

## CLERICAL RESIDENCE AND PLURALISM IN DERBYSHIRE 1772-1832

By M. R. AUSTIN  
(Derbyshire College of Higher Education)

In 1799, Lord Kenyon, giving judgement for the plaintiff in an action for non-residence brought against the vicar of St. Leonard's, Shoreditch, said

This is an important action to the morals of the public. It is important that the Vicar of every Parish should not only preach his weekly sermon to his parishioners, but that he should, by his good example, conciliate the temper of his parishioners, and contribute to bringing about that charity and goodwill which is evidence of the spirit of our holy religion.<sup>1</sup>

Rarely had the case for clerical residence been put so succinctly and with such apparent force. It seemed that any law which procured such benefits would be welcomed. One Derbyshire pluralist, Samuel Pegge, rector of Whittington, himself roundly criticized his absentee brethren:

In my little sphere, I know clergymen who have two cures, and reside upon neither; keeping no hospitality in their parishes, not visiting the sick, nor maintaining any social intercourse with their parishioners, (indeed, as to these useful and necessary matters, a clergyman that lives three or four miles from his cure, might almost as well be distant three or four hundred) to the very great detriment of their respective flocks, but riding on Sunday morning to deliver them a sermon, never see, or think of them all the week after; and this from year to year.

Pegge laid responsibility for this state of affairs squarely upon the bishops:

must not my Lord, the bishop of the diocese, be asleep, not to be aware or sensible of such culpable absence and misdemeanor in his clergy? where is his archdeacon? what is he doing? perhaps living in another diocese, and himself an absentee as well as the clergy I am speaking of.

He suggested that the bishops should strive to reduce the non-residents to order 'and compel even the most refractory, by such power and authority as they are invested with, to conform to decency, duty and good conscience.'<sup>2</sup> In fact the bishop of Lichfield and Coventry did reprimand absentee clergy when they were brought to his notice. In June 1782, Thomas Field, perpetual curate of Brampton, was presented to the bishop at his visitation at Chesterfield by 'a considerable number of the principal Inhabitants of Brampton' for his 'neglect' and for 'his not having discharged his Ministerial function'. The bishop told the parishioners that he 'would give Field such a reprimand...that he hoped for the future he would behave better.'<sup>3</sup>

Residence could also be compelled by recourse to the courts as the vicar of Shoreditch and others discovered.<sup>4</sup> But the law on residence at this time operated rather unfairly against the clergy. Legally, residence on a benefice was residence in the parsonage house. There were at the time of Kenyon's judgement only three grounds for non-residence, namely, 'bodily restriction' (imprisonment), illness (though whether this was a ground or not in any particular instance appears to have been a matter for the courts — in the case before him Lord Kenyon rejected the gout of the vicar of Shoreditch as a sufficient cause for his non-residence), and the lack of a parsonage house. The penalties for non-residence were severe, the incumbent suffering a penalty of £10 for every month of non-residence.<sup>5</sup> Other than these three exceptions, no other plea was admitted. As Sir William Scott pointed out as he sought to have the law changed, not even

the pious duty of attending the couch of sickness, or the death bed of a parent or wife, or a near relative, was considered as a ground of exoneration from the penalty. If a Minister did his duty ever so faithfully, yet was he liable to informations, if for a month together he slept out of the parsonage bed.<sup>6</sup>

The object of the Bills introduced by Scott was two-fold; to relax the restrictions on legal non-residence, and to enable to bishops to regulate non-residence by the granting of licences.

### The extent of non-residence

Comparative statistics of the residence of Derbyshire clergymen before and after the 1803 Act<sup>7</sup> which carried in to law Scott's objectives can be compiled from primary visitation returns of 1772, archidiaconal visitation returns for 1823-4 and a diocesan *Clergy Book* of 1830.<sup>8</sup> These statistics are presented in the following table.

*Table 1: Clerical residence in Derbyshire 1771-1830*

	1772		1823-5		1830	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Incumbents resident in the parsonage house	39	42	60	37	61	34
Incumbents resident elsewhere in the parish	9	10	5	3	32	18
Incumbents not resident in the parish but doing all the duty	19	21	49	30	37	21
Curates resident in the parish and doing all the duty	12	13	26	16	18	10
Living served by non-resident curates or neighbouring clergy	13	14	23	14	29	17
Totals	92 <sup>9</sup>	100	163	100	177	100

It is significant that the percentage of incumbents resident in parsonage houses declined during the period, while the percentage of incumbents living in their parishes but not legally resident rose. This indicates that the provision of parsonage houses did not keep pace with the creation of new independent cures (largely by the augmentation of parochial chapelries by the Queen Anne's Bounty board). The articles of enquiry sent by the Board through the diocesan bishops to benefices or chapelries to be augmented asked no questions about the residence of incumbent or curate, and it was inevitable that as augmentation was dependent upon the frequency of duty rather than the residence of the clergyman the provision of accommodation should lag behind the provision of independent cures. What is also significant is that the percentage of incumbents whether legally resident in the parsonage house, living in the parish elsewhere, or living outside the parish but doing all the duty of their benefices remained the same throughout the period, the total percentage of the first three classes in the table for the three years reviewed amounting to 73%, 70% and 73% respectively. Thus the proportion of incumbents personally doing all the duty of their livings was maintained, but not improved upon, during the period.

Throughout the period just over one quarter of the livings were served by curates or neighbouring clergy. The percentage of the livings with a clergyman resident in the parish, but not necessarily in the parsonage house, remained much the same throughout the sixty years, the percentages for the three years being 65%, 56% and 62% respectively.

As has been said, only those incumbents occupying parsonage houses were legally resident, a fact ignored, overlooked or misunderstood by the advocates of reform. Before he began his personal parochial visitation of his archdeaconry (the boundaries

of which were virtually co-extensive with those of the county) the archdeacon of Derby, Samuel Butler gave as his opinion that in Derbyshire

not one-sixth of the clergy who are returned as non-resident, though in the technical language of the law they may be called so, are really and virtually absent from their flocks; and even of that sixth an extremely small number will be found who do not keep occasional residence.

Butler said that the principal reasons for non-residence were want of a parsonage house, and 'the accidental intermixture of parishes which so frequently happens in towns'. In his archdeaconry 'the number of non-resident clergy is very inconsiderable, and if the circumstances I have just mentioned are taken into account will be found to be very small indeed'.<sup>10</sup> His estimate was rather optimistic. Two years later (in 1825) he reported that of 163 churches and chapels within his jurisdiction 60 had resident incumbents, 10 had incumbents within easy reach of their churches, 21 had resident curates, 5 had incumbents living in the parish and 5 had curates living in the parish. In 39 of the remaining 62 cases duty was performed by the incumbent.<sup>11</sup> Thus in 23 (or one-fifth) of the 103 cases where the clergy were technically non-resident they were 'really and virtually absent from their flocks'. But these figures relate to both incumbents and curates. As has been shown three out of ten incumbents had little or no contact with their parishes throughout the period.

### **The grounds of non-residence**

The non-residence licences granted by the bishop of Lichfield and Coventry to Derbyshire clergymen after 1804 reveal the main grounds of non-residence. For the purposes of this essay an analysis was made of the 255 licences relating to Derbyshire incumbents and granted between 1 March 1804 and the close of 1827 and which are filed in the Licence Books in the Lichfield Joint Record Office.<sup>12</sup>

Until 1813 the licences were issued for two years. In some cases the licence states this explicitly. From 1815 each licence states that it was valid for one year only. In some circumstances such as the illness of the incumbent or a member of his family or while the parsonage house was being repaired licences were issued for a period shorter than one year. John Chaloner of Wirksworth was granted a licence 'for the space of Eight Months' owing to 'the Infirmary of Body of your wife Augusta Chaloner',<sup>13</sup> and William Peach of Brampton was allowed to be non-resident for seven months while his parsonage house was being repaired.<sup>14</sup> The only two-year licence issued after 1815 was issued to Immanuel Halton of South Wingfield in 1826 on his undertaking to rebuild the parsonage house in that time.<sup>15</sup> From 25 March 1814 licences were issued on the condition that where a non-resident incumbent was himself not doing the duty he should employ a licenced curate.

Six grounds of non-residence are given in the licences. The two most frequently mentioned are the want and the unfitness of the parsonage house. Of the 255 licences in the Licence Books 115 mentioned the unfitness of the parsonage house. In 79 of these cases the incumbent was doing the duty of the parish himself. Sixty-eight licences mention the lack of a parsonage house. In 49 of these cases duty was being performed by the incumbent himself. The parsonage house occasionally appears to have been unfit only for the residence of the incumbent. J.G. Howard's curate resided in the 'unfit' parsonage at Stanton-by-Dale as did Ralph Heathcote's curate at Tibshelf.<sup>17</sup> The licences of these and other incumbents stipulated that the parsonage, though unfit, should be kept 'in good and sufficient repair'. As PP 1818 XVIII<sup>18</sup> and Archdeacon Butler's visitation articles clearly show, the small size or 'meanness' of parsonage houses was sufficient to label them unfit for clergymen becoming increasingly conscious of their social standing. At Mickleover, John Ward was licenced to reside in his own mansion in the parish while undertaking to keep the parsonage house in repair.<sup>19</sup> On the other hand residence in an unfit house was only excused when the unfitness had not been occasioned 'by any negligence, misconduct or default' of the incumbent.

The next most frequent ground of non-residence was the infirmity of the incumbent or member of his family. This was mentioned on 53 of the licences. Occasionally the

licences give quite detailed summaries of the nature of the illness. John Gardiner of Brailsford was granted a licence in 1825 owing to 'your actual Infirmity of Body arising from tenderness of Lungs to which the situation of Brailsford Parsonage House would be very prejudicial at your time of life...'<sup>20</sup> In fact Gardiner was issued with a licence as early as 1804, but then, and subsequently, on the ground that he was Preacher at the proprietary Octagon Chapel in Bath. In 1826 Gervase Brown of Ilkeston and the most notorious of the later Derbyshire pluralists was excused residence on the ground of 'your Infirmity of Body being subject to a severe nervous and Rheumatic complaint.'<sup>21</sup>

Next came residence on another living. This was mentioned on 30 licences, in all but one in conjunction with the want of unfitness of the parsonage house and/or the small value of the living. The exception was John Gardiner of Brailsford who was licenced in 1804, 1806 and 1808 solely on the ground of his Bath appointment. The low value of the benefice as a ground for non-residence ceased to be mentioned on the licences from January 1814.

Finally, 19 licences gave a literary or another ecclesiastical office as the ground for non-residence. Most of these occupations were those of schoolmaster or parish church or cathedral lecturer, though Robert Nares of Dalbury was 'one of the Librarians of the British Museum'<sup>22</sup> and Frederick Doveton of South Normanton was licenced to be absent for twelve months on his appointment 'to the Chaplaincy of the Factory at Boncoolen in the Island of Sumatra.'

### Pluralism

The fact that only 30 of the 255 licences gave residence on another living as the ground of non-residence with respect to a Derbyshire benefice tells us little about the incidence of pluralism in the county, these licences referring only to the non-resident pluralists. Yet the fact that such a ground is mentioned at all indicates that in these cases at least no dispensation to hold more than one benefice at the same time was necessary.

The legal position governing pluralism as it was interpreted in the diocese of Lichfield and Coventry was set out in a letter from J. Mott, proctor in the Lichfield consistory court, in 1817:

If a person holding a Benefice with Cure of Souls, not charged in the Kings Books takes another with Cure of Souls either above or under value in the Kings Books, the first will be voidable by the canon Law at the Will of the Patron or Bishop but not absolutely void.

If he takes a third Benefice with Cure of Souls of, or above 8£ p. annum in the Kings Books the other two will be voidable as above but not void. If such a person has a Benefice with Cure of Souls of 8£ p. ann in the Kings Books and takes another not charged or above or under 8£ per annum in the Kings Books without a Dispensation, the Benefice which he had first will be absolutely *void*. If he means to hold either or both the Benefices under 8£ p. ann *voidable* he must take that of, or above, 8£ per ann. last. If any other Benefice is taken after a Dispensation it will render those void which he held by Dispensation unless he resigns one and takes a fresh Dispensation to hold the other with it.

The distance is within 45 Statute miles which answers to 30 computed, to obtain a Dispensation. It depends upon the Patron and Bishop whether a person shall hold voidable Livings or not — I have known Patrons declare them void, which they may do by presenting another Clerk — The Instances of a Bishop interfering are rare.

To entitle a person to a Dispensation he must be DD, BD, LL D, or BL, or the Brother or Son of a Temporal Lord or of a Knight (Baronets were not created at the time the Statute passed) or MA and Chaplain to a Nobleman.

Voidable Livings may be held at any distance.<sup>24</sup>

This letter is not easy to interpret, but it appears to mean that

(a) incumbents might hold two or more discharged livings either above or below £8 in the Kings Books without dispensation, but that the first and subsequent livings would be voidable, and

(b) incumbents of livings in charge and worth £8 or above who wished to hold other benefices even though these benefices were discharged would require a dispensation.

A study of the Derbyshire pluralists granted dispensations and whose names and parishes appear in the *Index* to the Lambeth Act Books<sup>25</sup> bears out this interpretation.

As Diana McClatchey noted in Oxfordshire by no means all the pluralists appear in this *Index*.<sup>26</sup> This may be because some at least fell into group (a) above, i.e. were holders of voidable livings which could be held in plurality at the will of patron and bishop. Such pluralists did not require dispensation and thus would not appear in the *Index*. It appears that the law treated holders of discharged livings as it did the holders of perpetual curacies in this respect. The act 36 Geo III c. 83 laid down that 'such augmented [i.e. by Queen Anne's Bounty] Churches, Curacies and Chapels shall be considered in law as benefices presentative, so as that the licence thereto shall operate in the same manner as institutions to such Benefices, and shall render voidable other livings in like manner, as institutions to the said Benefices.' 1 and 2 Vict. c. 106, sec. 124 of 1838 brought perpetual curacies (together with donatives etc.) within the definition of benefices with cure of souls for the purposes of the act, and thereafter pluralist holders of perpetual curacies begin to appear in the *Index*.

Mott's comment that he had known patrons to declare group (a) livings void but that the instances of bishops 'interfering' were rare, suggests that the holding of voidable livings in plurality was widespread. It is also of interest that only those MAs who were also chaplains to noblemen, were, with the other qualified persons, entitled to a dispensation. The chaplaincy qualification was additional to the possession of a MA degree (and a licence to preach) required by Canon 41 of 1603.

It has been possible to trace all the benefices held by 109 of the incumbents of the 160 Derbyshire livings in 1772.<sup>27</sup> Of these, 42, or 39.5%, were pluralists (including holders of perpetual curacies). Of the complete list of 1832 comprising 142 incumbents, 59, or 41.5% were pluralists. Thus the percentage of incumbents holding more than one benefice was much the same at the beginning and at the end of the period. This bears out the Oxfordshire evidence.<sup>28</sup>

Much of this pluralism was inevitable where benefice incomes were low. Indeed it was argued by Samuel Butler in his Charge to his clergy in 1833 that positive advantages could result from the practice. He said that the evil of pluralities

is not so great as is usually apprehended. In some cases indeed where preferments of great value are held by the same individual, we may readily concur in condemning the accumulation; but where the preferment is moderate and especially where a living of small value is held with one of greater...so far from the plurality being injurious, I believe that it is very often productive of benefit. It generally produces more good to the poor inhabitants of that parish which has the small living when the incumbent is in easy circumstances, than when he is barely able to maintain his own family on the scanty income of his cure. It helps to form a class of men to become, at a future period, incumbents in the Church, who are thus employed as curates, and so keeps up among the clergy a provision for that succession of trained and experienced incumbents which it will be difficult to maintain when the door is closed to titles by the residence of each incumbent on his single living... And not infrequently it enables an incumbent to employ an assistant curate with a larger salary than the smaller living itself could produce. I will put a case which is not altogether hypothetical: a clergyman has a living of £300 a year with a considerable population, and would be glad of an assistant in the duty; he is presented to another small living of £40 or £50 a year with a small population: now though he could not afford to pay an assistant curate £80 a year out of his £300, he can afford it out of his £340 or £350. Thus the smaller living enables him to pay £80 to a curate who, if he actually possessed it as incumbent, would have but £40 or £50 a year.<sup>29</sup>

In short, not only were many small livings better served by being held in plurality than they would have been if held singly, but 'there are many small livings which, without pluralities, it would be impossible to have served at all, so inadequate are they to the separate maintenance of a clergyman.'<sup>30</sup>

A comparison of the benefice incomes of pluralists at the time Butler delivered his Charge, with those of clergymen who held one living only does not wholly bear out Butler's contention that pluralism was 'very often' productive of benefit. This can be seen from the following table.

*Table 2: Average benefice incomes of pluralists and single benefice incumbents in Derbyshire in 1832<sup>31</sup>*

		Average income per benefice	Average stipend paid to curates
Benefices held by pluralists	93	£207 p.a.	£77 p.a.
Benefices held by single-benefice incumbents	80	£250 p.a.	£74 p.a.

It is true that many single-benefice incumbents had other sources of income, and that the average of the pluralists' income was raised by the few clergy who held several rich livings such as F. Ricketts (rector of Eckington, and rector of St. James, Shaftesbury, Dorset; income from Eckington alone being £1600 p.a.) and Francis Blick (rector of Walton-on-Trent, prebend of Lichfield, vicar of Tamworth and perpetual curate of Wisset, Suffolk; income from Walton being £862 p.a.). Nevertheless it is evident that the income of the pluralists was on average considerably higher than that of the single-benefice incumbents.

#### *Parsonage houses*

As has been indicated, the principal causes of non-residence were the lack and the unfitness of parsonage houses.

No information about accommodation was required from the incumbents at Bishop Brownlow North's primary visitation in 1772, and only sparse information can be gleaned from the returns. The incumbents of nine benefices, Barlow, Belper, Blackwell, Boulton, Denby, Repton, Tissington, Willington and Wingerworth, stated that their benefices possessed no parsonage house. The houses in five parishes, Castleton, Dronfield, Hathersage, Measham and Ockbrook, were said to be unfit for habitation. The Castleton parsonage was on 'low, damp ground'; at Dronfield the house was said by the incumbent to be 'in good repair but too small for my family' and this was the case also at Hathersage where the incumbent said that the house was 'insufficient for my Family' but 'kept up, Tenanted, and in better Order than I found it Thirty years since'. The vicar of Ockbrook could not reside in the parsonage because it was only then being built. Only at Measham was the house obviously untenable, at least for a late eighteenth century clergyman, as it was 'a very little Old thatch'd House'.

It is evident that some clergymen were compelled to live in very poor conditions. In 1810 it was said of the perpetual curate of Sawley that he had to live in a

long, single house...which was in a state of great danger to the inhabitants, deluged by every falling shower...his barn and stable being also a common spectacle of ruin, and a scandal and offence to the well-wishers of the Church of England.<sup>32</sup>

The incumbent himself, Thomas Humphries, complained that he received only £40 p.a. from the Prebendary of Sawley (in Lichfield Cathedral), and that 'this pittance was encumbered with an old thatched house, the repairs of which have, from year to year, greatly contributed to diminish the already shamefully inadequate salary; and at length, the house is reduced to such a most dangerous state as would require more than five times the annual stipend to put it...into respectable and safe condition'.<sup>33</sup>

Yet at the same time there were other parsonages which were not being used by the parish clergy. In 1775 the vicarage of St. Michael's in Derby was put up for sale. It consisted of 'four Rooms on a Floor and a pleasant Garden' and was at the time in the possession of a butcher.<sup>34</sup> In 1786 Etwall vicarage was let 'with an Orchard and Garden and Two Acres of Land, well planted with choice Fruit Trees; Stabling for Six Horses, with Barns, Out-houses & with or without Eighteen Acres of Arable and Pasture Land...'<sup>35</sup> and in 1787 there was let the 'newly erected Parsonage House at Egginton... consisting of two Parlours, Kitchen and Brewhouse, with Lodging-Rooms for a small genteel Family, Outbuildings and other Convenient Offices; also a good Garden.'<sup>36</sup>

Insufficient information is available for a general picture of the provision and state of

parsonage houses to be obtained for the period before 1815, but thereafter the information is particularly detailed. A summary is presented in the following table.

*Table 3: The state of parsonage houses in Derbyshire 1815-1831*<sup>37</sup>

	1815		1823-4		1831	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Number of benefices chapelries, etc	181		163		175	
Number of parsonage houses	120	66	111	68	115	66
Number of parsonage houses fit for residence	84	70	91	82	97	84
Number of parsonage houses unfit for residence	36	30	20	18	18	16

The percentage of benefices and chapelries possessing parsonage houses remained fairly constant throughout the sixteen years at 66-8% but the percentage of these benefices possessing parsonages fit for the residence of a clergyman rose appreciably. Even so, the percentage of all benefices possessing houses fit for habitation in 1831 was only some 55%.

A parsonage was regarded as unfit for one of two reasons, lack of accommodation and dilapidation. For Archdeacon Butler, parsonages with one sitting room and three bedrooms as at Bradbourne were 'mean' but just acceptable as residences for clergymen.<sup>38</sup> The house of similar size at Fenny Bentley was described as 'an indifferent house: like a tolerable farm-house'<sup>39</sup> while at Ault Hucknall where the parsonage was 'an indifferent thatched house containing a parlour, kitchen, back kitchen & tolerable garden & three sleeping rooms' with extensive outhouses, the house did not reach Butler's standard and was 'not fit for a Clergyman'.<sup>40</sup> A house or cottage of smaller size though in good repair as at Elmton was often inhabited by a farmer or, as in this case, a farm labourer, and was 'perfectly unfit for a Clergyman',<sup>41</sup> although at Church Broughton the incumbent was resident in a parsonage consisting of one bedroom and one sitting-room and with a barn and a stable 'long since in a decayed state'.<sup>42</sup>

There are indications in the returns to Butler's visitation articles that some of these small thatched cottages, though classed as parsonages by both the 1818 return to parliament and by Butler may never have been intended as such. In three parishes, namely Somersal Herbert, Derby All Saints and Derwent, the 'parsonage' consisted of *two* small cottages which would hardly have been erected for the use of one clergyman<sup>43</sup> while at Osmaston-by-Ashbourne the 'small house unfit for the residence of a clergyman' was 'not known if a parsonage or a farm house on the glebe'.<sup>44</sup> This suggests strongly that these small cottages were built on glebe land for the use of tenant farmer and were never intended as parsonages. Snelston almost certainly provides another example of this. Snelston has been regarded as a parochial chapelry of Norbury for centuries with the rector resident at Norbury.<sup>45</sup> A Snelston terrier dated 3 August 1805 states that the majority of the glebe lands of the consolidated parish were in Snelston and were let to one Robert Allen. In 1823 Butler described the 'parsonage', if such it was, as 'a small cottage: the residence of a small farmer: unfit for a Clergyman'<sup>46</sup> and it thus seems most likely that this cottage was erected for the tenant of the glebe and not for a clergyman, the two churches of Snelston and Norbury being 'little more than a Mile distant and ye Inhabitants may with inconvenience attend at either or both'.<sup>47</sup> If such was the case in other parishes as seems very likely then too much must not be made of the evidence these so-called parsonages appear to afford that a considerable change in the social status of the clergy had taken place since the cottages were erected.<sup>48</sup>

There were fewer parsonages described as unfit because of their dilapidated state than because of lack of accommodation. In the 1818 parliamentary return of the condition of glebe houses, of the 36 Derbyshire parsonages declared to be unfit, 22 were so described because of their smallness and 12 because of dilapidation.<sup>49</sup> The descriptions of the last group clearly show that the incumbents of poor benefices found it difficult to maintain their parsonages. The Spondon house for example had been left 'in a very dilapidated state by the late Incumbent' and the Stapenhill house was 'left in a ruinous state by the late Incumbent who died insolvent.' For all the entreaties a few years earlier by Thomas Humphries and his parishioners the Sawley parsonage was by this time 'falling'. So clergy managed to keep their houses in repair only at considerable expense, a typical example being the modest four-bedroomed parsonage at Tibshelf upon which the incumbent had spent £600 though the gross value of his benefice was only £220 p.a.<sup>50</sup> In 1814 the vicar of Hathersage, John le Cornu, complained that his benefice income was only £54 p.a., but that 'chiefly by the little Savings of my small Emoluments during the last 23 years I have expended nearly £400 of hard-earned Money in rebuilding its Parsonage House and almost every Place about it which at my first coming hither I found in Ruins.'<sup>51</sup>

But the houses which could be described as unfit for any reason were in a minority. Certainly by the time of Butler's visitation in 1823-4 most parsonages were in a reasonable structural condition and from his returns a clear picture can be obtained of the type of house then regarded as acceptable as a clergyman's residence. Of the ninety-one Derbyshire parsonages within his jurisdiction which were fit for residence, Butler described eighty in some detail. The most convenient method of classification is by the number of main bedrooms (i.e. not including servants' rooms) which each contained.

Table 4: *The size of parsonages 1823-4*

Number of Bedrooms	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Number of Parsonages	1	1	12	26	21	13	3	1	2

The average three or four-bedroomed parsonage would have had two or three servants' rooms, two sitting rooms and a kitchen together with stables and other outhouses. Typical of the older parsonages was that at Wirksworth which was 'an old house in moderate repair: rambling and inconvenient: consisting of two principal sitting rooms, three good and four servants or indifferent bed rooms, kitchen and offices.' The outbuildings comprised a coach house and stables. At Eyam the house was in poor repair, but was 'a very good stone house consisting of a dining room, drawing room, breakfast room & five sleeping rooms & offices' with a stable, cowhouse and barn.<sup>53</sup> Houses similar to these were built throughout the period. The Ockbrook parsonage which was completed just prior to Bishop Brownlow North's primary visitation in 1772 consisted of three sitting rooms and six principal bed-rooms together with servants' rooms and a kitchen.<sup>54</sup> A plan attached to the faculty application for the parsonage at Doveridge in 1786<sup>55</sup> shows a substantial double-fronted building with nine bedrooms, several outbuildings, a 'hog sty' and an 'ash hole', a 'Best Necessary' and a 'Servants' Necessary'. This was a large mansion, placing its occupier amongst the gentry. The same could be said of the rectory at Eckington. In 1795 a contributor to *The Gentleman's Magazine* wrote of Christopher Alderson, the rector, that 'his successors will be much indebted for the elegant improvements he has made at the rectory, which vies with many of the best houses in the country for real taste in its decorations.'<sup>56</sup> It seems that Alderson had something of a reputation as a professional landscape architect for he 'is very happy in disposing pleasure grounds' notably at Frogmore and at Ford House in Derbyshire. At Eckington Alderson had laid out his rectory garden with 'a pretty piece of water, across which he has thrown a handsome bridge, and at one end placed a rustic temple.'<sup>57</sup> Thirty years later the 'very little Old thatch'd house'<sup>58</sup> at Measham had been replaced by a house containing three sitting rooms, five bedrooms,



servants' rooms, kitchen and 'suitable offices'.<sup>59</sup> At Barlow the 'handsome stone house now building in the Gothic style' in 1823 was of much the same size with two sitting rooms, three bedrooms, two servants' rooms, kitchen, back kitchen and offices, stable and cowhouse.<sup>60</sup> The parsonage at Spondon, built in 1815 had '3 sitting rooms, 9 lodging rooms and suitable offices',<sup>61</sup> its ground floor plan attached to the faculty application showing it to be a modest but substantial house. The newly erected parsonage at Mickleover of 1824 had four sitting rooms, six principal bedrooms, servants' rooms, a stable, coach house and cowhouse,<sup>62</sup> while the new house at Derby St. Michael's, built to replace the smaller house now sold, had six bedrooms.<sup>63</sup>

A study of Butler's visitation returns shows clearly that the parsonages built in the 1820s with their five or six main bedrooms were considerably larger than those which date from the period before 1770 (except those housing the really wealthy incumbents). It is doubtful whether this can be made to tell us much about the rising social status of the clergy. The mortgages made available by the Queen Anne's Bounty board and from private sources under Gilbert's act of 1777 and subsequent statutes, together with the increased income of the beneficed clergy in the second half of our period surely served to improve the quality of the clergyman's residence as much as a consciousness of his rising social position. Of course the two went together. The incumbent's rising income enabled him to live in a house which befitted a man of his income and pretensions. Certainly the sixty years of this period witness little change in the size of the parsonage houses of the resident incumbents, the house erected by Tunstall at Belper in 1816 and the Mickleover and Derby St. Michael's parsonages being of similar size to the Ockbrook and Doveridge houses. What is evident is that before the 1770s, in Derbyshire at least, incumbents had begun to attain the status of English gentlemen in holy orders. The same could not be said for those clergymen without whom many incumbents would not have enjoyed increasing income and status, the stipendiary curates.

#### The stipendiary curates

The average stipends of Derbyshire curates during the period are set out in the following table.

Table 5: Curates' stipends 1772-1830<sup>64</sup>

	1771		1823-4		1830	
	No.	£	No.	£	No.	£
Average stipend of curates serving one parish only:	19	36	27	77	41	84
Average stipend per curacy of curates serving more than one parish:	6	28	20	64	19	66

Curates stipends at the beginning of our period were governed by the provisions of *12 Anne st.2 c.12* by which bishops were empowered to order stipends in the range £20 -£50 p.a. Three curates in the extant returns to Brownlow North's primary visitation in 1772 received less than the minimum of £20 p.a. These were Thomas Mould, curate of Measham who received £18 allowed him by the 'Head Curate', or perpetual curate, William Williams (who was also vicar of Godmanchester), Joseph Dixon of Scropton (£16 p.a.) and Joseph Saunders of Wingerworth (£15 p.a.). Each of these men did the whole duty of these parishes. The gross income of the three benefices was only £25, £30 and £28 respectively and there was thus little opportunity for stipends to be improved. Only three curates in the 1772 returns, Collier of Aston-on-Trent, Ellis Henry of Derby St. Peter and John Ward of Morley received £50 p.a.

The average income of the benefices served by curates in 1772 was £64 10s p.a. and thus on average about one half of the income of these benefices went to the curate.

Therefore in many cases the bishop could hardly insist that a stipend of £50 p.a. be paid. Discussing with Samuel Johnson at Ashbourne in Derbyshire in 1777 the 'common subject of complaint, the very small salaries which many curates have', James Boswell argued that 'a clergyman should not be allowed to have a curate unless he gives him a hundred pounds a year.' Johnson replied that 'as the church revenues were sadly diminished at the Reformation' clergy could not afford to give their curates good salaries 'without leaving themselves too little'.<sup>65</sup> The evidence from Derbyshire at this same time bears out the truth of this. It was because benefice incomes were so low that many incumbents were forced to hold more than one living, placing curates in those in which they themselves did not reside, and, for the same reason, paying their curates little.

But perhaps the principal reason for the very low stipends of curates was that their supply exceeded demand and curates competed for employment. In the early years of the period there were always more advertisements in the *Derby Mercury* placed by curates seeking employment than by incumbents seeking curates. Apart from competition between themselves it appears that the curates also had to compete with imposters. In his Charge at his primary visitation in Derby All Saints in 1776 Brownlow North's successor as bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, Richard Hurd, warned the clergy 'to be very careful whom they employ for Curates as there are at this time a great Number of irregular and vicious Persons wandering through the Kingdom, seeking for Employment without having been regularly ordained...' and he criticised those incumbents who advertised for curates.<sup>66</sup>

It was also because supply exceeded demand that curates waited so many years for preferment. The diary of William Bagshaw Stevens contains much evidence of the lengths to which an unbeneficed clergyman would go to obtain even a modest benefice. A curate needed well-placed friends and 'early intelligence' of benefices likely to fall vacant, for 'in the Game of Preferment as well as at Drafts, much...depends on the First Move.'<sup>67</sup> Stevens would leave cards in the parishes of dying incumbents so that when they "Dropped" he would be first with his plea to be considered for the vacancy! Despite this forethought Stevens was unsuccessful for many years in obtaining preferment. Even less successful was Joseph Ashbridge, curate of Heath. His rector, Samuel Pegge (resident on his other benefice of Whittington) wrote on Ashbridge's behalf to Hayman Rooke in July 1789. Rooke was about to accompany the bishop of Carlisle to Rose Castle and Pegge hoped that Rooke's 'interest and good offices' with the bishop might obtain for Ashbridge 'a small piece of preferment, such as his Lordship would not think of conferring on a Chaplain, or on an intimate Friend' but which would be 'sufficient' for Ashbridge,<sup>68</sup> but Rooke was unsuccessful, Ashbridge remaining unbeneficed for a further 32 years.

Some curates remained unbeneficed throughout their lives. Some were the sons of wealthy land-owners and perhaps did not seek preferment. Such a one was Cornelius Heathcote Reaston, son and heir of P.A. Reaston of Barlborough Hall and patron of Barlborough, and Francis Ward Spilsbury of Willington. Others waited in vain for advancement. Robert Robinson, son of Peter Robinson of Norton, was curate of Whittington from 1818 until his death in 1867, and James Rhodes, curate of Mugginton, is said by Venn to have 'held no cures'. Others died before they could be beneficed when they might justifiably have hoped for preferment, such as Anthony Norman,<sup>69</sup> curate of Brailsford and Osmaston-by-Ashbourne for sixteen years before his death in 1833.

In the absence of preferment to benefices many curates sought to increase their incomes by moving from curacy to curacy. Thirty-nine parishes served by curates in 1823-4 and 1830 were studied. In the period between these dates only 13 curates remained in the same parish, the remaining 26 moving to higher paid posts.

The poverty of the curates was very real. Anna Seward, daughter of the rector of Eyam, wrote in 1767 of 'those lank, lean parsons which are sowed so thick over this country; most of them the starveling curates of their fat and jolly rectors, who live in gayer scenes and leave their clay-sunk parishes to the cheapest journeyman they can

procure.<sup>70</sup> Some of these 'starveling curates' served more than one parish to make ends meet, other sought employment as chaplains to landed families, such as Walter Fletcher who was chaplain to Sir Henry Harpur and served the donative curacy of Calke, or as schoolmasters such as Joseph Saunders who served Wingerworth as curate and was also Master of Chesterfield Grammar School. Others took pupils into their homes, such as Joseph Ashbridge of Heath who took eight to ten boys 'to Board and Teach'.<sup>71</sup> Other taught schools in their parishes. A few augmented their incomes in less conventional ways. In 1785, Thomas Brown, then the curate of Tideswell, not only served two curacies, kept a school and farmed the parish glebe himself, but added to his income by measuring hay as an independent assessor, and even occasionally by lettering a name-board for a cart or painting a sign-board for a house! His diaries record him preaching many sermons at club feasts and funerals for a half a guinea or a guinea. His income from all sources in that year amounted to £106 8s 8d, just exceeding, in best Pickwickian fashion, his expenditure of £99 1s 5d.<sup>72</sup>

Yet at least one curate, impoverished as he was, was content with his lot, being assured that his reward awaited him elsewhere. He was resigned, he wrote,

to my humble position, since, I am well convinced that the present will shortly be superceded by a very different sense of things. I know that the dissipated rich and the contented poor shall experience a reverse of condition: a reverse miserable to the one, but happy to the other... A Curate therefore, how great soever the hardships under which he struggles, by continuing in the uniform, conscientious discharge of his duty, is surely a juster object of envy than the luxurious Dignitary...If provision in the Church more adequate to his necessities be unattainable by the Curate, none is better instructed how to make a virtue out of necessity: none can better fortify his mind against those billows of adversity which may sink others, less supported by the aids of religion, into the gulphs of despair.<sup>73</sup>

A glance at the date of this letter to a local newspaper suggests that this clergyman had in mind less a heavenly than a temporal world to come.

The Curates' acts which regulated stipends and residence in the second half of this period began with 36 *George III c. 83* of 1786 which raised the maximum stipend to £75 p.a. In addition, on livings where the incumbent did not personally reside at least four months in the year the curate was to be given the use of the parsonage house, or a sum not exceeding £15 p.a. in lieu. The acts of 1813 (53 *George III c. 149*) and 1817 (57 *George II c. 99*) raised salaries to the range £80 - £150 p.a. The minimum had to be paid with or without the incumbent's consent, although the bishop was given discretionary power with respect to the stipends of curates serving the poorest parishes. In cases where two adjoining parishes were served by the same curate, the total stipend could be reduced by £30. Residence of the incumbent or his curate became statutory on all livings whose yearly value exceeded £300. Table 5 shows that not until the very close of this period did the average stipend of Derbyshire curates serving only one parish rise above the statutory minimum. In 1823-4 there were eleven curates serving one parish only, and each of which was doing all the duty of his parish, who received less than the statutory £80 p.a. In four cases the benefice income was below £100 p.a., namely Bradbourne (benefice income £98, curate's stipend £50), Brampton (£100 and £60), Wingerworth (£77<sup>74</sup> and £40) and Willington (£90 and £50). In the remaining seven parishes it would seem that the incumbent was well able to afford the minimum. These were Bradley (£298<sup>75</sup> and £50), Bonsall (£200 and £60), Carsington (£500 and £45), Pleasley (£500 and £75), Shirland (£254<sup>76</sup> and £72), Whittington (£300 and £60) and Mugginton (£500 and £75<sup>77</sup>). It is clear that curates' stipends did not improve at the same rate as those of incumbents during the period. By 1832 the average salary of the 84 Derbyshire curates was £76 p.a.<sup>78</sup> The average had doubled in the sixty years since 1772. In the same period the incomes of rectors had increased by 226%, of vicars by 261% and of perpetual curates by 272% for reasons which lie outside this study but have to do with enclosure allotments, tithes and tithe compositions.<sup>79</sup> Thus not only did the Curates' acts not succeed in enforcing a minimum stipend, but the incumbents were not disposed in most cases to allow their curates to share in their rising prosperity. In real money terms therefore the curates became poorer as the years passed. Few of them

could complain with greater excuse than Thomas Humphries of Sawley who, in 1810, was receiving £40 p.a. for doing all the duty of a large parish the incumbent of which, so he claimed, received £2,000 to £2,400 p.a. 'for doing nothing'. The curates had to maintain the parsonage house if they resided in it, and their slender income was in many cases the sole source of charity for the poor. One curate, Richard Moxon of Ilkeston, found that his poverty inhibited his pastoral ministry. It was said that

his visits amongst the poorest of his flock always caused him great pain; and well do I remember his remark when once urging him to go more amongst them: his reply was 'I really so often meet with cases of such extreme want, without, from my small means, being unable to do much for them, that I shrink from the distresses I have not it in my power to remove.'<sup>81</sup>

It was because 'a Curate has neither the authority in instructing and reproof which the actual possessor of the living has, nor the same ability to be charitable' that Thomas Gisborne denounced pluralism.<sup>82</sup>

As to residence on all livings over the value of £300 p.a., the 1830 *Clergy Book* of the diocese of Lichfield and Coventry shows that curates served 18 such parishes in Derbyshire. In seven cases the curate was resident in the parsonage house, and in eight cases he was living elsewhere in the parish. In four of these latter, the incumbent was himself resident in the parsonage. In three cases, Etwall, Mugginton and Norbury, both incumbent and curate were non-resident, though in each case the curate resided within three miles of the parish. Nevertheless the law of residence was being ignored in these cases.<sup>83</sup> The *Clergy Book* also shows that some 56% of the curates were resident in the parsonage or elsewhere in the parish they served. Of the 63 curates named, 18 or 29% were resident in the parsonage, and 17 or 27% were resident elsewhere in the parish. Forty-seven curates, or 75%, were properly licenced by the bishop. In the diocese as a whole (covering Derbyshire, part of Warwickshire, part of Shropshire and Staffordshire) in 1827 some 58.5% of the curates were resident in their parishes (35% in the parsonage house and 23.5% elsewhere in the parish), and 73.5% were licenced.<sup>84</sup> These figures compare with 49% residence in the parsonage or elsewhere in the parish in 1810. At that time 60% of the curates were licenced.<sup>85</sup> If the relationship of diocesan and county percentages of residence was the same in 1810 as in 1830 then some 10% more of the curates were resident in the parishes they served in 1830 than 20 years earlier. A crucial question is, did residence or non-residence make any difference to church attendance? To this question we turn finally and briefly.

#### **The residence of the clergy and the attendance of the people**

It has been possible to compare communicant attendance for 78 Derbyshire parishes for the period 1772-1824 with statistics of clerical residence.<sup>86</sup> The communicant figures for 35 parishes were remarkably stable over this fifty year period. In 12 cases there was no marked dissimilarity, though the tendency was, in all but three cases, for attendance to decline over the period. In only four parishes was there a considerable percentage increase in attendance. In the remaining 27 parishes there was a decrease in communicant attendance approaching, and in some cases exceeding, 50%. The influence not only of clerical residence but also nonconformist activity and demographic variations in determining these similarities and variations can be determined with reasonable certainty. The influence of a fourth, a political and social factor is more problematic. Note can only be taken here of the first of these influences, that of clerical residence. It is quite clear from these statistics that the residence of a clergyman had little effect on communicant attendance. As has been noted elsewhere,<sup>87</sup> in the 47 parishes in which communicant attendance was maintained or virtually maintained there was no resident clergyman throughout the period in 12 cases in either 1772 or 1824 and in seven parishes there was no clergyman resident in 1824 where there had been a resident in 1772. In two of the four parishes showing a marked increase in attendance there was no resident clergyman throughout the period. Of the 27 parishes showing a marked decline in attendance there was no resident clergyman in five cases throughout the period. In one parish there was a resident in 1824 where there had been

none in 1772 and in three parishes there was a resident in 1772 but not in 1824. In short, in the majority of the 78 parishes there was a resident clergyman throughout the fifty years. If the decline in communicant attendance cannot be blamed solely on the non-residence of a clergyman, neither can the maintenance or improvement of communicant attendances be put down to the residence of a clergyman.

What conclusions can be drawn from this detailed study of residence and pluralism in one county in that crucial period of reform from 1770 to 1830? It seems clear that pluralism was not as pernicious a practice as the more outspoken critics of the Church of England suggested. In the vast majority of cases pluralism was forced upon the clergy by the generally low level of benefice incomes. For the same reason the law seeking to reform the worst abuses could not be applied in very many cases. Where the want of an incumbent was made up by a curate he could blame the operation of the law of supply and demand for the impoverishment he suffered, the incumbents being no better and no worse than other employers of labour in this respect. Unless the clergyman was dedicated to his pastoral and teaching ministry his presence in his parish appears to have made little impact on the church-going habits of his parishioners. While the incumbents began to haul themselves up the social scale it appears that their ministry had little impact upon a population already growing indifferent to the Church they represented. Certainly by the close of the period whatever may have been the ideal in Lord Kenyon's mind, the role of the clergy was cast less in a conciliatory than in a confrontational mould. It was surely so before Lord Kenyon gave his judgment.

#### REFERENCES

- 1 In the case of *Middleton v. Blake*, reported in the *Derby Mercury*, 23 May 1799.
- 2 From a letter from T. Row (or The Rector of Whittington, one of Pegge's pseudonyms), *The Gentleman's Magazine*, LVI, Pt 2 (1786), 1129-30.
- 3 Lichfield Joint Record Office (hereafter cited as LJRO), B/C/5, 1784. Deposition of Paul Fletcher, witness of a brawl in Brampton church, dated 21 January 1784. See also the presentation of Joseph Mellor, incumbent of Fairfield, by the churchwardens at the visitation of the Dean of Lichfield in 1772, for 'absenting himself from the Service of the said Church...for the space of two years and upwards, and for not residing...within the time aforesaid', Lichfield Dean and Chapter Library, Bb 19.
- 4 Another case was cited by Sir William Scott introducing his first non-residence bill on 7 April 1802. The rector of Bow was penalised for non-residence 'though he attended his Ministerial functions with unremitting zeal, not only on the Sabbath, but on week days', *Derby Mercury*, 15 April 1802.
- 5 Not more than eleven of these penalties could be collected as every action had to be brought within a year of the cause of the action.
- 6 Sir William Scott, *loc. cit.*
- 7 43 Geo. III c. 84
- 8 LJRO, B/V/5; A/V/1/1; Clergy Book, 1830.
- 9 This is the number of extant returns which give a reply to this article.
- 10 S. Butler, *A Charge addressed to the clergy of the archdeaconry of Derby*, (Derby 1823), 20-1.
- 11 S. Butler, *Charge* etc, 1825, 8-9.
- 12 LJRO, B/A/9/1-3 and A-F. It is unlikely that the books contain copies of all the licences issued. The highest yearly total was 26 for the year ending 25 March 1808.
- 13 LJRO, B/A/9/2, licence dated 3 September 1808.
- 14 LJRO, B/A/9/E, licence dated 20 January 1826.
- 15 LJRO, B/A/9/E, 9 January 1826.
- 16 LJRO, B/A/9/B, 23 June 1817.
- 17 LJRO, B/A/9/B, 5 June 1818.
- 18 *Account of Benefices and Population; Churches, Chapels and their Capacity; Number and Condition of Glebe Houses and income of all Benefices not exceeding £150 per ann.*, 103-6 (this is a House of Commons Sessional Paper but printed by the Lords).
- 19 LJRO, B/A/9/1, 17 July 1804.
- 20 LJRO, B/A/9/E, 27 August 1825.
- 21 LJRO, B/A/9/F, 10 February 1826.
- 22 LJRO, B/A/9/1, 1 March 1804.
- 23 LJRO, B/A/9/10, 22 March 1823.

- <sup>24</sup> LJRO, B/C/5, 1815, letter to an unknown correspondent dated 22 December 1817.
- <sup>25</sup> The British Record Society, The Index Library, *Index to the Act Books of the Archbishops of Canterbury 1663-1859*, LV (1929) and LXXX (1938).
- <sup>26</sup> D. McClatchey, *Oxfordshire Clergy 1777-1869*, (Oxford 1960), 41.
- <sup>27</sup> Traced from LJRO, B/V/5; J. Foster, *Alumni Oxonienses*; J. Venn and J.A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, (Cambridge 1922), 40; J. Tilley, *Short biographies of seventy Derby clergymen of the Church of England*, MS c. 1880; J.C. Cox, *Notes on the Churches of Derbyshire*, (Derby 1875-9).
- <sup>28</sup> D. McClatchey, *op. cit.*, 44.
- <sup>29</sup> S. Butler, *Charge etc.*, 1833, 14-15.
- <sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 16-17. Yet Butler realised that special pleading would not convince the reformer. A year earlier, writing to Francis Hodgson, vicar of Bakewell, about the impending 'danger to the Church' following the passing of the Reform Act, he said 'happy are they who like me have been pluralists without ever receiving a clear £150 from the Church in any year save one, when a lucky fine nearly doubled the average income' (J.T. Hodgson, *Memoir of the Rev. Francis Hodgson*, (1878), ii, 216, letter dated 19 June 1832.) Butler was vicar of Kenilworth, worth £280 net p.a. in 1832, and a prebend of Lichfield as well as archdeacon of Derby.
- <sup>31</sup> Statistics compiled from PP 1835, XXII, 458-509. The income of each parish is the average of the three years to 31 December 1831.
- <sup>32</sup> Copy of a petition from the parishioners of Sawley, Wilne and Long Eaton to the Prebendary of Sawley, in T. Humphries, *The Prebendary and the Curate*, Nottingham 1810, 51.
- <sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, iv.
- <sup>34</sup> *Derby Mercury*, 21 July 1775.
- <sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 3 August 1786.
- <sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 12 April 1787.
- <sup>37</sup> Based on LJRO, B/V/5 and PP 1835, XXII, 458-509.
- <sup>38</sup> LJRO, A/V/1/1, 19.
- <sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, 47.
- <sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 191.
- <sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 159. Butler similarly described the parsonages at Brassington, Carsington, Thorpe, Elton, Marston Montgomery, Marston-on-Dove, Osmaston-by-Ashbourne and Trusley.
- <sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 349.
- <sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, 155, 355, 385.
- <sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, 537.
- <sup>45</sup> J.C. Cox, *Notes on the Churches of Derbyshire*, (Derby 1875-9), III, 248.
- <sup>46</sup> LJRO, A/V/1/1, 79.
- <sup>47</sup> LJRO, B/V/5, Norbury, article 5.
- <sup>48</sup> See D. McClatchey, *Oxfordshire Clergy 1777-1869*, (Oxford 1960), 20.
- <sup>49</sup> *PP 1818, XVIII*, 103-6.
- <sup>50</sup> LJRO, A/V/1/1, 273.
- <sup>51</sup> Church Commissioners File F 2111, letter dated 18 October 1814 to Richard Burn.
- <sup>52</sup> LJRO, A/V/1/1, 91.
- <sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, 171.
- <sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 545.
- <sup>55</sup> LJRO, B/C/5, 1786, application dated 17 January 1786.
- <sup>56</sup> *The Gentleman's Magazine*, October 1795, pt II, 826.
- <sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>58</sup> LJRO, B/V/5, Measham, article 4.
- <sup>59</sup> LJRO, A/V/1/1, 497.
- <sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, 107.
- <sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, 577.
- <sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, 519.
- <sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, 393.
- <sup>64</sup> Statistics compiled from LJRO, B/V/5; A/V/1/1 and B/V/10/3. All curates whose stipends are recorded in these returns are included, including the minority who shared duty with the incumbent. The difference in the stipends these received compared with the single-handed curates is statistically insignificant.
- <sup>65</sup> J. Boswell, *The Life of Samuel Johnson*, (London 1906, Everyman ed.), II, 103.
- <sup>66</sup> *Derby Mercury*, 9 August 1776. Charge delivered on 2 August.
- <sup>67</sup> *The Journal of the Rev. William Bagshaw Stevens*, ed. G. Galbraith, (London 1965), 230.

- <sup>68</sup> Library of the Society of Antiquaries, letter from Pegge to Rooke, dated 13 July 1789.
- <sup>69</sup> Or *Authority* Norman, as in S. Butler, *Life and Letters of Dr Samuel Butler*, (London 1896), I, 236.
- <sup>70</sup> W. Scott, *The Poetical Works of Anna Seward, with extracts from her literary correspondence*, (Edinburgh 1810), I, cxcvii.
- <sup>71</sup> Library of The Society of Antiquaries, letter from Pegge to Rooke, 13 July 1789.
- <sup>72</sup> Sheffield City Library, BAG.C. 327.3, Acc. No. 40197, MS diary; J.M.J. Fletcher, 'Tideswell in the days of Parson Brown 1785-1800', *Tideswell Parish Magazine*, 1927, (Sheffield City Library local pamphlets, Vol. 238, No. 12).
- <sup>73</sup> *Derby Mercury*, letter from *A Curate*, 4 August 1791.
- <sup>74</sup> Wingerworth benefice income from PP 1835, XXII, 506.
- <sup>75</sup> Bradley benefice income from *ibid.*, 465.
- <sup>76</sup> Shirland benefice income from *ibid.*, 499.
- <sup>77</sup> All curates' stipends and other benefice incomes from LJRO, A/V/1/1.
- <sup>78</sup> PP 1835, XXII, 458-509. Their total income was £6344 p.a.
- <sup>79</sup> Based on the incomes of the 81 benefices for which statistics for each year are available in LJRO, B/V/5; A/V/1/1; PP 1835, XXII, 458-509.
- <sup>80</sup> T. Humphries, *The Prebendary and the Curate*, (Nottingham 1810), 19.
- <sup>81</sup> J.D. Wawn, *A Funeral Sermon preached in the Parish Church of Ilkeston, Derbyshire, Sunday April 10th, 1836, on the occasion of the death of the Rev. R. Moxon*, (London 1836), 21.
- <sup>82</sup> T. Gisborne, *An Enquiry into the Duties of Man in the Higher and Middle Classes of Society in Great Britain, resulting from their respective stations, professions and employments*, (London 1794), 350-2.
- <sup>83</sup> LJRO, B/V/10/3.
- <sup>84</sup> PP 1830, XIX, 39-40.
- <sup>85</sup> PP 1812, X, 157. There were 196 curates of non-resident incumbents: 96 of these were resident within the parish, and 116 were licenced.
- <sup>86</sup> Using the returns in LJRO, B/V/5 and A/V/1/1, the 1830 Clergy Book in LJRO, B/V/10/3, and the articles of enquiry returned to Queen Anne's Bounty and contained in the Church Commissioners' F. Augmentation files at 1, Millbank.
- <sup>87</sup> M.R. Austin, 'Religion and Society in Derbyshire during the Industrial Revolution', *The Derbyshire Archaeological Journal*, XCIII (1973), 81.