

MINISTERS OF STATE: THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH IN LANCASHIRE
DURING THE ENGLISH REVOLUTION

ALEX CRAVEN

University of Manchester

Although the importance of religion in causing and driving the Civil War has rarely been doubted, historians' attention has more often been drawn to the study of 'Puritanism' before the outbreak of the wars, and 'radicalism' during them. The focus has been on the issues of doctrinal debates, denominational conflict, the effort to impose godly discipline in England, and the extent of toleration, rather than to a study of the institution of the Church during the mid seventeenth century. Much has been made of the campaign to reform the morals of the nation, from the abolition of the few remaining 'Popish' festivals on the calendar and the attacks upon 'profane' or 'heathen' entertainments (such as May poles or Sunday sports), to the Commonwealth legislation against swearing and fornication, culminating with the aborted project of the Major-Generals during the Protectorate.[1] More recent work has focused upon the continuing attachment of the nation to the Book of Common Prayer and Anglicanism.[2] What study that has been made of the machinery of Church has tended to finish abruptly at the revolutionary seismic fault line of 1642.[3]

The ecclesiastical legislation of the early 1640s is justly famous, but developments within the institutional structure and administration of the Church after 1645 have been largely overlooked. In the space of a few short years, the House of Commons deconstructed the ancient apparatus of the episcopal Church, and replaced it with a Presbyterian equivalent. The abolition of the Court of High Commission and the exclusion of the bishops from the Lords in 1641 were followed inevitably by the abolition of episcopacy. In 1645, Parliament swept away the Anglican liturgy of the Church of England, replacing the Book of Common Prayer with the Directory of Worship, a reformed liturgy acceptable to the majority of the godly in England and Scotland.[4] The Directory brought ceremonies into line with Presbyterian practice and suppressed customs and items of church furnishing considered superstitious or idolatrous. It was only in 1646, however, that Parliament returned its attention to the structure of the Church, ordaining that a Presbyterian system should be adopted throughout England. Presbyterian classes were indeed successfully erected in a number

of places, most notably in London and Lancashire. Where they operated, the classes took up the former bishops' responsibility for the ordination of the clergy and the discipline of congregations. Historians have traditionally been pessimistic about these measures, and there is little doubt that in many places they failed. John Morrill concluded that 'these ordinances were not only largely ignored but actively resisted', estimating that fewer than a quarter of English parishes purchased the Directory.[5] Indeed, as Claire Cross noted, many historians 'have denied that a church in any organised form existed in England between 1646 and 1660'.[6]

However, the rejection by many congregations of classical Presbyterianism, or of the strictures of godly discipline, should not lead us to conclude that there was no ecclesiastical institution in place in the mid seventeenth century. For too long, historians have been too easily distracted by sectarian squabbles that occurred often within a national church that was able to accommodate a broad godly consensus. The work of the Committee for Plundered Ministers demonstrates that there was an established national Church during this period, and that, for some of the clergy, this was a golden age of doctrinal tolerance and financial remuneration. The work of this committee and its successors included the sequestration of Royalist clergy, the appointment of approved ministers to vacant benefices, and two major surveys of the entire Church, which led to the start of a wholesale reorganisation of the parochial structure of the Church of England. Perhaps the most important aspect of these committees' activities, though, was the augmentation of clerical livings, by which they sought to create an adequately-funded clergy.

The Committee for Plundered Ministers was created by Parliament in 1642, initially to relieve those ministers sympathetic to Parliament who had suffered at the hands of Royalists, on an ad hoc basis. Its powers were soon extended, however, to include the sequestration of Royalist clergy, the approval of ministers for vacant benefices, and the augmentation of clerical wages, by which they sought to create an adequately funded clergy.[7] In 1650, a monumental survey of the national Church was undertaken, the first attempt to assess accurately the state of the Church since the *Valor Ecclesiasticus* of 1535. When Parliament swept away the episcopal hierarchy of the Church of England in 1646, its possessions were confiscated. Although most of these estates were sold to raise ready funds, the inappropriate rectories and tithes were reserved for the better maintenance of the clergy, and these were vested into the hands of a second body, the Trustees for the Maintenance of Ministers, in June 1649.[8] This duopoly of clerical

augmentation was terminated with the expulsion of the Rump Parliament in 1653, when its committees also ceased to sit, leaving the Trustees as the sole body directing the entire policy. It was this body that built upon the 1650 survey, beginning a complete reorganisation of the parochial structure of the Church in the late 1650s.[9] The appointment of the 'triers' in 1654 to scrutinise potential ministers introduced further centralised supervision into the affairs of the Church. By allowing many congregations to select ministers that were acceptable to themselves, the committees supported the broadest range of denominational practice in the history of the English national Church. Nevertheless, authority within the Church in the 1640s and 1650s was not simply devolved to individual congregations, and the committees were not averse to supporting ministers despite the hostility of local congregations. Between 1642 and 1660, therefore, the Church was directed and administered by centrally appointed government committees, who oversaw the appointment of clerics, arranged generous salaries for many ministers, and undertook ambitious policies that would have reformed the medieval parochial structure of the Church of England into something much more manageable and responsive to the needs of its parishioners.

Despite this range of important activities, these committees have rarely been studied in detail. Nevertheless, their work cut squarely across all of the key debates in mid-seventeenth-century historiography. The debate about the nature of the Church, and indeed whether there should even be an established Church, was of fundamental concern to contemporary religious writers. This debate particularly manifested itself in a protracted and sometimes bitter discussion about tithes, the source of much of the revenue used to fund clerical augmentations, putting the Committee at the heart of this controversy. Any changes to the system of tithes would have had profound implications for the future of the national Church during the 1640s and 1650s. Yet the Committee has rarely been discussed, largely because historians remain sceptical about the nature of the Church in this period. The monumental *History of the English Church During the Civil Wars and Under the Commonwealth* by William Shaw, first published in 1900, discussed the committees in detail, but Shaw restricted himself largely to a narrative of the changes in policy and personnel, never subjecting their work to any systematic analysis. Indeed, the only rigorous evaluation of the Committee and the Trustees so far published is a solitary article, by Rosemary O'Day and Ann Hughes, an analysis of the augmentation of livings in Derbyshire and Warwickshire.[10] However, whilst they reached somewhat pessimistic conclusions about the success of the policy of augmentations, my own

research into Lancashire is much more positive, suggesting that there was a wide range of divergent experiences in different localities. This essay will analyse the key activity of the Committee for Plundered Ministers and the Trustees for the Maintenance of a Preaching Ministry within Lancashire, the augmentation of clerical wages. Moreover, what I hope that it will show is that if we turn our attention from doctrine to structure we can see that there was a functioning, national, established Church in existence in the 1640s and 1650s.

* * *

The establishment of a well-endowed preaching ministry had been a goal of the godly since long before the start of the Civil Wars. The religion of the Word emphasised the importance of the sermon, and thus required men capable of preaching to the masses. Ad hoc schemes of itinerant ministers had been used since the Reformation to propagate the gospel in the ‘dark corners’ of the land, but there had been little success in planting an educated clergy throughout the countryside.[11] If the Church was to attract educated men – university graduates even – it would need the means to remunerate them, means that the Church was sorely lacking. Indeed, Christopher Hill recognised this issue to be crucial: ‘The major problem of the church of the old regime, all would have agreed, was that most livings were not adequate to maintain a learned clergyman.’ It was a situation made more complicated because much of the country’s ecclesiastical revenues were held in lay hands, leaving many benefices impoverished. ‘It was difficult to persuade a lay rector to augment a living; the church had no funds available... the property rights of lay patrons stood in the way of that reform of the church which the Puritans claimed most to wish to see.’[12] Despite some individual efforts to improve the value of particular livings, there was to be no systematic attempt to improve the income of the clergy until the intervention of the Committee for Plundered Ministers.

The spiritual needs of early modern Lancashire were notoriously ill-provisioned. There were just sixty-two parishes, many of which covered vast areas; Whalley, for instance, covered 106,395 acres. Although many parishes incorporated several chapels of ease, nevertheless there were just 182 churches and chapels in total, ministering to a population of around 150,000.[13] It was not only the problems of large parishes and swollen congregations that necessitated the reformation of Lancashire’s parochial network. There was an urgent need to redress the extreme inequalities of wealth experienced by the county’s clergy. The population boom of the late Middle Ages meant that the value of the tithes in many of Lancashire’s parishes had also rocketed.[14]

Where Lancashire had once had some of the poorest livings in the country, by the early seventeenth century they included some of the richest. In 1650, seventeen of Lancashire's rectors were due £100 or more from tithes; the rector of Croston had an income of £349, the rector of Wigan £417, whilst the rector of Winwick could expect £660.[15]

Even in those parishes where the tithes amounted to large sums of money, the vast bulk of them were often reserved to an impropriating layman. The sale of appropriated ecclesiastical property in the sixteenth century had left many of Lancashire's rectories in the hands of lay men, leaving the incumbents with a small fraction of the parochial revenues. Whilst seventeen Lancashire ministers earned £100 or more from their tithes in 1650, sixteen of Lancashire's vicars received stipends worth £20 or less.[16] The tithes of Huyton, Deane, Eccles and Warrington were all worth £150 or more, but the vicars received stipends of £10, £10, £18 and £20 respectively. Perhaps the most glaring anomaly was at Leigh, where the vicar's salary was £18 1s. 4d., plus a horse worth at £10, from tithes valued at £632 per annum in 1636; from this stipend, the vicar paid an assistant £4 and £1 10s in taxes.[17] Yet, this was as nothing compared to the poverty of the ministers serving at the county's chapels of ease, the vast majority of whom had no fixed income and who were therefore reliant upon the charity of their congregation for their maintenance. In 1650, fifty-one of the curates of chapels received £15 or less; twenty-three of these received £5 or less, some as little as £1. As Christopher Hill noted grimly, 'agricultural labourers were paid better than that!'[18] It is thus no surprise that there was such difficulty finding suitable men willing to take these posts, and thirty-eight of Lancashire's churches and chapels were vacant at the time of the survey in 1650.[19] This was the situation that the various schemes to augment clerical livings sought to address. Between 1645 and 1653, 127 augmentations were awarded to Lancashire's clergy, supporting 125 ministers serving at 122 churches and chapels.[20] The dwindling of resources coupled with the reorganisation of the system in 1654 meant that many grants were never paid or ceased to be paid as time went on; nevertheless, between 1654 and 1660, fifty livings in the county were improved with augmentations.

The sequestration of the benefices of Royalist clergymen provided the initial means for supporting Parliamentary clergy, the Committee depriving the malignant cleric and intruding an approved minister into his place. The earliest action of the Committee in Lancashire was the sequestration of the rectory of Walton-on-the-Hill in

March 1645, and in total it settled eight rectories and vicarages upon new ministers between 1645 and 1647.[21] It also took advantage of these arrangements to improve the income of the curates serving at the chapels within these parishes, by dedicating a fixed proportion of the parish tithes to each particular minister. In total, settlements permanently redistributing the tithes, such as this, were made to the benefit of the curates of sixteen chapels in six parishes.[22] Soon, the Committee extended its activities from simply depriving malignant clergy to providing for such ministers as were approved by the county's committeemen and godly ministers, by providing an augmentation to their stipends from sequestered ecclesiastical revenues, in particular from inappropriate tithes sequestered from Royalist lay rectors.

At first, the Committee limited itself to granting fixed sums to supplement clerical livings from the tithes of the respective parish. Thus, in 1645, the ministers at Leigh and Atherton received augmentations of £50 and £40 respectively from the sequestered tithes of Leigh.[23] The Committee soon pooled the revenues of sequestered inappropriate rectories from across the county, using them to augment livings throughout Lancashire. In total, 104 such augmentations were granted to the ministers of Lancashire by 1653. As Table 1 demonstrates, these were overwhelmingly for annual sums of £50, with some sixty of the 104 augmentations for this value. Five augmentations were for larger amounts, and the largest grant was made to Jeremy Marsden, awarded £100 a year in 1651 to preach throughout the large parish of Whalley.[24] Augmentations could be for much smaller sums, though: Bradshaw chapel was awarded just £13 16s. 10d. in 1646, whilst Edward Woolmer of Flixton received £16 formerly reserved from the parish to a prebend of Lichfield.[25] However, these were particularly low, and of the remaining thirty-nine augmentations worth less than £50 granted by 1653, twenty-eight were for £40.

[Insert Table 1 here]

As time went by, the Committee sought to increase its original grants, and fifteen augmentations were improved, normally to the value of £50; by 1653, eleven augmentations had been raised to this value (Table 1). Once again, sums larger than this were also awarded: the minister at Atherton saw his augmentation of £50 raised to £70 in 1649, whilst the £100 settlement made for Richard Heyrick of Manchester in 1651 was raised to £120 later in the same year.[26] Yet, augmentations of a low value could still be

awarded, such as the £25 1s. 8d. awarded to the minister of Chipping in 1652. Worse, the value of some augmentations fell; the £40 augmentation of the minister of Overton ended when the sequestration of the Bolton-le-Sands tithes were discharged, to be replaced with £35 6s. 8d. from a rent formerly reserved to the bishop of Chester. The £40 augmentation granted to Newchurch-in-Culcheth was discharged in 1649 when it became apparent that the tithes of Culcheth had been wrongly sequestered; it seems never to have been replaced.[27]

In granting augmentations, the Committee for Plundered Ministers seems to have been concerned by two factors: the need to increase the woefully low value of many livings, and the desire to extend the preaching of the gospel. The emphasis of the Committee's work, especially during the Commonwealth, was focused upon improving the income of ministers serving at chapels, many of which had no fixed maintenance. Of the thirty-five augmentations made for Lancashire between 1649 and 1653, only seven were for parish churches; even these seven included small and poor parishes such as Claughton, Chipping and Ribchester. The poverty and great burden attached to these cures were often explicitly stated as the reasons for the augmentation. The poor maintenance of the chapels at Burnley, Colne and Padiham was contrasted with the great pressure placed upon the ministers in those places, Burnley and Colne reportedly consisting of 1,500 communicants, whilst Padiham had 1,000 communicants. It was not only in the chapels that a low salary and heavy burden made livings unattractive. Although the vicarage of Blackburn was worth £50 a year, it was situated in a market town and was responsible for a congregation estimated at 4,000 people. The Committee for Plundered Ministers was concerned '[tha]t in regard of the greatness of the charge & the smallness of the meanes there... no minister would accept therof', and so added £50 a year to the vicar's income.[28]

Certainly the Committee for Plundered Ministers was sensitive to the poverty of numerous ministers, with many of the grants of augmentations noting that the minister in question received little or no fixed maintenance. This desire of the Committee to '[concern] itself... with the value of the living in relation to its pastoral responsibilities' was also found by O'Day and Hughes in their study of Derbyshire and Warwickshire. The augmentation of woefully poor livings was a guiding principle of the Committee, and it was strikingly successful, particularly in Lancashire. O'Day and Hughes found that the Committee augmented three-quarters of the Derbyshire livings worth less than £10, although only a third of Derbyshire livings valued between £11 and £20 were

augmented.[29] In Lancashire, seventy-five of 101 livings (74.3 per cent) with an income of £10 or less received augmentations, whilst eighteen of twenty-six livings (69.2 per cent) valued between £11 and £20 were also augmented. The figure is still remarkably high for livings worth between £21 and £50, ten from fifteen (66.7 per cent) of these benefices being augmented. The preference to deal first with the poorest livings explains why some livings were never improved, as many of those that did not receive an augmentation were not in need of one. In total, only eight of the thirty-four Lancashire benefices with revenues of £50 or more received an augmentation.

[Insert Figures 1 and 2 here]

Claire Cross suggested that ‘a Commonwealth parish minister could hope to obtain grants to bring his annual income to about £100 a year’.[30] This was optimistic, and in Lancashire only eight of the forty-four parish ministers not already in receipt of £100 or more had their income raised to this level, although several fell not far short. Nevertheless, the income of the parish clergy was improved. If seventeen parish ministers had been in receipt of £40 or less in 1641, only seven parish ministers were earning less than £50 a year by the time of the Commonwealth, although these still included desperately poor livings, such as Pennington, with just £12, and Tunstall, with £15.[31] If an income of £100 for parish ministers is optimistic, an income of £50 for many of the curates in the chapels seems plausible. Before the wars, the only chapel with a living worth £50 was Rivington, whilst fifty-one curates had an income of £15 or below. By 1650, the value of the livings of sixty-one chapels were worth £50 or more; some large chapelries, such as Liverpool and Oldham, were worth £90 or more, more than many parish ministers received! Of course, many chapels were not augmented, due to some extent to vacancies. Even so, the average salary of a curate at a Lancashire chapel was raised to almost £39 10s. by 1650.[32]

The Committee were committed to the extension of the propagation of the gospel. In granting augmentations, the Committee envisaged a scheme to plant a preaching ministry, often stipulating that they should be ‘for the maintenance of an able preaching Minister’.[33] Equally, augmentations were withheld from ministers judged to be unfit. Robert Dewhurst of Newchurch-in-Rosendale never received an augmentation, because complaints of ‘sev[er]all grosse scandals’ had been forwarded to the Committee for Plundered Ministers.[34] It also supported the creation of

lectureships within market towns. In 1599, four Queen's Preacherships were created in Lancashire, 'for the reclaiming of obstinate recusants... [and] for the needful instruction of the simple and ignorant in the knowledge of their duties to god and her Majesty'. The Committee for Plundered Ministers may have had this scheme in mind when it created extra lectureships in Blackburn and Preston, and Jeremy Marsden was given an augmentation of £100 in November 1651 to preach throughout the parish of Whalley. As with the King's Preachers, these new posts 'were placed, and actually resided, or should have resided, in a neighbourhood where Catholics abounded'.[35]

In 1650, thirty-eight of Lancashire's benefices were vacant, and the drastically low value of clerical salaries within the county was largely to blame. The Committee used augmentations to make vacant livings more attractive, in an effort to fill them. The scarcity of records makes it impossible to gauge accurately how many augmentations were awarded to vacant benefices. However, the Committee for Plundered Ministers made twenty-eight augmentations 'for such minister as this Committee shall approve off', suggesting that the benefice in question was vacant.[36] The Committee was also concerned to ensure that existing incumbents did not leave for want of adequate maintenance. Thus, even before 1649, it began a policy of increasing existing augmentations, often from £40 to £50. The policy was extended to encourage the building or repair of chapels. An augmentation was promised in 1645 to the chapel of Lund when it 'shall be re-edified', and the rebuilding was completed by 1648. An augmentation of £50 was awarded in December 1649 to the minister appointed to the chapel of Elswicke, 'lately... erected', although William Bell had to wait almost a year until he received his first payment in November 1650.[37]

Where the system suffered problems was the lack of organisation or of a clear, national plan. Although administered by a national body, augmentations continued to be funded entirely from local resources, explaining the very evident disparity between different regions' experiences of the Committee's work. In essence, the Committee presided over a number of county-based schemes of augmentation, each of which reallocated local surplus sequestered ecclesiastical revenues to the benefit of locally approved ministers, often in response to the initiative of interested local parties, either parishioners or ministers. Thus, when the Committee decided in July 1649 to increase the augmentation of John Wigan of Birch because his current grant was in 'noe way responsible to... the great paines by him taken in the worke of the ministry', it was because Wigan himself had informed them by petition of those very 'great paines'.

Similarly, the Committee was reliant upon the parties concerned to inform them of problems, such as when Christopher Hudson of Cartmel complained that he could not receive his new stipend because his tithes were being withheld by local parishioners. This shortfall is most evident, however, in the difficulties experienced by those in receipt of augmentations that failed, often because the intended revenues had already been awarded to other ministers or had been discharged from sequestration. That this was the case should not surprise us, given that there was no comprehensive account of ecclesiastical resources until the great church survey of 1650. Yet, as O'Day and Hughes have pointed out, we should not try to apply modern ideals to early modern administrators. 'The system in operation did not appear by seventeenth-century standards to be malfunctioning at all... Seventeenth-century bureaucrats had no twentieth-century ideal of the virtues of administrative centralization to live up to; no twentieth-century model to measure themselves against.'^[38]

It was the lack of an accurate idea of the funds available to it that led the Committee to seek to allocate augmentations exclusively from local resources. O'Day and Hughes argued that, rather than a negative form of localism, this instead represented a reasonable response to 'the absence of a centralized and efficient bureaucracy of its own', which would have made it 'impossible either to collect the necessary information about available revenue on a national scale or to ensure the collection of those revenues, transferral to a central fund, or payment'.^[39] Whilst this policy resulted in an inefficient use of the available resources, ensuring that the Committee failed to augment all poor livings, the delegation of augmentations to the local sequestration agents made the system more effective, and left the Committee with the responsibility of simply overseeing and directing these local bodies. A greater fault was the Committee's failure ever to survey fully the revenues available to it, resulting in the allocation of too many augmentations from too few resources, causing chaos and deprivation to the Lancashire ministers. Further confusion was added as delinquents and recusants died or compounded for their estates, reducing the total revenues available, and discharging many augmentations. Overall, twenty-nine orders to reallocate existing augmentations from new funds were made in Lancashire, although some augmentations needed to be dealt with more than once.

Unsurprisingly, therefore, where possible the Committee would grant augmentations from the resources of the mother parish. Fifty-seven of the 104 (54.8 per cent) Lancashire augmentations were drawn from revenues arising within the same parish,

a situation parallel to that found in Derbyshire and Warwickshire. The remainder of Lancashire's augmentations were drawn from a small number of sources, placing a heavy financial burden upon a few rich sequestered rectories (Table 2). The data demonstrate the strain that was placed upon the five rectories of Poulton, Kirkham, Childwall, Ormskirk and Melling, which would be the main source of augmentations in the county, supporting forty-two augmentations, although this figure includes fourteen churches and chapels within those parishes. The pressure placed on these five rectories was clearly too much, yet this was not the end of their burden. Nine of the twenty-nine augmentations allocated a new source of revenue were to receive money from one of these five parishes, whilst another four augmentations were also partly funded from at least one of them. Under the Republic, the cracks that had already begun to appear became fissures. It appears that the Committee had only a vague idea of what resources were available, and this led to the overcharging of some resources, particularly the tithes of Kirkham and Poulton. In March 1649 the Committee had to replace a £50 augmentation granted from the Kirkham tithes to Richard Briggs of Longton with an award from other sources, the former being 'otherwise disposed of'. Henry Morris of Burnley's augmentation from the Kirkham tithes was replaced in December 1651, because 'this Com[mit]tee had before granted [th]e whole p[ro]fitts of the said rectory to several other ministers'.^[40] Eleven more augmentations awarded from these five main rectories would be discharged and replaced between 1649 and 1653. In all, fifty-seven augmentations were made from the sequestered tithes of Poulton and Bispham, Kirkham, Childwall, Ormskirk and Melling, of which fifteen became void.

[Insert Table 2 here]

The discharge of sequestered tithes was another aspect of the problem of basing so many augmentations on so few resources.^[41] The death of Sir Thomas Tyldesley of Myerscough, killed during the Scottish invasion of August 1651, was particularly disruptive. Tyldesley had rented part of the tithes of Kirkham, whilst he was also an impropiator of part of the tithes of Poulton. The sequestration of Tyldesley's estates ceased with his decease, necessitating the regranteeing of several augmentations. The £50 augmentation to the minister of Bispham from the Poulton tithes was reported to have 'now become fruitless', and so a new grant of £51 was made from a variety of sources. Another three augmentations originally granted from Tyldesley's Poulton tithes were

redistributed in 1652.[42] This loss through composition or death of several sources of augmentations forced the Committee to combine a variety of smaller revenues together. Indeed, the paucity of the resources available to the Commonwealth after 1651 is striking, with eleven of the sixteen augmentations made in 1652 drawn from a variety of small revenues.

Despite the evident confusion, many augmentations were paid regularly and on time, making the Commonwealth period perhaps a golden age for the ministry in Lancashire, and there are records for the payment of fifty-three augmentations between January 1650 and March 1653, although the sums involved varied greatly.[43] In total, during this three-year period, at least nineteen ministers received payments equivalent to the full value of their augmentation for at least two years and another twenty received between one and two years' full value of their augmentation. Even those who are recorded as having been paid less than a full year's value of their augmentation still often received at least a full quarter's pay. This compares well with Warwickshire, where only two of sixteen ministers were recorded as receiving more than half of their augmentation over three years, and six received less than 10 per cent.[44]

Sequestration could clearly only be a short-term solution to the problem of financing the ministry. The estates, which could not remain under sequestration for longer than the duration of the delinquents' lives, could be released from sequestration by the payment of a composition fine. The new authorities sought to introduce a more permanent settlement by purchasing impropriated tithes from sequestered Royalists, who had £100 deducted from their composition fine for each £10 a year that they settled upon a minister.[45] Thus, when Edmund Assheton of Chadderton endowed Oldham with £100 a year and Shaw with another £40 a year, his composition fine of £1414 was wholly remitted. This proved popular, enabling Royalists to escape sequestration without having to raise large sums of capital for a fine, whilst permanently providing maintenance for individual ministers (a goal which need not have been opposed by the Royalists themselves), and thirteen such arrangements were made in Lancashire. Most notably, Sir Henry Compton settled £100 a year each upon the churches of Caton and Bolton-le-Sands, £50 a year upon Over Kellet, £30 on the minister at Over Wyresdale, and £16 13s. 4d. upon the chapel of Overton.[46]

However effectively the system worked under the Commonwealth, it was thrown into a state of utter confusion in 1653 with Cromwell's ejection of the Long Parliament, which simultaneously dissolved the Committee for Plundered Ministers and left many

augmentations in limbo. The short life of the Barebones Parliament further delayed any settlement of the finances of the Church. It was not until September 1654 that an ordinance was enacted, granting to the Trustees for the Maintenance of Ministers all of the powers of the former Committee for Plundered Ministers.[47] The Trustees began by instituting a thorough review of the resources available to them, and the state of the augmentations entrusted to them. Hughes and O'Day have highlighted the importance of the Trustees' possession of the 1650 Church Survey, which provided them with 'more exact information on the character of ministers, the value of livings and the revenue available'.[48] The Survey had been instituted by the Rump in June 1649, on the original appointment of the Trustees, to aid them in ascertaining which ministers were the neediest.[49] Commissions were set up to enquire into 'the true yearly value of all Parsonages and Vicarages presentative, and of all other Spiritual and Ecclesiastical Benefices and Livings, unto which any cure of Souls is attached'. The commissioners were also to evaluate the abilities of individual ministers, and to assess the need to reorganise the existing parochial structure, considering the merger or division of existing parishes.[50] The Survey provides a detailed picture of the state of the Church in June 1650, the month in which the commissioners finally called before them jurors drawn from each of the county's parishes. It assessed the revenues of every benefice, revealed the shocking number of vacancies at that time, and passed judgement upon the qualities of many of the county's ministers. As such, we should remember that this was not a wholly impartial appraisal of the state of the Church; nevertheless, it provided the Trustees with a clearer picture of the overall situation than any central regime had had in over a century.

The Trustees quickly confirmed twelve of the thirteen settlements made by compounding delinquents, and replaced the thirteenth, at Overton, with an augmentation of a larger value.[51] To these, they added twelve augmentations to benefices that had not previously been in receipt of an award from the Committee for Plundered Ministers, including a grant of £40 for the minister serving at 'Manchester College', which was probably the recently erected Baptist congregation of John Wigan.[52] Of the ninety-one remaining augmentations awarded before 1654, the Trustees renewed just twenty-nine.[53] As Table 3 demonstrates, only one of these was increased in value, whilst another seven remained at their previous value; twenty-one augmentations decreased in value. The reductions could vary dramatically in their impact; four ministers had their augmentations reduced by £10, but £20 was more common. The minister at Birch saw

the previous arrangement of £102 reduced to the more realistic £40, whilst the £50 awards made to ministers at Billinge and Hindley were both reduced to £10. However, we must beware of painting an overly simplistic picture. For instance, some of these new arrangements were not introduced until long after 1654, implying a complete cessation of payments in the intervening years. Poulton-le-Fylde's reduced augmentation of £30 was only awarded in 1660, whilst several renewals were only made in 1659; one suspects that the ministers in question never saw the fruits of these new arrangements.

[Insert Table 3 here]

The Lancashire sequestration accounts are much less regular for this period, and thus it is harder to calculate how effective these augmentations were. An account book of 1655 and 1656 notes payments to eleven ministers, but the records are confused.[54] It is difficult to identify some of the ministers, or to connect them to their livings. It is also not clear what sums are being paid, as they appear to be augmentations not listed in the orders of the Trustees. What is clear, however, is that these were all substantial sums, with no minister being paid less than £36 14s. 11d.; William Armistead was paid £98 10s. 8d., whilst Michael Briscoe might have received as much as £111 5s.[55] The accounts of the Trustees themselves are also extant for the year 1657, and they record the payment of eight compositions made by royalists, and twenty-one augmentations, representing slightly more than half (51.2 per cent) of the awards made by the Trustees.[56] Twenty-two of these payments are for the full value owed to the minister, whilst the remainder are all for at least half of the money due. Only three are noted as having been in arrears. Of these thirty payments, only Michael Briscoe, who held more than one augmentation, also received payments from the sequestration agents during the same period. In total, augmentations were paid to forty ministers between March 1655 and December 1657, often for much if not all of the value granted to them. Whilst the financial base of clerical augmentations had shrunk during the Protectorate, this enabled the Trustees to honour their awards much more effectively than had been the case before, ensuring a much more secure situation to those awarded augmentations.

Ultimately, the effort to improve clerical livings within Lancashire during the 1640s and 1650s, fraught with problems throughout, was only partially successful. The policy of buying inappropriate tithes through the composition of delinquents, whereby

significant sums were permanently settled upon ministers by lay rectors, would have greatly improved the situation. Not only did it seek to provide for ministers from the tithes of their own parish, it also took the burden of supporting the ministry away from the State and returned that responsibility to the lay rector. Indeed, it should be understood as reversing a significant problem that had originally been created during the Reformation, returning ecclesiastical revenues to the support of the Church. Yet it was a policy used too rarely to make a great impact. Only thirteen benefices had improved stipends permanently settled upon them as part of the composition of delinquents for their sequestered estates. The remainder of the livings in the county continued to be augmented from sequestered revenues. This proved a shaky business, for whilst the payment of endowments settled by indenture continued at least as long as the republican regime existed, the State often found itself unable to ensure the payment of other augmentations. No thought was given to the consideration that sequestered estates were a dwindling source of revenue, and there was no permanent plan for the augmentation of clerical livings. Over-reliance on too few sequestered rectories caused major problems when those rectories were removed from sequestration. The transience of this measure was demonstrated in 1660, when the whole system collapsed, and clerical livings reverted to their pre-war levels.

It would be unfair to say that the various regimes of the 1640s and 1650s failed to recognise this problem, however. The 1650 Church Survey demonstrates that there was an intention thoroughly to reform England's parochial structure, remoulding the country's existing approximately 9,000 ancient parishes into a more manageable and equitable system. The commissioners were to enquire 'how parishe Churches and Chappells are scituate and fitt to be vnited', 'what Chappells are fitt to be taken from parishe Churches and annexed to others or made parish Churches' and 'where it is fitt for other Churches to be built and the parishes devided and part of them appropriated to those new built Churches'.^[57] The scheme would have necessitated the erection of twenty-eight new buildings, many of which would have been new parish churches, and the relocation of some existing buildings. The jurors' recommendations would have divided Lancashire's existing sixty-two parishes into at least 185 parishes (Table 4). The least affected area was the large hundred of Lonsdale, which already had the most parishes in the county, and Lancaster would have been left as the largest parish in the county, despite the proposed separation of the chapels of Overton, Gressingham and Stalmine. The jurors' suggestions would have had the most dramatic impact in the

hundred of Blackburn, where the five ancient parishes would have been divided into twenty-eight new parishes. The huge parish of Whalley was to be divided into sixteen smaller parishes, whilst Blackburn would be separated into eight new parishes. In Amounderness, the jurors would have replaced the existing five parishes with twenty-two new ones, whilst the fifteen parishes of West Derby hundred and the twelve parishes of Salford hundred would have both been divided into forty-three parishes. In Leyland hundred, the seven existing parishes would have been replaced by seventeen parishes.

[Insert Table 4 here]

Despite some delay in acting upon these recommendations, partly due to the repeated upheavals in central government and partly as a result of the resistance of interested local parties, by 1659 at least four new parishes had been created in Lancashire, whilst the process was under way to create twenty-nine further new parishes when the system collapsed in 1660. Although the recommendations would not have led to a great many more churches than already existed within the county, by creating a greater number of smaller parishes they would have greatly reduced the vast differences in wealth between the benefices in Lancashire. Furthermore, the divisions of these parishes represented a permanent reorganisation of settlement of the existing ecclesiastical revenues, and as such was intended to replace the transitory and temporary system of augmentations.

Ultimately, the various regimes of the mid seventeenth century suffered from a lack of imagination, and a desperate need for cash. Whilst the quest to improve ministerial livings and promote a preaching ministry had been a long-term goal of many Parliamentarians, the central government was unable – or unwilling – to commit anything other than ecclesiastical revenues towards the augmentation of clerical wages. Land acquired by the abolition of both the monarchy and episcopacy might also have been dedicated to church reform, but instead was used to raise ready cash. The Commonwealth should be viewed in much the same way as Henry VIII, both having seized great portions of ecclesiastical land and then sold it to finance military adventures.

Nevertheless, the augmentation of benefices in Lancashire should not be accounted a failure. Whilst Andrew Coleby found that in Hampshire ‘under the Rump, central government had little impact on the quality of the local ministry’, Lancashire produces a very different picture. The evidence suggests that many of the county's

poorest livings were supplemented with sizeable augmentations, and a greater number of churches and chapels were served on a more regular basis than had been the case since at least the dissolution of the monasteries. Whilst it might be true that 'bodies like the Council of State were far more interested in the political loyalty of ministers than anything else', the provision of a more numerous and better rewarded clergy was a policy that was pursued with at least some success in Lancashire.[58] Many of the parochial chapels of the county, particularly those in the most remote areas, found themselves during the Interregnum with an incumbent for the first time in years. Although some gross inequalities remained between the richest and poorest benefices in the county, the majority of the most deprived livings had their revenues significantly increased by the awards of augmentations. The augmentations of clerical livings in the 1640s and 1650s thus represent the greatest improvement to the condition of the clergy until the advent of Queen Anne's Bounty in the eighteenth century.

What I hope I have shown is that there was still a national Church, overseen by a central body responsible for the appointment and maintenance of the ministry. Historians have too often been distracted by the failure of the Presbyterians to enforce discipline and orthodoxy after 1649, and by the existence and toleration of various sects. However, if we draw our attention back from these disputes, it will become apparent that these denominational divisions disguise the fact that most of the parishes of England were still functioning as they always had done. The vast majority of English men and women continued to attend services at their local church, services that broadly conformed to a national liturgy, performed by ministers supported from State revenues. Instead of using the idea of a compulsory and doctrinally orthodox, universal Church as the yardstick of a successful national Church, we should recognise that England had a very different form of established Church in the 1650s, one very much made in the image of its creators. The fact that the ministers serving in England's parishes ranged from orthodox Presbyterians to Congregationalists to Baptists (and no doubt also included closet Anglicans) simply demonstrates that the Church in the 1650s reflected the concerns of many leading Parliamentarians for substance over form, and a willingness to support 'godliness' in its many guises. Ultimately, this project suffered because of the failure of any of the mid seventeenth-century regimes to achieve longevity; had Cromwell lived longer, or had the Protectorate survived him, the process of dividing England's parishes to create a better funded ministry might well have proved a success.

[1] Christopher Durston, 'The failure of cultural revolution, 1645-1660', in *The Culture of English Puritanism 1560-1700*, ed. Christopher Durston and Jacquelin Eales (Basingstoke, 1996), pp. 210-33; Keith Wrightson, 'The Puritan reformation of manners with special reference to the counties of Lancashire and Essex, 1640-1660' (unpub. Ph. D. thesis, Univ. Cambridge, 1974); idem., 'Two concepts of order: justices, constables and jurymen in seventeenth-century England', in *An Ungovernable People: The English and Their Law in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, ed. John Brewer and John Styles (1980), pp. 21-46;

Ronald Hutton, *The Rise and Fall of Merry England: The Ritual Year, 1400-1700* (Oxford, 1994); Christopher Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals: Godly Government during the English Revolution* (Manchester, 2001); Christopher Hill, *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England* (1962); idem., *Puritanism and Revolution* (1958); idem., *The World Turned Upside Down* (1972); A. L. Morton, *The World of the Ranters* (1970); *Radical Religion in the English Revolution*, ed. Barry Reay and J. F. McGregor (Oxford, 1984). The recent collection of essays edited by Christopher Durston and Judith Maltby seeks to redress this situation, however: *Religion in Revolutionary England*, ed. Christopher Durston and Judith Maltby (Manchester, 2006).

[2] Judith Maltby, *Prayer Book and People in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England* (Cambridge, 1998), idem., “‘The Good Old Way’: Prayer Book Protestantism in the 1640s and 1650s”, *Studies in Church History*, xxxviii (2004), 233-56; John Morrill, ‘The Church of England, 1643-1649’, in *Reactions to the English Civil War*, ed. John Morrill (Basingstoke, 1982).

[3] Christopher Hill, *Economic Problems of the Church: From Archbishop Whitgift to the Long Parliament* (Oxford, 1956); *Continuity and Change: Personnel and Administration in the English Church 1500-1642*, ed. Rosemary O’Day and Felicity Heal (Leicester, 1976); *The Church and Society, Henry VIII to James I*, ed. Rosemary O’Day and Felicity Heal (Leicester, 1977). Rosemary O’Day, *The English Clergy: Emergence and Consolidation of a Profession, 1558-1642* (Leicester, 1979).

[4] *A Directory for the Publique Worship of God Throughout the Three Kingdoms of England, Ireland and Scotland, Together with an Ordinance of Parliament for the taking away of the Book of Common Prayer and for establishing and observing this present Directory throughout the Kingdom of England and Dominion of Wales*, (1645).

[5] Morrill, in Morrill, *Reactions to the English Civil War*, p. 90.

[6] Claire Cross, ‘The Church in England 1646-1660’, in *The Interregnum*, ed. G E Aylmer (Basingstoke, 1972), p. 99. However, more recent work has tended to reject this pessimistic interpretation. See Ann Hughes’s recent study of the national Church during the 1650s: Ann Hughes, “‘The Public Profession of These Nations’: the National Church in Interregnum England”, in Durston and Maltby, *Religion in Revolutionary England*, pp. 93-114. I am grateful to Prof. Hughes for allowing me to see a copy of her chapter before publication. See also Jeffrey Collins, ‘The Church Settlement of Oliver Cromwell’, *History*, lxxxvii (2002), 18-40.

[7] W. A. Shaw, *A History of the English Church During the Civil Wars and Under the Commonwealth 1640-1660*, 2 vols (1900), II, 185-97. Despite its inadequacies, this is still

the most comprehensive account of the various experiments attempted in Church government by the successive regimes of the 1640s and 1650s.

[8] Shaw, *History of the English Church*, II, 204-15; *Acts & Ordinances of the Interregnum* [hereafter *A&O*], ed. C. H. Firth and R. S. Rait, 3 vols (1911), II, 142-48; *Lancashire and Cheshire Commonwealth Church Surveys*, ed. Henry Fishwick, Record Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, I, (1879) [hereafter *Church Survey*], xviii-xix; *C[ommons] J[ournals]*, VI, 226-27.

[9] National Archives: Public Record Office, C47/21/15, 17-19, C94/1-3; Lambeth Palace Library, COMM/12A-C.

[10] Shaw, *History of the English Church*, II, 185-93; Rosemary O'Day and Ann Hughes, 'Augmentation and Amalgamation: was there a systematic approach to the reform of parochial finance, 1640-60?', in *Princes and Paupers in the English Church, 1500-1800*, ed. Rosemary O'Day and Felicity Heal (Leicester, 1981), p. 167.

[11] J. E. C. Hill, 'Puritans and "the dark corners of the land"', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th ser., XIII (1963), 77-102; Ernest Axon, 'The King's Preachers in Lancashire, 1599-1845', *Transactions of the Lancashire and Cheshire Antiquarian Society*, LVI (1941-2), 67-89.

[12] Hill, *Economic Problems of the Church*, pp. 54, 69-70.

[13] *Victoria History of the County of Lancaster*, ed. William Farrer, 8 vols (1906-14) [hereafter *VCH Lancashire*], VI, 349; Michael Mullett, 'The Reformation in the parish of Whalley', in *The Lancashire Witches: Histories and Stories*, ed. Robert Poole (Manchester, 2002), pp. 88-104; B G Blackwood, *The Lancashire Gentry and the Great Rebellion 1640-60*, Chetham Society, 3rd ser., xxv (1978), 3. In his edition of the 1650 Commonwealth Church Survey, Henry Fishwick counted sixty-four parishes. He included in this list, however, Newchurch-in-Culcheth chapel (Winwick parish), Horwich chapel (Deane parish), and Oldham chapel (Prestwich parish, although often treated as if it was a separate parish in its own right), whilst he excluded the ancient parish of Brindle (listed as a chapel): *Church Survey*, pp. xx-xxv.

[14] Haigh, *Reformation and Resistance* (Cambridge, 1975), pp. 22-30.

[15] The seventeen rectories were Aldingham (£140), Ashton-under-Lyne (£113), Bury (£162), Croston (£349), Eccleston (£115), Halsall (£169), Heysham (£100), Lancaster (£280), Middleton (£232), Prestwich (£120), Rochdale (£160), Sefton (£248), Standish (£199), Walton-on-the-Hill (£192), Whittington (£137), Wigan (£417) and Winwick (£660). The Warden and four Fellows of the Collegiate Church of Manchester shared £550 between themselves; the tithes of the rectory of Aughton were worth £97. *Church*

Survey, pp. 4-5, 14-16, 19, 21-27, 38-42, 46-47, 59-60, 81-88, 94-95, 97-101, 108-17, 122, 125-28, 131, 133-34.

[16] The sixteen parishes were Bolton-le-Sands (£20), Chipping (£10), Dalton-in-Furness (£17 6s. 8d.), Deane (£10 13s. 4d.), Eccles (£18), Flixton (£20), Hawkshead (£20), Huyton (£10), Kirkby Ireleth (£13 10s.), Leigh (£16 14s. 8d.), Pennington (£12), Ribchester (£20), Tunstall (£15), Ulverston (£10), Urswick (£20) and Warton (£20). *Church Survey*, pp. 13-14, 16-17, 36-38, 55, 75, 118-19, 121, 129-30, 133, 135-41, 169-70.

[17] *Church Survey*, pp. 13-14, 37, 51, 78; Hill, *Economic Problems of the Church*, pp 140-41; *VCH Lancashire*, III, 417.

[18] R C Richardson, *Puritanism in North-West England* (Manchester, 1972), p. 3; Hill, *Economic Problems of the Church*, p. 113

[19] *Church Survey*, pp. xx-xxv.

[20] Because some churches were served by more than one minister, and because some ministers received more than one augmentation, it is easiest to talk of numbers of augmentations made rather than numbers of ministers or churches in receipt of augmentations.

[21] The eight sequestered benefices were Brindle, Bury, Garstang, Halsall, Lancaster, Sefton, Walton-on-the-Hill (rectory) and Wigan. Wigan had been held by the Bishop of Chester, whilst Bury and Halsall, and Garstang and Lancaster, had been held by pluralists, although the incumbents were sequestered for delinquency. [*Minutes of the*] C[ommittee for the Relief of] P[lundered] M[inisters], ed. W. A. Shaw, 2 vols, RSLC, XXVIII & XXXIV (1893 & 1897), I, 1-5, 7, 12, 41-42, 46. The original manuscripts of these minutes are spread between Lambeth Palace, the British Library, the Bodleian Library, and the PRO: Lambeth Palace Library, Commonwealth Records; British Library, Add. MSS. 15,669-71; Bodleian Library, Bodley MSS. 322-29; NA: PRO, SP22.

[22] The tithes were redistributed within the parishes of Bury, Halsall, Sefton, Walton, Wigan and, oddly, Winwick. Winwick was never sequestered, the resident rector, Charles Herle, being a respected member of the Westminster Assembly. Nevertheless, a settlement was made for the three chapels within the parish, although a new settlement had to be made for Newchurch-in-Culcheth shortly afterwards. Therefore, the latter will be treated as an augmentation of a fixed value for the remainder of this essay. *CPM*, I, 1-8, 10, 41-42.

[23] *CPM*, I, 9-10.

[24] *CPM*, I, 23, 44, 58, 106-07. The award made to Ormskirk has been treated as a single augmentation of £90. Although originally a grant of £50 for the minister and £40 for an assistant, the Vicar had undertaken the extra services himself, and so was awarded the full sum; *CPM*, I, 25, 122. The five awards also include a grant of £64 to the ‘severall chappells of Baley and Chageley’; *CPM*, I, 40. There was no chapel at Chaigley, whilst Bailey chapel had fallen into disuse in the sixteenth century; *VCH Lancashire*, VII, 19.

[25] *CPM*, I, 17, 37-38.

[26] *CPM*, I, 69, 106; *CPM*, II, 20.

[27] *CPM*, I, 72-74, 120-21.

[28] *CPM*, I, 69-70, 87-89, 92.

[29] O’Day and Hughes, in O’Day and Heal, *Princes and Paupers*, pp. 173-74.

[30] Cross, in Aylmer, *Interregnum*, p. 104.

[31] *Church Survey*, pp. 118-19, 133.

[32] This figure includes £330 divided between the nine incumbents of the chapels of Manchester, an accommodation which appears to have been formalised in 1654. It does not include the incomes at Chorlton, Didsbury and Walmsley, all of which listed lump sums held in stock in the 1650 church survey, rather than an annual payment of interest, a fixed stipend or voluntary contributions from the parishioners.

[33] For example, *CPM*, I, 32.

[34] *CPM*, I, 47-48; *Church Survey*, p. 168.

[35] *CPM*, I, 86, 96, 106-07, 116; *VCH Lancashire*, vi, 360; Axon, *TLCAS*, LVI, 70.

[36] *CPM*, I, 1, 4, 8, 10, 13, 15, 18-19, 24, 32, 39-40, 49, 83-84, 252; *VCH Lancashire*, VI, 318.

[37] The augmentation for Lund was increased to £50 in December 1650. *CPM*, I, 9, 62, 83-84, 88-89, 94, 102-03; *Church Survey*, p. 148.

[38] *CPM*, I, 75-80, 259; O’Day and Hughes, in O’Day and Heal, *Princes and Paupers*, pp. 172-73, 187.

[39] O’Day and Hughes, in O’Day and Heal, *Princes and Paupers*, pp. 174-75.

[40] *CPM*, I, 68, 109.

[41] *CPM*, I, 74, 102, 108.

[42] *CPM*, I, 110, 113-14, 116, 124. The other three augmentations were Haslingden, Walmsley and the lectureship at Blackburn.

[43] NA: PRO, SP28/211; SP28/305-7. The county sequestration accounts record payments to sixty-five ‘livings’, including payments for lectures at Blackburn and Preston.

In January 1651, the stipend of the vicar of Bolton was paid from the sequestered estate of the lay rector, Christopher Anderton. Payments amounting to £4 10s. 1d. are also recorded to a Thomas Cudworth for officiating at Manchester College in the summer of 1650. These have been discounted, because they are not augmentations. NA: PRO, SP28/211/ fols 282, 916.

[44] O'Day and Hughes, in O'Day and Heal, *Princes and Paupers*, p. 177.

[45] Shaw, *History of the English Church*, II, 185-93, 199-202.

[46] *Royalist Composition Papers*, ed. J H Stanning and John Brownbill, 6 vols, RSLC, XXIV, XXVI, XXXVI, LXXII, LXXXXV & LXXXXVI (1891-2, 1898, 1916, 1941-2), I, 92, II, 74, III, 44, 132-33, 164, IV, 88; *Calendar of the Committee of Compounding*, pp. 1602-03, 1783; Lancashire Record Office, DDM/19/37-8, DDCa/8/19-20.

[47] *A & O*, II, 1000-1006; Shaw, *History of the Church*, II, 230.

[48] O'Day and Hughes, in O'Day and Heal, *Princes and Paupers*, p. 181.

[49] *A & O*, II, 142-48; *Church Survey*, pp. xviii-xix; *CJ*, VI, 359.

[50] *A & O*, II, 147.

[51] After protracted proceedings, the Trustees ultimately ordered Sir Richard Kirby to pay the arrears of the settlement he had made for the minister at Hawkshead. Although this was later reduced, when the chapel of Colton was raised to the status of a parish, it seems likely that the ministers never received the benefit of this award: LRO, DDSa/32/3; *VCH Lancashire*, VIII, 374; *RCP*, II, 161, 206-07, 234, 311. An abatement in the value of the rents of Bolton-le-Sands rectory led to a reduction in the augmentations at that church and at the chapel of Over Kellet; *CPM*, II, 143-44. It is not clear, but it seems that the settlement of £60 made by Sir George Middleton to the minister at Warton was continued after the expiry of his lease of the moiety of that rectory. The rectory, which had been held by the dean and chapter of Worcester, reverted back to the Trustees, who, in December 1654, granted the incumbent £40 from the small tithes of the parish. No continuation of the previous augmentation was mentioned, but an account of December 1657 noted that the minister of Warton was due both £40 from the small tithes and an augmentation of £60; *CPM*, II, 57, 225, 288; *VCH Lancashire*, VIII, 155, 157.

[52] The new grants were for Chorlton, Deane, Downham, Heapey, Longridge, Manchester College, Newton, Salford, Stretford, Silverdale and Whalley, and for Richard Hollinworth, a Fellow of Manchester's Collegiate Church.

[53] These ninety-one augmentations are the 104 augmentations made for fixed sums between 1645 and 1653, less the thirteen augmentations that were replaced by permanent settlements at the composition of delinquents.

[54] NA: PRO, SP28/211/ fols 221v-23. There are actually two lists of payments, each to ten ministers, with some differences both in the men named and the sums paid. The first list of payments purports to be for 'a yeare and a halfe ended 29th Sep 1656', whilst the second was made during an examination of the accounts in 1660, and represents the last half of 1655 and the whole of 1656. Assuming that the later ended on 24 Mar. 1657, this second list would cover the period from September 1655 until March 1657, whilst the first list covered March 1655 until September 1656. This would explain the discrepancies.

[55] NA: PRO, SP28/211/ fol. 221v states that Briscoe was paid £111 5s. between March 1655 and September 1656, whilst fol. 223 records that he was paid £97 5s. between September 1655 and March 1657.

[56] NA: PRO, SP28/290/ fol. 21v. The accounts record payments to Lancashire ministers by the Trustees between 25 Dec. 1656 and 25 Dec. 1657. There is also the payment of a £10 pension to the minister of Chipping.

[57] *Church Survey*, p. 2.

[58] Andrew Coleby, *Central Government and the Localities: Hampshire 1649-1689* (Cambridge, 1987), p. 58.

(9,504 words)