' with the interest on the grants augmenting his chapelries of Monyash and Chelmorton. It was 'a very hard case', especially as he now had 25 children!<sup>37</sup>

The proposed augmentation of the chapelry of Chelmorton had been the occasion of hard words between Chapman and Richard Burn, the Secretary of the Board, in 1793. Burn had written to ask Chapman for particulars of the income of the chapelry and whether Chapman would be prepared to separate Chelmorton from Bakewell and to release to the curate its profits. In his reply Chapman had remarked that the information required by the Secretary was of 'no great consequence' and was in any case outside his knowledge. He added imperiously that 'whether the several Particulars are communicated to you or not, the Chapel of Chelmorton comes within the will of Q. Anne'. This high-handed reply provoked Burn to express to Chapman his astonishment at Chapman's 'ignorance', although he did not accuse Chapman of deliberate evasion, and this in turn brought the following reply:

A more extraordinary Letter I scarce ever received penn'd by any one who claims the least Pretensions to the Character of a Gentleman. The Insolence of Office I have frequently heard of, but never met with so striking an Instance of it as in the Case before me . . . . You do not indeed positively say that I am the most complete Blockhead you ever had any Transactions with, but you make use of words at least tantamount thereto.<sup>38</sup>

In 1796 Parliament relaxed the rule that the incumbent could not take the income arising from augmented chapelries. John Wood, vicar of Pentrich, received the interest on grants to his chapelry of Ripley in 1826, though a discussion as to the legality of this had been going on since 1821.<sup>39</sup>

This refusal to separate chapels on augmentation from the control of the incumbent of the parish was one reason why otherwise suitably qualified livings escaped augmentation. But there were other reasons. Burn's suggestion that Chapman was being deliberately obstructive over his answers to the Chelmorton enquiry indicates that the inaccuracy or even dishonesty of the clergy in making returns was another. On a parish or chapelry being drawn by lot to receive augmentation, articles of enquiry about the living, its status and the status of the incumbent, its income and 'the ancient and accustomed duty' performed in the church were sent to the clergyman by the diocesan bishop at the request of the Bounty Board. This information was certified as correct by one or two clergymen in the neighbourhood, counter-signed by the bishop (who frequently added a few comments in support himself) and returned to the Secretary of the Board. Occasionally the clergy over-estimated their income, even from sources defined as 'certain' such as tithes, compositions for tithes and glebe, and denied themselves the benefit of augmentation. John Farrar (perpetual curate of Baslow) wrote to the Secretary in 1787 to say that he

hath good reason to Apprehend that the Bounty hath been withheld from this poor Curacy, thro: the ignorant and erroneous returns formerly made by his Predecessors; who hath returned that for a Certainty which in itself is of the greatest Uncertainty.<sup>40</sup>

In 1800 the perpetual curate of Mellor, Matthew Olerenshaw, wrote to the Secretary to defend himself against 'your Charge of not acting quite conscientiously' in statements he had made about parish lands.<sup>41</sup>

Another reason why parishes and chapelries remained unaugmented was simply the failure to return completed articles of enquiry to the Bounty. By 1821 the two livings of Sawley and Wilne were worth only £40 per annum and £30 per annum respectively, and the Prebendary of Sawley, L. Gardiner, wrote to the Secretary asking for augmentation. The Secretary replied that the livings remained unassisted as queries repeatedly sent to the Prebendary had never been answered, and that he was 'surprised' at this omission. Gardiner asserted that he had never received these enquiries and was himself surprised both at 'the Mode' and 'the Inaccuracy' of the Secretary's letter. He demanded 'an Answer by Return of Post'. Richard Burn replied that 'I cannot but admire the Gentlemanly Style of your last letter' and suggested that Gardiner make an

approach to his Bishop 'for the Queries repeatedly sent'.<sup>42</sup> That the inefficiency of the Bishop's staff was probably the cause of the trouble is suggested in correspondence between the vicar of Ashbourne, Samuel Shipley and the Bishop's secretary in 1823. Shipley wrote to say that the Secretary of the Bounty had informed him that 'he had forwarded the papers immediately after my calling to your Lordship, for your signature; fearing from your Lordship's numerous episcopal engagements the papers in question may have been inadvertently mislaid . . . . ' to which the Bishop's secretary replied that 'the Bishop of Lichfield is quite certain that the Ashbourne papers . . . . were never sent to him from the Bounty Office . . . . '<sup>43</sup> Such 'inadvertence' by one of the parties could delay augmentation for years. Occasionally the Bounty office was at fault. In 1780 the Secretary wrote to the perpetual curate of Alvaston that 'inquiry was made some years since into the Nature and Value of the Curacy of Alvaston in order that the same might be augmented by the Governors, and an Answer was given thereto but by some Accident mislaid by the late Secretary and not laid before the Governors till lately'.<sup>44</sup>

After 1824 the Governors were allowed to augment by lot only those livings which did not exceed £60 per annum in value. Augmentation of livings of greater value than this required a benefaction which could be met by a grant. Inability to obtain a benefaction thus became another reason why parishes with an income greater than £60 per annum remained unassisted in the later years of our period. Especially embarrassed were those beneficed clergy who were compelled to give up curacies from which they obtained much-needed extra income in order to meet the higher standards of pastoral care demanded of them in their benefices. The vicar of Alfreton, John Pepper, put the problem thus in a letter to Christopher Hodgson in 1829:

The Lord Bishop of this Diocese having recommended there should be double Duty in the Parish Church of Alfreton, and fixed the time for its' commencement at Lady Day next: You will do me a great Kindness by favouring me with your opinion, whether, or not, by application (through his Lordship) to the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty, I may hope to obtain the benefit of a Grant from the Board in aid of the undertaking; the circumstances under which I am placed being of an extraordinary and unprecedented kind. If you will please to refer to the Documents relating to this small Living, deposited in your Office, you will find in the year 1826 the sum of £183 was granted to discharge a Mortgage; the Interest of which—£8 4s 6d—had been paid for many years by the Vicar. The population of the Parish, purposely taken that year, amounted to 5470 inhabitants. The Value of the Living then returned to the Board was £148 15s 4d pr ann., after deduction made for the payment of the Mortgage Interest. Owing to the insolvency of my Predecessor, it was mentioned, more than £314 16s had been expended by me in the necessary repairs of Buildings belonging to the Vicarage, which were very old and ruinous, and had been neglected. Before my Induction in the year 1817, I had been 22 years resident Curate in an adjoining Parish; as well as served another Curacy, for which a Stipend is allowed of £52 10s pr ann: On commencing the double Duty here (which has not been performed in the memory of man) and on relinquishing the Curacy now held by me for 24 years: the Governors, when informed, will perceive the Income of this small Living, (as I have no other pecuniary resource) will be insufficient for a maintenance, and the support of my professional character in such a public situation, when through age, infirmity, or sickness, I am under the necessity of employing a Curate. I am now in my 60<sup>th</sup> year, and am frequently suffering under painful attacks of Gout and Rheumatism. The Bishop has kindly offered to contribute £20, if a Subscription could be raised among my Parishioners to meet the usual Advances from the Bounty Board; but there is no prospect of obtaining any considerable Sum from such source, there being very few Capitalists amongst us, and many Dissenters; which it is hoped, will be a strong inducement to the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty to take the circumstances pointed out into their consideration, and will incline them to grant the indulgence of an augmentation to the Vicarage, which will be very thankfully received. I beg to add, the former Vicars of Alfreton, for the last century, have invariably had either the Profits of some other Living, or of a Curacy annexed to this Vicarage for their subsistence . . . .

Hodgson was unmoved by this appeal and replied: 'Before you can obtain any Grant from the Governors of Q.A. Bounty a Benefaction must be raised of £200—which the Governors have the power to meet with the sum of £200—if they approve'.<sup>45</sup>

Throughout the period the Governors insisted that duty should be performed frequently in the churches and chapels of the livings they augmented. Hodgson, in discussing the benefits conferred on the Church of England by Queen Anne's Bounty says that 'the Governors have taken care to recommend, where augmentations were made by them, that increased duty in cases requiring and admitting it, should be

performed'.<sup>46</sup> They did more than recommend; they insisted that unless duty was performed every Sunday the living would receive no grant. The augmentation of Quarndon was refused on this ground. In 1780 when the income of the living was £19 2s. per annum duty was performed every other Sunday. In 1804 the curate, William Barber, wrote to Burn saying that although an augmentation of £200 fell by lot to Quarndon in 1793 the Governors informed the then curate 'that they would not confirm the said lot of £200 unless the curate [then Thomas Manlove] would agree to do duty at Quarne every Sunday—this the Curate would not do, and the Bounty was given to some other Benefice'.<sup>47</sup>

A further reason was the refusal of a patron to secure the incumbent's stipend. In September 1782 the Secretary of the Board wrote to William Bladon, the perpetual curate of Hognaston and Kniveton, to say that:

The Govs many Years ago intended to add a second Augmentation to the Curacy of Kniveton, but Mr Gell, the then Patron,<sup>48</sup> refusing to secure the perpetual paymt of the Usual Stipend paid by him for doing the Duty such augment<sup>n</sup> was declined.

Bladon replied that Gell's steward had agreed that it would be 'expedient and highly Necessary that a Stipend should be fixed for the Good of Mr Gell and for the Inhabitants of Kniveton', but six months later no stipend had been guaranteed and Richard Burn wrote that if 'the Business cannot be brought to some conclusion' by 15th May, 'the intended Augmentation must be set aside'. And it was, Kniveton receiving no grant until 1789.<sup>49</sup>

There were several cases in the county of patrons refusing to guarantee stipends, and indeed of discontinuing what had previously been paid. The income of the donative of Foremark in 1811 was a mere £20 per annum, and the incumbent wrote to Queen Anne's Bounty complaining that 'a Gratuity of ten pounds per annum in addition to the 20£ had for many years past been allowed to the Curate of Foremark by the Patron, but was withdrawn by Sir Francis Burdett about three years ago upon a disagreement with the present incumbent the Revd Robt Nichs French, and has been withheld ever since'.<sup>50</sup> Another reason for the failure to augment also had to do with patronage. A chapel could not be augmented while its patronage was in dispute. Richard Ward, perpetual curate of Dethick, complained to his bishop in 1799 that no less than three lots which had fallen to Dethick had been passed over for this reason.<sup>51</sup>

Even when a living was augmented, grants frequently remained uninvested in land for years, not because there was no land available, but because what there was was too distant from the benefice for the incumbent to supervise the collection of rents, at least to the satisfaction of the Board. In 1815 land in Lincolnshire had been bought with a Queen Anne's Bounty grant augmenting Sandiacre. In September 1820 the incumbent, James Holme, wrote to the Secretary complaining that he had been unable to collect rents from the occupier of the land, though he (Holme) still had to pay taxes on it, and that these taxes were now £20 in arrears. He accused his agents in Lincolnshire of complicity to defraud him and had taken his tenant to court. He wrote to ask the Governors of the Bounty for support in his case 'in justice to myself, my benefice and to the Clergy at large'. The Secretary replied that he was sure the Governors 'will not interfere in yr dispute with your Tenant' although they later paid a drainage rate of £25 15s. for Holme.<sup>52</sup>

Cases such as this made the Board wary of approving purchases of land which lay at a considerable distance from the augmented benefice. In 1826, £1,200 of Parliamentary Grant was allotted to Tissington, and for two years the incumbent, W. Alderson, had been 'endeavouring to meet with an eligible purchase as near to the Church as I was able but without success'. Then he found 'a very beneficial purchase' at Hathersage, 24 miles from Tissington. Hodgson said that 'as the distance of the Estate you mention from the living is an insuperable objection it would be useless to propose it to the Governors'.<sup>53</sup> Earlier in the period the Governors sanctioned the purchase of land at considerable distances from the benefices. The augmentation of Holmesfield in 1809

was invested in land at Mizzen in Lancashire<sup>54</sup> and the grant to Smisby in 1783 was vested in land at Hinckley.<sup>55</sup> The Governors' refusal to sanction such purchases later in the period made land investment very difficult for the clergy. Richard Whinfield, the vicar of Heanor, wrote in 1822 that 'the Commission which came to me some time ago respecting the purchase of some land came too late, the land was sold, and I have seen no other lands that would be advantageous to the Living . . . .<sup>56</sup> Much otherwise eligible land was entailed. Matthew Witt, perpetual curate of Ticknall, writing to Hodgson in 1828 of 'an opportunity of making a purchase of *good* land—and in the *parish itself*—and highly eligible for the good of the living' warned him that 'from the fact of nearly all the remaining landed property in the parish being intailed on the owner [Sir George Crewe] and his heirs, there is little or no probability of an offer similarly advantageous to the living presenting itself for many years—if ever'.<sup>57</sup> The point that the entailing of landed property made land purchase extremely difficult had been made 14 years earlier by Thomas Pares, the patron of Ockbrook. He wrote to the Secretary saying that very little property was obtainable because the great estates were settled and that what land did come on to the market was 'so greedily bought up by farmers for their own Occupancy as very rarely to allow an investment of more than 3 P C and more possibly not so much'. He announced his intention of purchasing grazing land near Leicester, and apparently the Governors raised no objection.<sup>58</sup> The unavailability of land for purchase in or near the parish was undoubtedly the main reason why so many parishes remained for many years with unvested grants earning the Bounty's low rates of interest.

The clergy were, on the whole, grateful for the benefit they received from Queen Anne's Bounty, 'well knowing the Governors' readiness to make the condition of the resident, poor and laborious Clergy as comfortable as the exigencies of times and the circumstances of Application will admit'.<sup>59</sup> Occasionally they expressed their gratitude in more tangible form, like John le Cornu, the vicar of Hathersage, who sent Richard Burn two volumes of sermons by Dr. Dupre 'as a small Token of Gratitude to you' for a £1,000 augmentation,<sup>60</sup> or J. Morewood, the perpetual curate of Wingerworth, who wrote to Burn's clerk in 1797 to say that 'inclosed in a small Baskett I send you a Hare which I hope you will do me the favour to accept with many thanks for the kind attention you have paid to my business'.<sup>61</sup> But it was Thomas Brown, vicar of Tideswell, who best expressed in words both the thanks and the expectations of the clergy when he wrote to Burn in 1813:

I conceive it my Duty unequivocally to declare, that the Governors and all those it may concern are highly intitled to my sincere and grateful acknowledgements, and being all I have in my Power to offer, I beg leave, with the utmost deference, to solicit their kind acceptance thereof. The Living, it is true, has long wanted Assistance, and the Best and Highest be praised that such attention thus far has been paid to it by his worthy and honorable agents as it deservedly merits . . . .<sup>62</sup>

#### REFERENCES

- <sup>1</sup>See especially G. F. A. Best, *Temporal Pillars* (1964).
- <sup>2</sup>J. Bacon, *Liber regis vel thesaurus rerum ecclesiasticum* . . . . (1786), vi.
- <sup>3</sup>Lichfield Joint Record Office (hereafter referred to as LJRO), B/V/5.
- <sup>4</sup>*Report of the Ecclesiastical Revenues Commissioners*, PP 1835, XXII, 458–509 incl.
- <sup>5</sup>Based on C. Hodgson, *An Account of the Augmentation of Small Livings* etc. (1845), ccxc–ccxciii.
- <sup>6</sup>In LJRO, A/V/1/1, to be published shortly with introduction and notes.
- <sup>7</sup>Church Commissioners (hereafter CC) File F 537, articles of enquiry dated 1775 and 15th February 1796.
- <sup>8</sup>CC File F 305, articles dated 1782, 1787 and 1810.
- <sup>9</sup>S. Pegge, *Collections* etc., vol V, Parochial Miscellanies, 126. (College of Heralds.)
- <sup>10</sup>CC File F 267, articles dated 1777 and 11th June 1811.
- <sup>11</sup>CC File F 2111, articles dated 4th June 1813; LJRO, A/V/1/1, 199, article 65.
- <sup>12</sup>LJRO, B/V/5, Heanor, article 9, CC File F 2162, articles dated 17th November 1824.

- <sup>13</sup>PP 1818, XVIII, 105; PP 1835, XXII, 467.
- <sup>14</sup>CC File F 589, articles dated 14th June 1813.
- <sup>15</sup>LJRO, A/V/1/1, 31, article 70.
- <sup>16</sup>CC File F 589, articles dated 12th November 1825.
- <sup>17</sup>LJRO, A/V/1/1, 35, articles 66 and 70.
- <sup>18</sup>LJRO, A/V/1/1, 103, article 70.
- <sup>19</sup>LJRO, A/V/1/1, 119, article 70.
- <sup>20</sup>LJRO, A/V/1/1, 143, article 70.
- <sup>21</sup>LJRO, A/V/1/1, 549, article 70; LJRO, B/V/5, Pentrich, article 9; PP 1818, XVIII, 104.
- <sup>22</sup>LJRO, A/V/1/1, 281, article 70.
- <sup>23</sup>PP 1835, XXII, 491.
- <sup>24</sup>LJRO, A/V/1/1, 317, article 70.
- <sup>25</sup>CC File NB 12/187. The benefice income is given here as £95 per annum average for the three years to 31st December 1831. Hodgson, *op. cit.*, ccxciii, gives augmentations in 1810 and 1814 from the Bounty, and in 1810 and 1820 from the Parliamentary Fund. In the latter year the sum invested was £1,000. The perpetual curate was James Holme.
- <sup>26</sup>LJRO, A/V/1/1, 135, article 70.
- <sup>27</sup>LJRO, A/V/1/1, 191, article 70.
- <sup>28</sup>LJRO, A/V/1/1, 341, article 70.
- <sup>29</sup>LJRO, A/V/1/1, 183, article 70.
- <sup>30</sup>LJRO, A/V/1/1, 349, article 70.
- <sup>31</sup>LJRO, A/V/1/1, 159, article 70.
- <sup>32</sup>John Thompson, vicar of Heanor, wrote to the Secretary in 1789 to say that 'the Interest . . . . being so small it is proposed that the Augmentations and Benefactions . . . . shall be invested in a Purchase as soon as can be done' (CC File F 2162, letter dated 4th April 1789).
- <sup>33</sup>See p. 86.
- <sup>34</sup>CC File F 3350, letters from Montague to Heathcote, 30th December 1755 and 15th January 1756, and from Heathcote to Montague, 10th January and 31st January 1756 and 1st July 1756.
- <sup>35</sup>The chapelry was augmented with £200 by lot in 1758, 1759 and 1783, and with £200 to meet a benefaction of £200 from the Revd. William Burrow in 1790. By 1815 the income was only £20 per annum. In 1823 the then rector of Morton, R. B. Tarbutt, was doing all duty and receiving the income. (Hodgson, . . . . *Augmentation of Small Livings*, clxxvi, ccxciii; PP 1818, XVIII, 105; LJRO, A/V/1/1, 217, 279.)
- <sup>36</sup>CC File F 3296. Letter to the archbishop dated 2nd July 1786. In 1783 the income of Monyash was £15 per annum and duty was performed once each Sunday. (Articles dated 8th May 1783.)
- <sup>37</sup>CC File F 3296, letter to Richard Burn from Chapman, dated 8th September 1807.
- <sup>38</sup>CC File F 970, letter from Burn to Chapman, dated 4th December 1793 and from Chapman to Burn, 26th November 1793 and 6th December 1793. Chelmorton was not augmented between 1744 and 1842.
- <sup>39</sup>CC File F 3961, see especially letters from Wood to Hodgson, dated 7th September 1821, 11th March 1822 and 28th May 1822, and from Hodgson to Wood, 8th March 1822, 25th May 1822, etc.
- <sup>40</sup>CC File F 305, petition with articles of enquiry dated 27th December 1787.
- <sup>41</sup>CC File F 3239, letter from Secretary to Olerenshaw, dated 30th June 1800, and Olerenshaw to the Secretary, 5th July 1800.
- <sup>42</sup>CC File F 4084, letters from Gardiner to the Secretary, dated 29th October and 1st November 1821 and from the Secretary to Gardiner, 31st October and 5th November 1821.
- <sup>43</sup>CC File F 153, letters from Shipley to the Bishop, dated 5th June 1823, and from the Bishop's secretary to Shipley, 6th June 1823.
- <sup>44</sup>CC File F 90, letter dated 29th March 1780.
- <sup>45</sup>CC File F 60, letters from Pepper to Hodgson, dated 7th February 1829, and from Hodgson to Pepper, 13th February 1829. Alfreton received no further augmentation (Hodgson, . . . . *Augmentation of Small Livings*, ccxc).
- <sup>46</sup>Hodgson, . . . . *Augmentation of Small Livings*, 16.
- <sup>47</sup>CC File F 3876, articles dated 1780; letter from William Barber to Burn, dated 8th February 1804.
- <sup>48</sup>The Dean and Chapter of Lichfield were patrons of Kniveton, but under the terms of a lease in 1549 the Gell family were to pay the curate.
- <sup>49</sup>CC File F 2397, letters from the Secretary to Bladon, dated 17th September 1782 and 25th April 1783, and from Bladon, 12th October 1782.
- <sup>50</sup>CC File F 1807, articles dated 14th March 1811, article 6.
- <sup>51</sup>CC File F 1414, letter from R. Ward to Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry dated 10th January 1799.

<sup>52</sup>CC File F 4072, letters from Holme to the Secretary dated 28th September 1820 and from the Secretary to Holme, 21st October 1820.

<sup>53</sup>CC File F 4669, letter from the Secretary to Alderson, dated 8th May 1828.

<sup>54</sup>LJRO, A/V/1/1, 203, article 70.

<sup>55</sup>LJRO, A/V/1/1, 629, article 70.

<sup>56</sup>CC File F 2162, letter from Whinfield to the Secretary, 29th October 1822.

<sup>57</sup>CC File F 4646, letter from Witt to the Secretary, 27th October 1828.

<sup>58</sup>CC File F 3602, letter from Pares to the Secretary, 11th April 1814.

<sup>59</sup>CC File F 2315, letter from John Ibbotson, vicar of Heanor, to the Secretary, 10th September 1817.

<sup>60</sup>CC File F 2111, letter dated 27th January 1816.

<sup>61</sup>CC File F 5084, letter dated 24th January 1797.

<sup>62</sup>CC File F 4650, letter dated 20th May 1813.