

The residences and revenues of the bishops of Chester in the Restoration era, 1660–1689¹

M. C. Freeman

By summer 1661, more than twelve months since the return of the king, the government of Charles II felt sufficiently secure to allow the bishops of the restored Church of England to go down to their dioceses. Bryan Walton, who had been nominated to the vacant see of Chester on 5 October 1660 and consecrated on 2 December, was fully aware of some of the practical problems he would face and set these out in three petitions to the king in July and August 1661 before setting off for the North West.² The first requested the removal of prisoners being held in the bishop's palace to the castle so that repairs to the palace could begin; the second asked for the vicarage of Croston to be given to the bishop and his successors on the demise of its elderly incumbent, James Hyatt. To justify this request, he gave further details about his needs as bishop. Officially, the income was reckoned by the Exchequer to be £420 1s 8d, though Walton admitted that there had been 'some Improvement' on this. Nevertheless, unavoidable annual expenditure was around £430, so it had always been the custom to allow the bishop to hold some other living *in commendam*. His own position was made worse by the ruinous

¹ This paper derives from part of my recent doctoral thesis on 'The Restoration episcopate: The example of the bishops of Chester'. I should acknowledge the support and advice of my supervisors, Dr J. Hollinshead and Dr J. Appleby of Liverpool Hope University, and the help of the staffs of the Public Record Office (now the National Archives), London, the Cheshire Record Office (now Chester and Cheshire Archives and Local Studies), Chester, and the Bodleian Library, Oxford.

² M. A. E. Green, ed., *Calendar of state papers domestic, 1661-1662* (London, 1861), pp. 49, 69.

condition of the palace, which required some £1,000-worth of repairs, and the fact that the king had ordered bishops to augment the stipends of the vicars or curates who cared for the parishes of which they held the impropriation, for it was only a slight exaggeration for Walton to say that his income as bishop of Chester consisted 'wholly of Improvements'. To make matters worse, he said, the dilapidated palace was his only official residence, but was located in one corner of a vast diocese where he would be inaccessible to many of his flock. Croston, by contrast, was 'seated near the middle of the Diocesse' from where he could better govern it and, according to the Exchequer's figures, would boost his annual income by £38 5s 10d.³ The third petition merely added that Croston would also make it easier for him to offer hospitality.

This second petition draws attention to most of the topics to be considered in this paper: the extent of the bishop's income, the ways it could be augmented and the demands upon it, the problems with the condition of the palace, the need for other residences and the impact of all this on the administration of the diocese.

Some of the most important evidence has long been available in print. Much detailed information is to be found in a survey of the endowments of the diocese, the cathedral chapter, and the collegiate church in Manchester begun under the commonwealth and completed in 1655. A transcript of this was the very first publication of the Lancashire and Cheshire Record Society. The notes on every aspect of the diocese and its history made in the reign of George I by Bishop Gastrell and known as the *Notitia Cestriensis* and the diary kept by Bishop Cartwright in 1686-87 were likewise among the earliest publications of the Chetham and Camden Societies respectively, while records of a case heard in the archbishop of York's Consistory Court about the repairs to the palace still outstanding on the death of Bishop Hall in 1668 have been transcribed in the *Journal of the Chester Archaeological and Historical Society*.⁴ However, there are also a

³ National Archives, London, SP 29/40. See Appendix 1.

⁴ H. Fishwick, ed., *Lancashire and Cheshire church surveys, 1649-1655*, Record Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, 1 (1879), pp. 171-223; F.

number of important documents relating directly to the Restoration period which remain in manuscript, principally in the collections at the Bodleian Library. Apart from passing references to financial issues in several of the bishops' letters, these include a couple of summaries of the bishop's income and a return of expenditure made in response to a questionnaire from Archbishop Sheldon.

From Walton's petition, it is clear that the most pressing problem was for the bishop to have a proper base within his diocese from which to work. The cathedral was the former abbey church of St Werburgh and the bishop's palace, extending from the western side of the cloisters and the north-west corner of the church along the south side of Abbey Court, had previously been the abbot's dwelling. The Chester historian Randle Holmes, writing at the end of the first civil war, bewailed the damage done to the city during the siege, including 'the destroying of the Bishop's palace, with stables in the barne yard, and the ruine of the great church'.⁵ To say that the palace had been destroyed by 1646 was an exaggeration, but at the very least it must have been suffering from neglect by the time it was sold off by the republican regime at the end of 1650 and was clearly in a poor state of repair by the time Walton regained possession of it in 1661.

Two years after Walton submitted his petition, it was reported to Archbishop Sheldon: 'In Bishop Waltons time about 600/ was spent in repayre of the Bishops Pallace, & Bishop Hall hath since expended on the same Pallace 300/, & is building still'. The same report went on to claim: 'Seaven hundred pounds will not put the Bishops Pallace into its Condition before the

Gastrell, (ed. F. R. Raines), *Notitia Cestriensis, or historical notes of the diocese of Chester*, Chetham Society, old ser. 19, 21, 22 (1849-50); J. Hunter, ed., *The diary of Dr Thomas Cartwright, bishop of Chester*, Camden Society, 22 (1843); *Journal of the Chester Archaeological and Historical Society*, new ser. 37 (1958), pp. 302-11.

⁵ D. M. Palliser, ed., *Chester: Contemporary descriptions by residents and visitors* (Chester, 1980), p. 15.

Rebellion, nor will 1000/ restore the Church, Deane & Prebendaries houses, to a comely & habitable State'.⁶

The repair of episcopal residences was a protracted business, and in many dioceses it caused ill-feeling and rancorous disputes when an incoming bishop felt that his predecessor had failed to do all that he could or should. The papers in the case brought by Bishop Wilkins against Bishop Hall's executors serve to confirm or amplify what can be known about the situation at Chester from other sources.

Several craftsmen gave their estimates for dealing with 'the [outstanding] dilapidacions and ruines which were about the Pallace' at the time of Hall's death in 1668 and these came to a total of £690 19s 0d, of which £85 10s 0d was for work on the stables. It seems that the part in worst condition was the area of the so-called Great and Green Halls, which adjoined the cloisters. The witnesses confirmed Randle Holmes's assertion that the stables had been demolished during the war (the garrison having used the timber for firewood) and tell how the lead had been stripped off the roofs during the interregnum. Materials and labour for recovering the roof of the Green Hall account for nearly half the estimated costs. Peter Stringer, who had been a chorister and lay clerk at the cathedral before the war and who was ordained and became a petty canon in 1662, gave a good deal of hearsay evidence. He believed Walton had spent £1,500, of which £500 had been donated by Sir Peter Venables, one of the wealthiest gentlemen in Cheshire. In view of the figures already quoted from the report to Sheldon, this is a considerable overestimate, but without Venables's contribution (which the report may have ignored as not coming out of the bishop's own pocket) matches the likely cost given in Walton's petition to the king. The story of the £500 gift is also related by the nonconformist Adam Martindale as one 'all the countrey was told'.⁷ Stringer went on to report the now deceased Gertrude Hall claiming her husband had spent over £500 on the palace. In the light of the 1663 statement

⁶ Bodleian Library, Oxford (Bodl.), Tanner Ms 144, ff. 13-14. See Appendix 3.

⁷ R. Parkinson, ed., *The life of Adam Martindale, written by himself*, Chetham Society, old ser. 4 (1845), p. 165.

that he had by then spent £300 and that work was still in progress, this figure seems quite reasonable. Indeed, one of the bricklayers employed at the palace during Hall's time reckoned what was then done must have cost at least £700, without allowing for the erection of new stables. The various workmen who gave evidence at the hearing had themselves received £339.

The protracted case ended on 30 May 1673, by which time Wilkins, too, was dead. It was decided that the damage was the result of the civil war and not of Hall's neglect, and that he and his successors were protected by the Act of Indemnity. Similar verdicts were reached in cases concerning the palaces of the bishops of Oxford and Winchester.⁸ In the Chester case, both sides had to meet their own legal costs, which must have been considerable. Taken all together, the evidence suggests that successive bishops must have spent around £2,000, four or five times their official income, before the palace was really in a satisfactory condition.

There is also evidence that the work carried out by Hall included some improvements. Whereas the old stables had been constructed of wood, Bishop Gastrell noted that

Brick stables were built by Bishop Hall upon Land belonging to [the] Dean and Chapter and were held by Lease of 21 years from them. A void piece of ground under the Walls being let to him to build on anno 1662 paying 6d. per annum rent.⁹

The hearth tax returns for 1664-65 show that he paid tax for seventeen hearths in the palace itself and that this was an increase of five compared to previous returns, so even if the roof still leaked, the palace was warmer than before. The same returns also refer to one hearth in 'the Lord Bishopp's garden house new built'.¹⁰ They also provide a rough standard of comparison with the occupants of other houses in Chester. No-one exceeded the

⁸ M. D. Chapman, *God's holy hill: A history of Christianity in Cuddesdon* (Charlebury, 2004), p. 74; I. M. Green, *The re-establishment of the Church of England, 1660-1663* (Oxford, 1978), p. 107.

⁹ Gastrell, *Notitia*, part 1, p. 35.

¹⁰ F. C. Beazley, ed., *Hearth tax returns for the city of Chester, 1664-65* (London, 1906), pp. 57, 60.

bishop's total of seventeen hearths, though two citizens equalled it. Altogether, ten people in Chester lived in houses grand enough to pay on ten or more hearths, including three knights or ladies, two aldermen, a colonel, the dean (Henry Bridgeman) and the chancellor of the diocese (John Wainwright). This would suggest that even though the bishop, when in residence, was a highly significant figure, he did not dominate the city, and, in fact, though he had inherited the former abbot's lodging, the various traditional rights of St Werburgh's Abbey, such as jurisdiction over the cathedral and its precincts, had descended to the dean and chapter. One consequence of this was that the bishops in this period seem to have had a relatively untroubled relationship with the civic authorities, in contrast to the dean, who was periodically in dispute with them. The city assembly accepted nominations from the bishop for people (usually his former servants) to be given the freedom of the city and only once challenged Pearson for, allegedly, erecting a new fence on their land, a dispute which appears to have been settled amicably.¹¹

Though only Pearson, who became bishop in 1673, and his successors may have enjoyed the palace in a good state of repair, it was not and never had been looked upon as ideal. Before the civil war, Bishop Bridgeman had regarded the smoke and fumes from the buildings on the north and west sides of Abbey Court, which were used as a brewery and bakery, as a threat to his health,¹² but, as Walton had pointed out when asking for the vicarage of Croston to be granted to himself and his successors, Chester was too remote from much of the diocese. Indeed, the need for a more accessible residence in Lancashire had long been recognized. As early as 1545 Bishop Bird had asked Henry VIII to

¹¹ On disputes, especially with Dean Arderne, *Historical manuscripts commission, eighth report* (London, 1881), p. 391; on grants of freedom, Chester and Cheshire Archives and Local Studies (CCALS), AB/2, ff. 138, 189, 196; on fencing, CCALS, AB/2, f. 197 and J. Addy, ed., *The diary of Henry Prescott, LL.B., deputy registrar of Chester diocese*, Record Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, 127, 132, 133 (1987-97), vol. 127, p. 246. The disputes in Arderne's time may have been exacerbated by political differences, the city authorities favouring the Whigs, while the dean was a staunch Tory.

¹² *Cheshire Sheaf*, 1st ser. 1 (1878), pp. 5, 9.

transfer 'the house, lands, and tithes' of Manchester Collegiate Church to the newly founded diocese in order to provide a more convenient administrative centre, and the Elizabethan bishop, William Chadderton, who held the wardenship of Manchester *in commendam*, tried unsuccessfully to have the arrangement made permanent.¹³ Immediately before the civil war, Bishop Bridgeman had similarly held the wealthy and conveniently placed rectory of Wigan, and no less a person than Archbishop Laud was trying, before he was swept from power, to purchase the advowson so that this link could be perpetuated. In the end, though, the advowson came into the hands of Lord Chief Justice Bridgeman, the former bishop's son, who presented Hall to the living when it fell vacant as a result of the Bartholomew-tide ejections, and established trustees who for the future were to present the 'Bishop of the said Bishoprick of Chester, or other persons as they in their judgements shall think fit'.¹⁴ In the event, they thought fit to appoint the successive bishops for the remainder of the seventeenth century.

If possession of Wigan did bring practical and financial benefits in the long term, Hall, at least, found that it also involved him in further expense, as two letters written in 1667 show. As rector, he was responsible for repairing the chancel of the parish church. It was, he said, 'ruinous', and the cost, following a robbery of which he had been the victim, 'seems a sufficient caveat against my growing rich'.¹⁵ Two of the witnesses in the court case about the repairs to the palace claimed 'that Bishop Hall was at a great deale of charges in repaires about the Parsonage in Wigan', and in a letter written from Wigan in April 1667 the bishop implied that the work had absorbed most of the benefice income for the past five years. Bridgeman's intention of annexing the living to the bishopric, he declared, 'hath been my encouragement to bury the

¹³ C. Haigh, 'Finance and administration in a new diocese: Chester, 1541-1641', in R. O'Day & F. Heal, eds, *Continuity and change: Personnel and administration in the Church of England, 1500-1642* (Leicester, 1976), pp. 152, 163.

¹⁴ G. T. O. Bridgeman, *A history of the church and manor of Wigan*, Chetham Society, new ser. 15-18 (1888-90) but with continuous pagination, p. 484; Bodl., Tanner Ms 144, f. 22.

¹⁵ Bodl., Additional Ms C305, f. 60.

revenue of it hitherto in rebuilding and making this place fit for a successor'.¹⁶ He must have succeeded in this, for Wilkins did not sue Hall's family for neglect of the house at Wigan, while Hall's own last surviving letter, written from Wigan two and a half weeks before his fatal accident, makes it clear that he much preferred living there to Chester.¹⁷

As rectors in Wigan, Hall and his successors enjoyed a greater local standing than they did as bishops in Chester, since they were also lords of the manor. This, though, could involve them in disputes with the town authorities similar to those of the dean and chapter with the city authorities. Lord Chief Justice Bridgeman was asked to arbitrate over these, and in an award made on 5 July 1664, placed restrictions on the rector's jurisdiction and compelled him to lease his annual fair and weekly markets to the corporation.¹⁸

A bishop, however, not only needed a home in his diocese. He had duties at court, in parliament and about government business that frequently required him to reside in London. The bishops of many of the wealthier and more ancient sees had official residences in the capital; those from the newer foundations did not. Unfortunately, far less information survives about this than about the living arrangements for Chester's bishops in the North West, so it is almost impossible to tell whether the lack of a permanent London house was, on balance, a disadvantage or not. Even Cartwright's diary is little direct help in this matter, and the great majority of the bishops' surviving letters, being sent to Sheldon or Sancroft, were written from Chester or Wigan, not from London addresses where they would have opportunities to speak to the archbishop face to face. An exception occurred in August 1667, when Hall wrote to Archbishop Sheldon from 'The Ship in Aldersgate Street' explaining how 'I could not conveniently wayt personally upon your Grace, as I would have done, being ingaged to preach in my old parish tomorrow'.¹⁹ Whether Hall regularly put up at 'The

¹⁶ Bodl., Additional Ms C305, f. 58.

¹⁷ Bodl., Additional Ms C305, f. 64.

¹⁸ Bridgeman, *History of Wigan*, pp. 486-93.

¹⁹ Bodl., Additional Ms C305, f. 62.

Ship' because he knew it from his time as lecturer at St Botolph's, Aldersgate, during the interregnum or just on this one occasion because it was handy for his preaching engagement, there is now no way of knowing. Perhaps the latter is more likely, as his only other surviving letter from London, written four years earlier, was sent from 'Captaine Strongs, Chappell Street, Westminster'.²⁰

A number of contemporaries recorded visits to Wilkins in London. Pepys went to see him on 18 October 1668, just three weeks after his nomination, at which time he was at Lincoln's Inn. In the following January, when the Manchester dissenter Henry Newcome called on him, he was in lodgings in Pall Mall. During his final illness, he was, apparently, staying at his son-in-law John Tillotson's house in Chancery Lane.²¹ Bishop Ferne had also been staying with relations at the time of his death in 1662.²² To lodge with relatives, if possible, would seem a natural solution to the problem, and Cartwright recorded one occasion, a week before his actual consecration, when he preached at Stepney and lodged the night before at his cousin Margaret's. This was clearly exceptional, however, for he does not usually bother to note where he passed the night. Most probably, Cartwright used a variety of rented lodgings, since on 12 April 1687 he noted, 'Dined at home with my sister Barnard, Mr Furnis and his son my landlord', while on the following 14 July he recorded, 'I ... took my leave of my old landlady in King Street'. Only in October 1687, when he was promoted to a place on the Ecclesiastical Commission, did Cartwright mention, 'I went and hired a house in Lincoln Square, and stables, for £2 10s per week'.²³ In the following September, a newsletter sent out to the English resident in Venice informed him that 'the Bishop of Chester has taken a great house in St

²⁰ CCALS, ML/3/390v. The identity of Captain Strong is uncertain.

²¹ R. Latham & W. Matthews, eds, *The diary of Samuel Pepys* (12 vols, London, 1970-83), vol. 9, p. 331; R. Parkinson, ed., *The autobiography of Henry Newcome, M.A.*, Chetham Society, old ser. 26-27 (1852), p. 179; A. Wood, (ed. P. Bliss), *Athenae Oxoniensis* (3rd edn, 4 vols, London, 1817), vol. 3, col. 970.

²² W. Kennet, *A register and chronicle ecclesiastical and civil* (London, 1728), p. 644.

²³ *Cartwright's diary*, pp. 4, 45, 67, 86.

James's'.²⁴ This must have been unusual if it was considered worth remarking on, and there is no evidence that anyone apart from Cartwright took such a step. With a greater involvement in government affairs than any of his predecessors (by 1688 he was even helping to recruit fishermen to serve in the navy)²⁵ Cartwright may have felt the need of a more substantial London base from which to work.

By the 1670s, then, the bishops of Chester had two permanent residences in a good state of repair, one located alongside their cathedral, registry and consistory court, the other more accessible to much though not all of their diocese. Until the final year of Cartwright's episcopate they were, apparently, spared the expense of maintaining a house in London, but there does not appear to have been any other regular arrangement for their accommodation when they were required to be there. Arranging for lodgings must have added to the inconvenience of a journey which could take up to a week in either direction, and it all had to be done on the basis of an episcopal income which, so Walton claimed in his petition, was inadequate.

It has already been shown that Walton under- rather than over-estimated the cost of repairs to the palace, but he himself admitted that the official figure for his income as bishop was too low as, in fact, was the one for Croston. Nevertheless, his position was, on paper, a difficult one. According to those official figures, in England only the bishops of Gloucester, Peterborough, and Rochester had smaller incomes than their colleague at Chester, but only the bishop of Lincoln and the archbishop of York had larger dioceses (in terms of area) to administer. Twenty-nine years before Walton outlined his financial difficulties, Charles I had acknowledged that Chester was one of several dioceses in which the revenues 'suffice not to maintain the Bishops which are to live upon them according to their place and dignity', and Bishop Cartwright referred to this in 1687 when he complained that two opportunities to annex the revenues of the rectory of Ribchester

²⁴ *Historical manuscripts commission, report on the manuscripts of the marquess of Downshire* (6 vols, London, 1924-95), vol. 1, p. 141.

²⁵ *Historical manuscripts commission, report on the manuscripts of the earl of Dartmouth* (3 vols, London, 1887-96), vol. 1, p. 301.

to the diocese, as the royal martyr had directed, had been let slip.²⁶ Randle Holmes likewise declared that the bishop had insufficient income to live in accordance with his status.²⁷ What was the reality of the situation, and how far were claims of relative poverty justified?

One of the summaries of the bishop's income made soon after the Restoration gives the revenues of the see as a mere £319 per annum.²⁸ This document is undated, but probably belongs to 1663, since it is accompanied by a list of the cathedral revenues for that year. However, even when pleading poverty, Walton had admitted to an annual income over £100 higher than this, and the list of sources of revenue, when compared to others, is incomplete, omitting half of the impropriated rectories which were leased out to provide the bulk of the bishop's regular income.

Of more use is a summary list of regular income and outgoings made at some time between the grant of Croston vicarage when it should fall vacant and Walton's death, that is between 22 August and 29 November 1661.²⁹ Unfortunately, this cannot be made to yield entirely consistent figures with the information in the commonwealth survey and Bishop Gastrell's *Notitia*, but the divergences are not wide and the 1661 summary gives a useful guide to the various sources of revenue. The net total of £743 10s 0d certainly shows that the bishop's income was 'now improved' on the official figure of £420 1s 8d. The document also reveals the even greater improvement in the income for Croston, something about which Walton's petition to the king had remained silent. This would suggest that all figures which cannot be verified from other sources should be treated with caution. What more can be said about the various headings in this list?

The rents on leases of impropriated rectories stand out as by far and away the most important source of revenue, coming to more than all the others put together. It was with these that the

²⁶ Bodl., Tanner Ms 144, f. 26.

²⁷ British Library, Harley Ms 2155, f. 44.

²⁸ Bodl., Gough Ms Cheshire 2, f. 11.

²⁹ Bodl., Tanner Ms 144, f. 12. See Appendix 2.

commonwealth survey was concerned. In 1663 Bishop Hall bewailed the fact that 'the true Value' of impropriations was 'knowne by the Tennant, and usually conceal'd from the Bishop'.³⁰ This implies that he was unaware of the contents of the survey undertaken by the republican regime only a decade earlier, probably because it had been prepared for the authorities in London and no copy would have been kept in the North West since no revival of the old diocesan structure was anticipated. The surveyors' detailed enquiries had revealed the cumulative value of the twenty-four rectories to be over £4,000 to those who had leased them, but the rents being paid to the bishop totalled only £567 8s 6d. Apparently, no rents were being paid for Backford or Cottingham in the early 1650s (in the former case the tithes were being used to augment the vicar's income) but it would appear from Gastrell's *Notitia* that they would normally have added a further £70 11s 4d. His figure for the rents from the other rectories is fractionally lower than that calculated from the commonwealth survey at £566 13s 2d, but he mentions two pieces of property which the survey did not: some tenements in York which were leased for £1 10s 0d per annum and the so-called Archdeacon's House in Chester which was let for £1 6s 8d, though the tenant could reclaim up to 13s 4d each year for repairs until 1683 when Bishop Pearson made a new lease under which the tenant was 'obliged to repair without any abatement of Rent'.³¹ In addition, the rents due on the manor and rectory of St Bees in Cumberland, which were payable to the crown, had been made over to the diocese by Queen Mary. These were worth £143 16s 2½d, though £63 1s 2½d had to be returned to the monarch. All these various rents give a grand total of £814 1s 4½d, slightly lower than the estimate made in 1661, but not significantly at variance with it. It is worth noting in passing that the £1 rent due each year for Bradley rectory in Staffordshire seems to have been

³⁰ Bodl., Tanner Ms 144, f. 14.

³¹ By Gastrell's time the bishop's orchard, the orchard house and the old porter's lodge were also rented out on an annual basis for a further £10 16s 8d. It is uncertain when this practice began, but it may have been with Wilkins's arrival. Gastrell, *Notitia*, part 1, pp. 33, 63.

unpaid since 1553. Hall and Pearson both fought legal battles to recover possession of the rectory, but without success.³²

It is also clear that this income remained more or less static across the entire period. Gastrell's summary of all the leases and their terms shows that only minor adjustments were ever made on renewal, and there is no evidence of any sustained or determined attempts to increase the levels of rent. Tenants preferred the long-term advantage of low rents, even when other inducements to agree to an increase were offered. 'Tenants that were only to renew & adde a life or two (though offer'd proportionable abatements in their ffines) would not yield to charge their Estates with much, if anything, above the old rents', reported Hall in 1663.³³ It is not unlikely that the bishops readily went along with this. As individuals, they naturally benefited more from a substantial entry fine that could be pocketed at once than from a long-term but relatively small increase in the regular income of the see, but they were also subject to other pressures and temptations. One such case was Bowden rectory, leased by Lord Delamere. In 1669, as the expiry of his lease drew near, he prevailed upon the king himself to write to Wilkins urging him to renew on the existing terms 'in consideration of his [Delamere's] acceptable services'.³⁴ The new lease was duly granted in the following year. Another was the case of Ribchester, which so distressed Bishop Cartwright. Here, the elderly Bishop Walton seems to have been primarily concerned with making provision for his family after his own death. In 1661 he leased the impropriated rectory to John Tibboles (who may have been a relative) 'in trust (as it appears) for the Bishop and his Family'. The three lives for the term of the lease were Walton's wife, son and nephew.³⁵ But Cartwright's protest over this may have been a case of the pot calling the kettle black. He himself bought out the existing tenant for Wallasey and then let it to his own son with the

³² Gastrell, *Notitia*, part 1, pp. 41-42; Bodl., Tanner Mss 37, f. 60, 144, f. 21.

³³ Bodl., Tanner Ms 144, f. 14.

³⁴ M. A. E. Green, ed., *Calendar of state papers domestic, 1668-1669* (London, 1894), p. 608. The 'acceptable services' are not defined.

³⁵ Gastrell, *Notitia*, part 1, pp. 24, 59.

intention that the income should help provide an annuity for his widow in the event of his death.³⁶

The 1661 summary estimates unavoidable expenditure under various headings at £400. Bishop Gastrell reckoned that the actual administration of his leases cost £20 each year, and the figure was probably much the same in the Restoration period. Other costs were written into the terms of some leases. In some cases they were regular costs, such as the vicar's stipend or the payment of tenths on the vicar's behalf; in others they were irregular, such as payment of first-fruits and clerical subsidies, or responsibility for the repair of the chancel of the parish church in question. These costs can never have come to less than £80 in total, and on occasion may have been much more. Tenths for the bishopric itself were £42 0s 2d, which had to be paid every year. When the diocese was created by Henry VIII out of the archdeaconries of Chester and Richmond, the actual powers of the two archdeacons had been vested in the bishop himself to be delegated as he chose. However, the post of archdeacon was retained and the bishop was personally responsible for allowing each of them a stipend of £50. All these items come to about £250 a year, sometimes more, but are well short of the figure of £400 in the summary. This, however, may have been allowing for the payment of first-fruits on the diocesan income as well as tenths, although only the latter are explicitly mentioned. First-fruits were generally paid in instalments, commonly over four years. Ferne managed to obtain permission to spread payment over six years, but this was exceptional and may reflect the government's recognition that bishops returning to dilapidated palaces and cathedrals faced added expenses in the early years of the Restoration. Wilkins, by contrast, had a prolonged tussle with the Treasury commissioners to obtain even four years over which to pay, but by then churchmen may have been felt to be under less financial pressure, while the government was in a fairly desperate plight at the conclusion of the second Dutch War. Legally, a clergyman had the right only to spread the payment of

³⁶ *Cartwright's diary*, p. 83, entry for 6 Oct. 1687; F. Sanders, 'Thomas Cartwright, D.D., Bishop of Chester, 1686-89', *Journal of the Chester Archaeological and Historical Society*, new ser. 4 (1892), p. 30.

first-fruits over two years, and the commissioners obtained a declaration from the Privy Council 'that for future these things may be restrained to the law'. Pearson, though, also obtained four years in which to pay, and Cartwright three, so the custom that had evolved was clearly too strong to be easily set aside, even though the government had law on its side.³⁷ Nevertheless, this still represented a drain on the bishop's income of £94 10s 4½d in most years and brings the total of unavoidable costs much nearer to the £400 anticipated by Walton. Indeed, only Pearson, bishop from 1673 to 1686, held the see for long enough to be free from this particular burden for a significant period of time.

Turning to the other sources of income that were listed, the first is 'Rents of Deaneries'. Some aspects of an archdeacon's usual jurisdiction, with the right to the accompanying fees, were delegated by the bishops to the rural deans, who of course paid for the privilege. The traditional rents on the deaneries had yielded £36 6s 0d per annum, though Bishop Bridgeman had succeeded in raising this to over £100. The 1661 list gives only the older figure, however, and the partial list of 1663 is in line with this, with a figure of £24 for the deaneries within Chester archdeaconry. Gastrell records that they were let *en bloc* in 1666 for an unspecified sum, and a rental of £100 was definitely reached again only in 1686 when Cartwright leased them to his son John and cousin Thomas Waite. It seems unlikely that this family arrangement would have been the occasion for a nearly threefold increase in rent, so the higher figure was probably restored twenty years earlier by Bishop Hall after a number of years at the lower level.³⁸

³⁷ The arrangements for payment by the successive bishops can be traced in: W. A. Shaw, ed., *Calendar of Treasury books, 1660-1667* (London, 1904), pp. 191, 370 (Walton & Ferne); Green, ed., *Calendar of state papers domestic, 1661-1662*, p. 373 (Hall); Shaw, ed., *Calendar of Treasury books, 1667-1668* (London, 1904), pp. 509, 513; Shaw, ed., *Calendar of Treasury books, 1669-1672* (London, 1906), pp. 2, 3, 5, 11, 33; Green, ed., *Calendar of state papers domestic, 1668-1669* (London, 1894), p. 190 (Wilkins); Shaw, ed., *Calendar of Treasury books, 1672-1675* (London, 1909), p. 373 (Pearson); Shaw, ed., *Calendar of Treasury books, 1685-1689* (London, 1923), pp. 163-64 (Cartwright).

³⁸ Gastrell, *Notitia*, part 1, pp. 18, 26-29, 33, 34.

Other aspects of the bishop's jurisdiction also boosted his regular income. In the Chester archdeaconry (though not in Richmond) he had the customary right to certain property belonging to any priest who died. This right was maintained until 1755 and was reckoned by Gastrell to be worth between £10 and £20 a year. In 1661 this figure might have been included in the total for 'Pensions yearely payd to the Lord Bishop of Chester' since Gastrell gives a correspondingly lower figure under this heading of 'about £80', a difference of £18 14s 0d. The sources of these pensions are nowhere fully stated, and by the early eighteenth century, if not before, they were no longer being regularly received. Consistory Court papers show that some were payable by the holders of certain impropriations, but that Hall and Wilkins had to take legal action to secure them.³⁹ The same was true of synodals and procurations. Synodals were a small annual payment made by parochial clergy as a token of their submission to the bishop's authority; procurations were payments made by parishes at the time of the bishop's triennial or archdeacon's annual visitations. The various sources agree that those paid annually should have yielded about £70. When defaults in payment became widespread is uncertain, but the interregnum must be the most probable time. Clergy and parishes were surely reluctant in the years after 1660 to resume a small but irksome burden which they had been spared for sixteen years or more, and when the total anticipated revenue was listed in 1661 there is already a note of doubt: 'If all these dues are truly payd ...'.⁴⁰

The expectation in 1661 of a regular disposable annual income from diocesan sources of £743 10s 0d was not unrealistic, though it may have been a little over-optimistic. D. R. Hirschberg, indeed, estimated a basic revenue of only £473 in 1663 rising to £744 by about 1680, but his earlier figure seems to have placed undue reliance on the incomplete figures in the Gough manuscript

³⁹ CCALS, EDC5 (1664), no. 60; EDC5 (1668), no. 44; EDC5 (1671), no. 19.

⁴⁰ Bodl., Tanner Ms 144, f. 12, my italics; Gastrell, *Notitia*, part 1, p. 33. Some clergy refused payment of procurations due to Cartwright at Easter 1689 when he was in exile, *Cheshire Sheaf*, 3rd ser. 1 (1896), p. 86.

and ignored the evidence of the commonwealth survey.⁴¹ It is more likely that these sources of income remained fairly static throughout the period under review. There were, however, more irregular additional sources of income, and also further demands on the bishop's purse.

The greatest boost to his revenue came when a lease was due for renewal and the tenant would pay an entry fine. In 1663 Sheldon had asked about the level at which these were set, to which Hall replied, 'Seaven yeares purchase for 21 yeares, & Eight for 3 lives is the most that is taken'.⁴² Virtually all the leases were for lives rather than years, and Gastrell listed all the leases and renewals from the foundation of the diocese. Unfortunately, he did not record the entry fines, nor are they stated in those leases of which copies happen to survive,⁴³ so all that can be known for certain is those years in which this additional revenue would have been received and the maximum sum that it may have been if a rate of eight times the annual rent was always charged, which is doubtful. Hall's words quoted above would suggest it was not, and this proves to be the case in those instances from Cartwright's time for which his diary provides additional evidence. 'I sealed a Lease of Kirkby Ravensworth to Mr Andrew Wilkinson for his own life, and Anne Jackson, and Charles Wilkinson his brother, and the fine I took was £112', he recorded on 13 September 1687. This is nearer to just four-and-a-half times the annual rent of £25 5s 4d. Only a few weeks earlier he had written to Wilkinson 'that he should have his lease for £114 18s 8d and not under', but he must have had to drop his price slightly. Tenants were always likely to press for a low fine as well as a low rent. When trying to find a new tenant for Patrick Brompton in December 1686, Cartwright first tried for an entry fine of £80 and a few months later of £74, little more than double the annual rent, though £80 represented five times the balance left to the bishop after he had

⁴¹ D. R. Hirschberg, 'Episcopal incomes and expenses, 1500-c.1760' in R. O'Day & F. Heal, eds, *Princes and paupers in the English church, 1500-1800* (Leicester, 1981), p. 214.

⁴² Bodl., Tanner Ms 144, f. 14.

⁴³ CCALS, EEB 99127, 99225, 99234, 99235, 99340, 99349, 99399, 99450. The register book of leases (EEB 99486), which covers the period after 1673, was reported missing during the period of research for this study.

paid the vicar's stipend. Cartwright's best deal was the £100 he received from his own son for the lease of Wallasey, which represented over six times the annual rent, but it was the same sum that he had spent buying out the previous tenant. In earlier negotiations with another prospective purchaser of the lease he had only asked 'for £80 and an hogshead of claret'.⁴⁴ The bishops will have received no additional income from entry fines in seven of the twenty-nine years from 1660 to 1688. The leanest period was the early 1670s. No leases were renewed in 1671, 1672 or 1674, and 1673 can have produced no more than £8 since Budworth, renewed that year, was let for a mere £1 per annum. In contrast with this, Pearson could have gained as much as £1,000 in 1677 when Backford (let at £12 13s 4d) and Bolton and Clapham (let at £113) both came up for renewal, though a figure of around £600 is more likely. From the return made in 1663, it appears that immediately after the Restoration £200 was allowed in compensation to someone who had purchased the glebe of two impropriations during the interregnum but lost them when church and crown lands reverted to their original owners.⁴⁵ Over the period as a whole, however, the bishops may have seen their annual income bolstered by an average of just under £200, which is what Gastrell expected in the early eighteenth century.

There were also the procurations payable in the years of an episcopal visitation of the diocese. Theoretically, these took place every three years, but in practice were often missed because they were superseded by a metropolitanical visitation by the archbishop of York or because of the illness or death of the bishop. Walton, Ferne and Cartwright never carried out visitations of the whole diocese; Hall, Wilkins and Pearson only in 1665, 1671, 1674 and 1677. Since three of these were years when no entry fines were received, the procurations, if duly paid, would have been all the more welcome.

Another source of ready cash may have eased any problems arising from the somewhat erratic nature of the sources

⁴⁴ *Cartwright's diary*, pp. 16, 69, 72, 78.

⁴⁵ Possibly this was Michael Warton, who leased both moieties of Cottingham in 1662. This was one of the impropriations for which no rent was being paid when the commonwealth survey was undertaken, Gastrell, *Notitia*, part I, p. 49.

of income just considered. The bishops would commonly take a bond before instituting an incumbent to his living, its ostensible purpose being to indemnify the bishop if he were sued by a third party claiming the right of presentation. Bishop Cartwright noted in his diary for 18 November 1686 that he instituted 'Gabriel Blakiston, master of arts, to the rectory of Danby Wisk, ... and had Sir William Blakiston the patron's bond to save me harmless'. At the beginning of the previous year Sir Daniel Fleming had recorded in his 'Great Book of Accounts' a bond of £100 given to Pearson among the expenses involved in his son's institution to the living at Grasmere. The practice was not new. Bridgeman had taken a bond of £200 from Laud when instituting Robert Bath, the archbishop's nephew-in-law, as vicar of Rochdale in 1635.⁴⁶ Though this money had ultimately to be repaid, it must have eased short-term cash-flow problems.

All this left the bishops of Chester with an average income of around £900, more in some years but less in others. Certainly, it is still well short of Gregory King's estimate made in 1688 that a spiritual lord would have an income of around £1,300, or of one suggestion made on the eve of the Restoration that bishops should receive a salary of £2,000 taken from customs and excise duties.⁴⁷ This explains Walton's desire to secure the income of Croston vicarage for the diocese. When the opportunity finally came in August 1662 and James Hyatt was ejected for

⁴⁶ *Cartwright's diary*, p. 13; J. R. Macgrath, ed., *The Flemings at Oxford, being documents selected from the Rydal papers in illustration of the lives and ways of Oxford men, 1650-1700* (3 vols, Oxford, 1904-24), vol. 2, p. 351; F. R. Raines, *The vicars of Rochdale*, Chetham Society, new ser. 1 (1883), p. 93.

⁴⁷ King's 'Scheme of the income & expence for the several families of England' is reprinted in P. Laslett, *The world we have lost – further explored* (London, 1983), pp. 32-33. G. R. Abernathy, *The English Presbyterians and the Stuart restoration, 1648-1663* (Philadelphia, 1965), p. 37. One of Cosin's correspondents, Clement Spelman, saw the civil war as God's punishment for the Tudor plunder of the church and suggested that former monastic lands should be restored to Chester and other poorer dioceses, J. Maltby, 'Suffering and surviving: The civil wars, the commonwealth and the formation of Anglicanism, 1642-60', in S. Platten, ed., *Anglicanism and the western Christian tradition* (Norwich, 2003), pp. 138-40. Income was meant to secure status rather than be a reward for work done and the variations between sees gave the crown a potential lever of control over churchmen.

nonconformity, the situation had moved on. Croston remained a crown living, but successive bishops of Chester were also rectors of Wigan. According to a survey of Lancashire parishes carried out in 1650, the combined tithes and glebe rents of Wigan and Holland parishes (the two were divided during the interregnum but re-united at the Restoration) were £462 8s 0d, while stipends due to curates and other outgoing came to £209 17s 4d, leaving a net income of £252 10s 8d. This substantial sum may even have increased somewhat during the time the rectory was in the hands of the bishops, for Gastrell believed it was worth 'above 300/ p. an. clear, all Curates paid'.⁴⁸

When Ferne was appointed bishop, he was allowed to retain his mastership of Trinity College, Cambridge, 'for a year or more',⁴⁹ but even after Hall and his successors had been presented to the rectory of Wigan, they held other senior posts *in commendam*. Hall remained archdeacon of Canterbury and Pearson archdeacon of Surrey, while Cartwright held on to the vicarage of Barking until he resigned it in favour of his son.⁵⁰ The records show Wilkins to have been involved in complex negotiations not only over the time he would be allowed to pay first-fruits on the bishopric, but also over which of his existing posts he could retain and what should happen over the outstanding instalments of first-fruits on those he would resign. The outcome shows him to have been a shrewd and successful man of business. He retained the deanery of Ripon with the hospitals of St John the Baptist and St Mary Magdalen, which he had held since August 1660 and so were long clear of the burden of first-fruits. This was despite the fact that a warrant had been issued granting them to Thomas Lamplugh. On the other hand, he shed several more recently

⁴⁸ Fishwick, ed., *Church surveys*, pp. 59ff; Gastrell, *Notitia*, part 1, p. 243.

⁴⁹ Green, ed., *Calendar of state papers domestic, 1661-1662*, p. 306.

⁵⁰ The living was in the gift of All Souls' College, Oxford. In summer 1688 Cartwright resigned it to James II as the 'supreme Ordinary', who in turn commanded the warden and fellows of the college to nominate John Cartwright in his father's place. The college balked at this, so the king declined to accept the resignation. The matter was unresolved at the Glorious Revolution, F. Bickley & J. D. Cantwell, eds, *Calendar of state papers domestic, 1686-1687* (London, 1964), p. 277; Bickley & Cantwell, eds, *Calendar of state papers domestic, 1687-1689* (London, 1972), pp. 250, 255.

acquired preferments, and with them debts to the Treasury totalling £97 13s 3d.⁵¹

Hall and Pearson, at least, also had small family estates of their own, the one in Cornwall, the other in Norfolk. Taken altogether, these various benefices and private means will have brought Chester's bishops up to the level of income expected of a spiritual peer of the realm and will have been in line with those of many of the leading gentry within their diocese,⁵² but the demands made on this income were heavy, and some had to be met before the bishop saw a penny of it.

When Jonathan Trelawny learnt that James II was intending to nominate him to the see of Bristol, he wrote to the Earl of Rochester in some alarm:

I hear his Majesty designed me for Bristol, which I should not decline was I not already under such pressure by my father's debts, as must necessarily break my estate to pieces if I find no better prop than the income of Bristol, not greater than 300*l.* per annum; and the expence in consecration, first fruits, and settlement, will require 2000*l.*

'Your Lordship must needs know', he wrote to Bishop Turner of Ely a few weeks later, 'the income of Bristol is too mean to give a man credit for so large a sum as is required before I can be seated

⁵¹ E. H. Dunkin, C. Jenkins & E. A. Fry, *Index to the act books of the archbishops of Canterbury, 1663-1859* (London, 1929), part 2, p. 152; Green, ed., *Calendar of state papers domestic, 1668-1669*, pp. 13, 23-24, 74, 154-55, 190; Shaw, ed., *Calendar of Treasury books, 1669-1672*, pp. 5-6.

⁵² J. T. Cliffe, *The world of the country house in seventeenth-century England* (London, 1999), appendix a, pp. 198-202, mentions Sir Peter Vanables (Baron Kinderton) among gentry with an income of over £3,000; Sir John Bellot, Roger Nowell, Richard Shireburn, Richard Shuttleworth and Richard Towneley among those with over £1,000; and William Lawton, Sir Peter Leycester and Geoffrey Shakerley (governor of Chester) among those with over £500. The list is not exhaustive, being based on those for whom there is also evidence for the number of servants they employed, but is sufficient to show the bishop's relative standing.

there'.⁵³ Though Chester's bishops enjoyed better financial prospects than Bristol's, they, too, may have had to go into debt on first taking up office.

Of the expenses to which Trelawny referred, first-fruits have already been discussed. 'Expense in consecration' would involve the fees payable to a variety of legal and court officials, firstly to procure the *Congé d'élire* and royal letters needed for election by the dean and chapter and then for the royal assent to confirm the election. In Sheldon's letter-book, kept by his secretary, there is a list of 'Fees for passing the Seales for a Bishop'.⁵⁴ Though it refers explicitly to Blandford's consecration as Bishop of Oxford in 1665, it was clearly preserved as a record of the standard payments, which came to a total of £60 17s 4d. The only item likely to have varied was the £1 5s 0d paid 'to the officers of the Signet & Privy Seale for their Extraordinary trouble in despatch'. Seventeenth-century bureaucratic machinery was in constant need of such lubrication. Custom then also demanded that the new bishop provided a lavish banquet after his consecration. John Evelyn recorded in his diary how he was a guest along with 'the Duke of Buckingham, Judges, Secretaries of State, Lord Keeper, Counsell, Noblemen, & such an infinity of other company' at the 'sumptuous dinner' laid on by Wilkins.⁵⁵ Some idea of the cost of these celebrations is given by the fact that when Sancroft became archbishop of Canterbury, he obtained an order in council directing that the custom of presenting each of the guests with a pair of gloves should be replaced by a donation of £50 towards the rebuilding of St Paul's Cathedral.⁵⁶ Further expense was involved when the new bishop came to take his seat in the House of Lords. On 12 May 1687 Cartwright paid 'Sir Thomas Duppa £6 for my fees due to the officers attending the House of Lords at my first admission on 28 April last past', and on the same day he paid twenty guineas for

⁵³ Both letters, dated 10 July and 22 Sept. 1685, are quoted in A. Strickland, *The lives of the seven bishops committed to the Tower in 1688* (London, 1866), pp. 369-71.

⁵⁴ Bodl., Additional Ms C308, f. 157.

⁵⁵ E. S. de Beer, ed., *The diary of John Evelyn* (6 vols, Oxford, 1955), vol. 3, p. 518.

⁵⁶ J. Chambers, *Christopher Wren* (Stroud, 1998), p. 82.

the privy seal on the permission for him to pay his first-fruits in instalments.⁵⁷

'Expenses of settlement' presumably involved furnishing the bishop's new residences and acquiring anything that might be felt necessary to his new status. A list survives of items from the palace at Chester and the parsonage at Wigan sold by Hall's executor, Sir Amos Meredith.⁵⁸ Many, though not all, were sold to Wilkins and included such essential items as the fire grates and water cisterns. The new bishop must have had to replace many of the items that went to other purchasers, such as 'the Copper in the washhouse'. Unfortunately, the prices paid are not recorded, but an interesting sidelight is thrown on the differing ways in which Hall and Wilkins provided for the needs of their households. Among the items the latter chose not to buy were an assortment of tubs and barrels used in connection with a cider press. Presumably, Hall had his own cider made from the fruit grown in the bishop's orchard; it may have been Wilkins who began the practice of renting this out. Gregory King expected a bishop's household, his dependent relatives and servants, to number about twenty. Obviously, this will have varied from case to case. Hall and Pearson had no children; Cartwright was married twice and had eight. Pearson's will made provision for legacies to his servants, but does not say how many there were. A dozen or fifteen would fit with King's generalisation and with the numbers maintained by gentry of similar means to the bishop. There are too many variables to give any precise indication of what this will have cost in terms of wages and provision of food or liveries, but it must have been a significant amount.⁵⁹

⁵⁷ *Cartwright's diary*, p. 54. In 1702 William Nicolson reckoned the various expenses of his consecration came to at least £500, plus a further £115 for travelling to London and staying there, N. Sykes, *Church and state in England in the eighteenth century* (Cambridge, 1934), p. 150. Rather earlier, in 1633, Juxon's consecration banquet had cost £110, T. A. Mason, *Serving God and mammon: William Juxon, 1582-1663* (Newark, 1985), p. 49.

⁵⁸ Bodl., Tanner Ms 144, f. 28. When Bishop Stratford first visited Chester in Oct. 1689 he went into lodgings while the palace was being furnished. *Cheshire Sheaf*, 3rd ser. 1 (1896), pp. 86-87.

⁵⁹ On the numbers of servants and their cost in comparable gentry households, see Cliffe, *World of the country house*, chapters 5 and 6 and appendix a. Pearson's housekeeper (female) and cook (male) are referred to in the city of

Once in his diocese, the new bishop was under constant pressure to set a good example of devotion to church and crown and of concern for the welfare of the wider community. Archbishop Sheldon kept a record of money 'Disbursed by Bishops since the King's returne in Publique Works & Charities'.⁶⁰ By summer 1663, in response to Sheldon's enquiries, Hall reckoned that he and Walton (and probably the dean and chapter, though the document⁶¹ explicitly refers only to the bishops) had 'already expended' £2,736 5s 8d and that a further £1,700 was 'necessarily to be expended'. This was not exceptional. From Sheldon's records it would appear that in the same three year period Archbishop Juxon had spent £6,400, Bishop Sanderson £4,092, and Bishop Duppa £1,600. These were all occupants of wealthier sees than Chester, but Sheldon maintained a relentless pressure on everyone to contribute to the needs of church, state and society. In 1666 Bishop William Nicholson was informed that £100 was not enough to loan the king, even from so poor a diocese as Gloucester, while Bishop Gilbert Ironside was rebuked for not setting the clergy of Bristol a better example in his response to Charles's request for money.⁶² In such circumstances, however, it would not be surprising to find that bishops sometimes provided the figures Sheldon wanted to see, and those in Hall's return should be treated with some caution where they are not corroborated by other evidence or could not have been easily verified by Sheldon himself.

The largest single item was the renovation of the palace, and the figures there are supported by the evidence of witnesses in the case brought by Wilkins against Hall's executors. The same is true of his claim to have donated plate and furniture to the

Chester assembly book, CCALS, AB/2, ff. 189, 186. His will, providing payment of arrears of wages plus a further year's pay for those employed for a shorter time, is printed in Bridgeman, *History of Wigan*, pp. 560-61. Cartwright mentions paying 'Joseph Lloyd his year's wages ... £6', but does not say in what capacity Lloyd served him, *Cartwright's diary*, p. 82, entry for 5 Oct. 1687. R. B. Schlatter, *The social ideas of religious leaders, 1660-88* (Oxford, 1940), p. 62, notes that writers of the period taught that servants should receive a just wage, but never defined what that was.

⁶⁰ Bodl., Additional Ms C308, f. 151v.

⁶¹ Bodl., Tanner Ms 144, f. 14.

⁶² Bodl., Additional Ms C308, ff. 62, 65v.

cathedral worth £86 5s 8d. Flagon embossed with Hall's arms are still in existence, and at the trial the precentor had valued them at £100.⁶³ One claim which Sheldon could easily have checked was that Hall had contributed £50 towards the repair of St Paul's. Another was the answer to his question, 'What hath bene expended since the Kings Majestyes Returne ... in Presents to the King, Particularly that by Act of Parliament, and the other by the Bishops Deanes & Chapters free Consent?' He replied, 'The Statute Voluntary Present, together with the perfectly free Present, of Bishop Walton, was 500/-00-00'; and he added for good measure, 'Bishop Halls free Present of 250/ was given in his Capacity as Prebendary of Windsor, & is not to be reckon'd here'.⁶⁴

About the other items, it is impossible to be so certain. The £300 allegedly already spent and £1,000 yet to be spent on the repair of the cathedral and the houses of its clergy are more likely to have come from the dean and chapter themselves. A question mark should also be placed against the claim to have given at least £600 to the augmentation of poor vicarages. Meeting the king's expectations about this had been a particular anxiety expressed by Walton in his petition, but the whole issue clearly caused Charles and his advisors some concern in the early days of their return to power. During the interregnum, many poor livings had been augmented by the Committee for Plundered Ministers from the confiscated revenues of the old hierarchy, and with the return of the *status quo ante bellum* impoverished clergy who lost this additional income would feel little reason to be loyal to the restored church or government. Only in the next century, when revolution and war had changed the whole basis of royal finance, did the initiative known as Queen Anne's Bounty out of first-fruits and tenths become feasible. Forty years earlier, the crown retained its income from these sources and merely exhorted bishops to give a lead in helping poorer clergy, but the records show only one example of improvement in the remuneration of the vicar in any of the bishop of Chester's

⁶³ R. V. H. Burne, *Chester cathedral* (London, 1958), p. 134; M. H. Ridgway, *The early plate of Chester cathedral* (Chester, 1980), p. 3, plates 6, 7.

⁶⁴ Bodl., Tanner Ms 144, f. 14.

impropriated rectories, and that was made by Pearson several years after this return was drawn up.⁶⁵ Perhaps Hall's figure represents a pious intention rather than the actual expenditure claimed, a case where the spirit was willing but the flesh was weak.

Hall's figure of over £2,700 spent in three years should probably be reduced to something nearer £1,600, but this still represents nearly 80% of the regular income from the diocese in the same period, one in which three new bishops had to meet all the expense that taking up post has been shown to involve. With the passage of time, the costs of making good the ravages of war and neglect became less, but bishops were still expected to show conspicuous loyalty to the crown. In summer 1687 Cartwright had to entertain King James himself as a guest at the palace, and there was a steady flow of other important personages travelling to and from Ireland who required hospitality. Some other items continued to be important. For example, even the ports of the North West lost seamen to Barbary pirates. In his return to Sheldon, Hall claimed to have given £100 for the redemption of captives, and Pearson was certainly involved in raising money for the same purpose during summer 1681. Though the records prove only that he tried to ensure money raised in the diocese went to help men from Chester, it is precisely the kind of instance where bishops were expected to lead by example.⁶⁶

Financial exactions did not cease at death. Just as the bishops received property from deceased incumbents in the Chester archdeaconry, so a similar payment was due to the crown on their own deaths. In November 1664 Henry Ferne's executors secured

a grant ... of discharge from the gift of a horse, bridle and saddle, cloak with a cape, cup with a cover, bason and ewer,

⁶⁵ In 1705 the vicar of Childwall wrote, 'In the year 1681, the Rt. Rev. Father in God, Dr John Pearson, then Lord Bishop of Chester, and John Garraway Esq. Gave each £200, wherewith £30 per annum was purchased out of the Great Tithes, and are annexed to the Vicarage', Gastrell, *Notitia*, part 2, p. 166.

⁶⁶ Bodl., Tanner Mss 144, f. 14, 36, f. 143; CCALS, ML/4/518.

gold ring, and kennel of hounds, usually given to the King by the executors of a bishop of Chester.⁶⁷

Ferne's tenure of the see had been exceptionally brief, only a few weeks, and his estate will have received little or none of its income. There is no evidence of similar dispensations for any of the other bishops in this period.

The Restoration bishops of Chester, it seems safe to conclude, were not poor men, but they were not in a position to accumulate large personal fortunes, given the short time for which most of them held the see and the expectations contemporaries had of how their wealth would be used. Just as Bishop Hall reckoned the expense of renovating the chancel at Wigan and his losses from a robbery were 'a sufficient caveat against my growing rich', so John Lloyd, in his sermon at Wilkins's funeral, claimed that 'what he [Wilkins] yearly received of the Church, he bestowed in its service', and declared, 'I have heard him say often, I will be no richer, and I think he was as good as his word'.⁶⁸

The bishop's financial resources, or the lack of them, impinged directly on the administration of the diocese. As already noted, the diocese was formed from the two archdeaconries of Chester and Richmond, both of which had come into the possession of one man, William Knight, in the 1530s. The archdeacons of Richmond, in particular, had in the Middle Ages come to hold an extensive jurisdiction largely independent of their nominal masters, the archbishops of York. It was partly to remedy this situation and prevent its recurrence that Henry VIII vested the powers of the two archdeacons in the new bishop, but it also let him transfer to the new see the endowments of the archdeaconries and avoid handing over too much of his own newly-acquired monastic wealth. Because the usual jurisdiction of archdeacons had been absorbed into that of the bishop, the rural deans acquired a significance in Chester not found elsewhere. They were delegated the power to hold their own courts to deal

⁶⁷ M. A. E. Green, ed., *Calendar of state papers domestic, 1664-1665* (London, 1863), p. 98.

⁶⁸ Bodl., Additional Ms C305, f. 60; J. Lloyd, *A sermon preached at the funerals of the right reverend father in God, John, late lord bishop of Chester* (London, 1675), p. 43.

with local matters of discipline and to prove wills and grant probate for estates valued at under £40. As noted above, Bishop Bridgeman had begun the practice of leasing the deaneries in each archdeaconry *en bloc* to various officials, and this practice was continued at the Restoration. The original motive for this would appear to have been financial, since the change was the occasion for charging higher rents on the leases than before. It did not necessarily give the bishop any greater control over what was happening at local level and it cannot now be known whether individual bishops hoped it would, even when they made leases to relatives, as Wilkins did by leasing the Richmond deaneries to his half-brother Walter Pope and as Cartwright also did by leasing the Chester deaneries jointly to his son John and cousin Thomas Waite. In practice, it probably made no lasting difference to levels of efficiency or episcopal control, at least after the death of the bishop who made the appointment in question. These particular men survived in office well into the eighteenth century, but Pope spent most of his time in the south of England and Bishop Gastrell considered Waite to be unprincipled and extortionate, so it would appear that their interest was mainly financial.⁶⁹ Virtually all seventeenth-century officials were dependent on fees and other perquisites rather than a salary, and this represented a standing temptation to use their position for financial advantage rather than in the interests of efficiency or fair-dealing, so it is no great surprise to find that at Bishop Hall's visitation in 1665, the people of Kirkby chapelry complained of 'Philip Flanner M.A. dean Rural for excessive fees ... taken by him or his under officers', or that two years later a case was being brought against the deputy of the rural dean in Manchester for commuting penances to cash fines and charging excessive fees in probate cases.⁷⁰

The fact that the bishops depended on *commendams* to bolster their own income must have had some effect on the running of the diocese, if only because they were liable to distract the bishop's attention from his main task. Hall, for example, became involved in a legal case regarding his revenues as

⁶⁹ Gastrell, *Notitia*, part 1, pp. 27-31; *Cartwright's diary*, p. 22, entry for 29 Dec. 1686.

⁷⁰ CCALS, EDV 1/34, f. 21; EDC5 (1667), no. 22.

archdeacon of Canterbury.⁷¹ Certainly, an adverse effect was felt the other way. While Pearson was busily promoting the collection for the redemption of captives and pressing for its use to help the crews of ships from Chester, he was having to defend himself against charges of mismanaging the same funds in his role as archdeacon of Surrey.⁷²

At the start of the period under review, during the episcopate of Bishop Hall, comes evidence of those who had bought their offices taking action to defend their investments, even against the bishop himself. As early as October 1662, the dean and chapter of the cathedral remonstrated with the bishop that the diocesan chancellor and registrars were encroaching on the jurisdiction of the rural deans and their officials, who were losing income as a result, and Hall was compelled to issue a written confirmation of the rural deans' traditional sphere of jurisdiction.⁷³ A little later the four existing proctors in the Consistory Court were challenging Hall's attempted admission of another.⁷⁴ Like the first example, this case was probably about money and the profits of office, since the newcomer, Edmund Seare, would take a share of the fees paid by litigants, though it may also have arisen from Hall's attempts to assert or extend his own powers, but if so apparently he failed, for no patent for Seare to be a proctor appears in the bishops' register.

Chester, it must be concluded, was a hopelessly unwieldy diocese with structures of administrative control and pastoral oversight that were inadequate and outmoded. The limited basic revenue meant those structures were further undermined by financial expedients and the bishop's own attention could be distracted by the needs of his *commendams*. The dominant mood of the Restoration era was one of reaction against the experiments and upheavals of the civil war and interregnum. It was a time for defending traditional rights and not one in which to attempt any major re-adjustment or radical restructuring of the church. That

⁷¹ Lambeth Palace Library, Ms 2014, f. 84.

⁷² Bodl., Tanner Ms 35, f. 8.

⁷³ CCALS, EDR 6/6, ff. 78-81.

⁷⁴ W. J. Sheils, *Ecclesiastical cause papers at York: Files transmitted on appeal, 1500-1883*, Borthwick texts and calendars: Records of the northern province, 9 (York, 1983), p. 31.

would have to await the great wave of reform of so many aspects of national life in the nineteenth century when the diocese was gradually broken up into the smaller units found today, bishops were freed from many of their political duties and the transport revolution made travel around their dioceses much easier. For now, the bishops of Chester struggled to retrieve and maintain the situation that had existed before the cataclysmic events of the middle decades of the century. In this they were like all their colleagues, but perhaps only those in the Welsh dioceses worked in such difficult areas with yet more slender resources.

APPENDIX 1

(National Archives, London, SP29/40. In the published *Calendar*, this document is assigned to August 1661, the grant of the advowson of Croston being made on 22 August, Green, ed., *Calendar of state papers domestic, 1661-1662*, p. 69.)

To the Kings most Excellent Majesty
The humble Petition of Brian Bishop of Chester

Sheweth

That the said Bishopricke is valued in your Majestyes Bookes in your Exchequer at £420 01s 08d per Annum, and though there have bin some Improvement since the said valuation yet there is constantly paid out of the Revenues thereof £430 or thereabouts, so that in respect of the smallness of the cleare yearly profits, your Petitioners Predecessors have usually had some commendam annexed to the said Bishopricke, by the gracious ffavour of your Majestyes noble Progenitors.

And your Petitioner further sheweth that a far greater Charge is incumbent upon him than any of his Predecessors have bin lyable to, both in regard that the Palace at Chester (the only house belonging to the Bishop) is by the late ill times so demolished, that the Repaire thereof (which your Petitioner is now about) will cost £1000 & upwards, and also for that the Bishopricke consisting wholly of Impropriations, upon renewing of any Lease, an Augmentation of the Vicarage must be made, according to your Majestyes late pious order, so that the Purchasers of the Gleabe being first satisfy'd, and the Vicar & Curates meanes augmented, there will be little profit accruing to the Bishop.

And whereas the Vicarage of Croston in the County of Lancaster & Diocese of Chester of the yearly value of £38 05s 10d in your Majestyes Bookes of ffirst fruits, to which the Tithes are annexed under the yearly pension of £45 14s 04d payable to your Majesty, and is in your Majestyes Gift plene jure, and the present Incumbent James Hyat is about 80 yeares of age, and the vicarage is so seated near the middle of the Diocesse, that the Bishop residing there some part of the yeare, he may be the better enabled to governe the same, than by constant residing at Chester, which is at the hithermost part of the Diocesse.

Your Petitioner humbly prayeth, That your Majesty will be graciously pleased, for the better maintenance of your Petitioner & his Successors, to grant the Advowson of the said Vicarage to your Petitioner & his Successors, & to annexe the same with the profits thereof, whensoever it shall fall voyd, to the said Episcopall See of Chester, & to the Bishops thereof for ever.

And your Petitioner shall ever pray &c.

APPENDIX 2

(Bodleian Library, Oxford, Tanner Ms 144, f. 12. The final note shows that this list of income and expenses was drawn up between the grant of the advowson of Croston to Bishop Walton on 22 August 1661 and his death on 29 November following.)

Bishopricke of Chester

Old Rents issuing out of the Rectories Improprate belonging to the Bishopricke of Chester amount to the sune of	817	10	00
Tenth, Subsidies, Archdeacons Pensions, Vicars wages, & other payments going out of the said Rents yearely are about	400	00	00
So the cleare profits of the Improprations only	417	10	00
But the Rents of Deaneries yearely payd to the Lord Bishop of Chester are	36	06	00
Pensions yearely payd to the Lord Bishop of Chester are	98	14	00
Yearely Synodalls & procurations are	74	17	01

More Synodalls Procurations and pensions are due to the Lord Bishop of Chester out of several Ecclesiasticall promotions within the Archdeaconry of Richmond rising yearly to the sume of	116	02	11
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	326	00	00
Besides Triennial procurations in the Bishops Visitation come to	127	00	00
So in the year of Visitation the Bishopricke of Chester, if all these dues are truly payd, shall be worth besides what may happen by ffines upon renewing of Leases	870	10	00
	other yeares	743	10 00
There are now severall Leases (some having two Lives, others but one) which the Tennants are desirous to renew.			

My Lord, for the benefit of his successors, hath procured the Vicarage of Croston in Lancashire (valu'd at 4 or 500/ per annum) to be annexed to the Bishopricke, when it shall become void, by the death or Removall of My Hyet, who is reported to be near fourscore yeares of age, & no true son of the Church.

APPENDIX 3

(Bodleian Library, Oxford, Tanner Ms 144, ff. 13-14. The correction in the answer to item 8 is an interesting example of Restoration 'political correctness'.)

		<u>Chester</u>	£	s	d
What hath beene expended since the Kings Majestyes Returne					
1 In Repaires of the Church & Ornaments	1	The Cathedrall Church is & meanly endowed, & hath a pretty numerous body to maintaine, & the			
2 In repaires of	2	Chapter has seal'd but one			

the Bishops Deanes & Prebendaries houses	Lease, & that for 300 <i>l</i> , yet that sune at least has bin expended about the Church, Deane & Prebendaries houses	300-00-00
	Given & consecrated by Bishop Hall to the use of the Cathedrall Church, one Guilt Bason, & a paire of guilt Potts valueable at £71 05s 08d, which, with a seat built by the Lord Bishop, is In Bishop Waltons time about 600 <i>l</i> was spent in repayre of the Bishops Palace, & Bishop Hall hath since expended on the same Pallace 300 <i>l</i> , & is building still	86-05-08
3 In Presents to the King, Particularly that by Act of Parliament, and the other by the Bishops Deanes & Chapters free Consent	3 The Statute Voluntary Present, together with the perfectly free Present, of Bishop Walton, was Bishop Halls free Present of 250 <i>l</i> was given in his Capacity of Prebendary of Windsor, & is not to be reckon'd here.	500-00-00
4 ffor Redemption of Captives	4 Given by Bishop Hall for the Ransome of Captives	100-00-00
5 ffor Augmentation of Vicarages & Wages for the Quire	5 Not above 4 Leases of the Bishopricke were quite run out (& those in Bishop Waltons time) & Tenants that were only to renew & adde a life or two (though offer'd proportionable abatements in their ffines) would not yield to charge	

		their Estates with much, if anything, above the old rents, yet to Augmentation of Vicarages has bin given at the least	600-00-00
6	What to Purchasers	6 The Bishopricke consisting of Impropriations, there was only one Purchaser of the Gleabes of 2 Parsonages, & to him was allow'd	200-00-00
7	What to any pious use or publique Charge	7 Payd by Bishop Hall towards the repayre of St Pauls	50-00-00
8	What necessary Repaires are yet to be taken Care for, & what sume they may probably amount unto	8 Seaven hundred pounds will not put the Bishops Pallace into its Condition before the War Rebellion, nor will 1000/ restore the Church, Deane & Prebendaryes houses, to a comely & habitable State	1700-00-00
9	How many yeares value they usually take for 21 yeares or three Lives, and so in proportion	9 Seaven yeares purchase for 21 yeares, & Eight for 3 lives is the most that is taken, & that commonly at an under value, the true Value being best knowne by the Tennant, and usually conceal'd from the Bishop, or Chapter	
		Already expended	<u>2736-05-08</u>
	June the 25 th 1663	Necessary to be expended	<u>1700-00-00</u>