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The extensive rebuilding of churches in the second half of the nineteenth century is seen as proof of the revival of the Anglican Church after a long period in the doldrums. This revival was facilitated by the Whig administrative reforms of the 1830s which enabled the Church to tighten its discipline and use its resources more effectively. In the parish level, there was increased concern amongst the Anglican clergy over the decline of the fortunes of the Church at a time when Methodism was expanding rapidly. During the second quarter of the latter part of the century, the progress of a reduction in the number of pluralism and absenteeism which had previously been the norm in the Church, resulted in a more active resident clergy. Largely as a result of this increased activity, over the period 1840 to 1882, no fewer than 663 churches in the Lincoln diocese were built, rebuilt or restored.

This phase of rebuilding and restoration coincided with, and to some extent was a consequence of, several movements within the Anglican church; most notably the ‘Oxford Movement’ which started in 1833 and the ‘Cambridge Movement’ or Camden Society (later the Ecclesiological Society) founded in 1839. The latter group, through their journal The Ecclesiologist, was very outspoken about church furniture, galleries, old-fashioned pews, short or non-existent chancels were all attacked, whilst Gothic architecture, particularly that of Pugin, was praised. It is a measure of the success of this pressure group, that its idea of the Victorian Church plan became almost universal.

It is perhaps axiomatic that major change, such as the rebuilding of the parish church, does not occur in a social vacuum, and that in many parishes there was likely to be heated debate concerning the merits of any given scheme either for restoration or reconstruction. Indeed, it is an essential task of the local historian to identify historic ‘communities of interest’ that would have had an influence on developments within the locality. It is only by identifying such elements that we can move beyond rather simplistic notions of historical progression towards a more realistic and interactive view of past societies.

This study of the building of Binbrook St. Mary and St. Gabriel should not be considered as an isolated example of religious conflict. The correspondence of Bishop Kaye, for instance, is littered with examples of conflict between parishioners and clergy, between rectors and their curates and between incumbents and their patrons. Perhaps the most extreme example of conflict over the church building was the case of Sixhills, in 1870, where Edward Heneage dismantled the church tower to provide stones for the roads on the estate! It would appear that the principal reason behind so dramatic an action was to remove the incumbent; ultimately this was successful. More directly comparable to the case study discussed here was the restoration of St. Mary the Virgin at Stow between 1846 and 1866 which has been exhaustively studied by Mark Spurrell. This relates ‘the story of the efforts of the perpetual curate, the Reverend George Atkinson, to achieve the work, and of the efforts of the farmers of the parish to frustrate it’. Obelkovich, in his survey of south Lindsey, cites several similar examples of the reluctance of the ratepayers to become involved in expensive schemes for the refurbishment of their parish church.

At first sight, the parish of Binbrook appears to support the notion of an Anglican Church strengthening its hold over its flock and reaffirming its confidence in its doctrines. The soaring spire of St. Mary and St. Gabriel dominates the modern skyline of the village in much the same way as it must have done when opened in 1869, a tribute to the architect, James Fowler (1828-1892); the rector, John Thomas Huntley (1790-1881), and to his faithful parishioners. The truth, alas, is rather less than awe-inspiring, yet it reveals a great deal about the internal politics of the nineteenth century countryside, and particularly of those ‘open’ villages where there was a strong element of independent tradesmen and freeholders prepared to stand up against the squar谆chy and the clergy. In this particular instance much of the story can be traced through the parish vestry minutes and the copious correspondence of the rector with the Incorporated Church Building Society (I.C.B.S.).

For much of the century, the church in Binbrook was in a parlous state. The church of St. Gabriel had become a ruin by about 1822 (Fig. 1a). In 1826, J. H. Loft, commented on the tumble-down condition of St. Gabriel's:

It is a scandalous thing now new churches are building at such an Expense that the archdeaconry should allow Parishioners to pull down parts of Parish Churches instead of repairing defective parts... 

[1] ith respect to this church it is most scandalous, as there are 52 acres of land now let at 30s. per acre left to keep it in repair, but in place of which the Church was allowed to be pulled down by piecemeal, until it fell down from entire want of repair; and the Parson has a sinecure the parishioners making use of the Church's land for to relieve their Poor Rate, well may dissenting increase. The church of St. Mary (Fig. 1b) had also become progressively more dilapidated and had suffered from over a century since its completion.

Fig. 1. Binbrook Churches. a. St. Gabriel's b. St. Mary's (Michael Sleight).
of neglect both physical and spiritual. There had been no resident incumbent from at least the second half of the eighteenth century, nor was there a proper parsonage house for the poorly-paid succession of curates who ministered to the spiritual needs of the community.15

The 1851 Census of Religious Worship illustrates well the position of the Anglican Church within the parish.16 The parish church (St. Mary's) had an average attendance of about 100 people, whilst attendance at the Wesleyan chapel was given as 250 and at the Primitive chapel as 132. Clearly the Anglican Church was very much in a minority within the parish. Non-conformist domination permeated all levels of village life. It was not only the labourers and tradesmen who were dissenters, but also a sizeable proportion of the more affluent tenant farmers and medium-sized owner-occupiers.17 These farmers had very real power in village life and were also sympathetic to the Anglican Church. This was a very different situation from those parishes with resident large landowners or parishes where large landowners held most of the land. In these 'close' parishes, the position of the Anglican Church, reinforced by the support of the landowner, was likely to be much stronger.

Binbrook was by no means an isolated example of non-conformists being in the majority at this time. In the county as a whole, Everett has calculated that approximately one half of all religious attenders in 1851 were non-conformists, a high figure by national standards.18 However, a more detailed study of thirty-two parishes in the North Lincolnshire Wolds gives an even higher figure of fifty-eight per cent non-conformist and only forty-two per cent Anglican,19 figures exceeded only by three counties in England: County Durham, Northumberland and Cornwall.20

In 1845, on the death of the previous, non-resident, incumbent, John Grant, the Rev. J. T. Huntley was appointed to the newly-united Binbrook living. He had from 1819 been rector of Swineshead and vicar of Kimbolton in Huntingdonshire, having graduated from Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1814.21 In his letter thanking Bishop Kaye for his appointment he wrote: 'I am going to Parish with which I am not, according to general opinion, very highly civilised.22 Two months later he again wrote to Kaye, 'I was quite surprised to be told that the substitution of Opium for intoxicating liquors was very general and the abuse of the Drug carried to a great excess'.23 Even at this early stage, it is clear that his forthright approach was unlikely to win him many friends in the community.

Huntley's initial period of residence in the parish was brought to an abrupt end in 1854 when the living was sequestered to recover his debts which amounted to over £4,000.24 The debts appear to be unrelated to events in Binbrook, for over two decades later Huntley was to comment, 'My living was under sequestration from moral delinquency of its incumbent'.25 Huntley did not return to Binbrook until 1864, the spiritual affairs of the parish again being attended to by a succession of curates.

During his second period of residence in Binbrook (1864-1871), Huntley was also a magistrate, and his sentencing policy, in line with the majority of clerical magistrates at the time, was harsh to say the least. For instance, in 1865, William Bond, a labourer from North Willingham (presumably unemployed), was committed to Lincoln House of Correction for one month with hard labour for soliciting alms.26 Such actions were a further source of hostility to both Church and Rector and led many labourers to turn to the chapels.

Alongside this apparent contempt for the lower ranks of his parishioners, there was also a running conflict with the previous curate, Frederick Sturmer, over outstanding payment for services rendered. The fact that the curate was now residing in nearby Talby meant that this dispute was almost certain to be common knowledge in the village, and was likely further to alienate those sections of the community who were not strongly allied to the Anglican Church.27 At the end of the 1870s, Huntley was to fall out with another curate, James Sellers.28 He does not appear to have been an easy man to get along with.

Nevertheless, most of the problems facing the Rector were outside his control. Huntley had to battle constantly against a predominant non-conformist vestry, firstly, over how money from the parish charity should be spent, and later over the rebuilding of the church.29

i. The Parish Charity.

The parish charity was, in fact, the Binbrook St. Gabriel Church Estate and consisted of the income from fifty-two acres of land. The origins of the charity are unclear. The Charity Commissioners noted, in 1837:

- The older parish books have been mutilated and in great part destroyed, but in 1756, occurs an entry, dated 31st March, to the following effect:

  John Harrison, churchwarden, his accounts:

  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disbursed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received by church land</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

  In this same year three accounts appear to have been kept, the churchwardens, the constables and overseers.
  No account is entered from 1756 to 1800, when occurs the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church account for 1800</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent for church lands</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remains</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

  In the year 1801, no rent is accounted for, in 1802 half a year's rent only, in 1803 the rent was suddenly raised to £24 per annum; again, in 1809 to £40 8s., and ultimately, in 1826 to £82 10s., which is the present rental.

  After the increase in rent, no distinct churchwardens' account was kept. Little of the money was spent on the upkeep of the church, indeed after 1822 the whole income of the estate was diverted to the diminution of the poor rates. The Charity Commissioners were unequivocal in their judgement on the matter:

  'The parish officers contend (without any good ground as it is thought), that these lands are parish lands, and have lately proposed to sell them under the powers of the Poor Law Amendment Act; this however, has not been effected.

  There is reason to believe that the old parish books were purposely destroyed, and the accounts of the churchwardens, constable, and overseer mixed up, to enable the parish more safely to apply the rents of the 'church lands' towards the relief of the poor; and in exonation of the poor-rates; and although it may be difficult to recover the sums already missupplied, we have considered it our duty to submit this case to Her Majesty's Attorney-General, that in future the rents may be properly disposed of towards the maintenance of the church.30

  Clearly, the parishioners had other priorities for the spending of money which legally belonged to the church, and, as we shall see, they were strongly opposed to any efforts to redirect the funds towards the rebuilding of the church.31

ii. Conflict within the vestry.

There was considerable tension between the chapel-going village and the rector and his churchwardens. This tension came to a head over the proposed building of a new church and over the use of church funds. At the end of a long running dispute about the decrepit state of the parish church and the merging of the two parishes, St. Gabriel and St. Mary, the then Rector, John Grant, petitioned Bishop Kaye, and the parishioners wanted the church money to carry on subsidising the poor rate rather than being used for either rebuilding St. Mary's or enlarging St. Gabriel's. He was to note further, 'Though both the Churchwardens are themselves staunch Churchmen, they are afraid of being defeated in vestry'.32 At times, opposition to the Church took a
distinctly secular line. In 1842, Grant reported that he had been insulted (an actionable attack) by one of his churchwardens who, afterwards attempted to write me down in the Stamford Gazette as drawing an income of thousands a year.33

The Church in Binbrook had two staunch, and powerful supporters in Robert Johnson, who farmed over 500 acres from the Manor House, and John Iles who farmed about 1,000 acres at Binbrook Hill. During the 1830s and early 1840s, Johnson Grant appears to have used Robert Johnson as his source of information for events in the parish at a time when he was resident in Kentish Town, London.34 This active support for the church continued through the period of Huntley's incumbency. In 1849, in reply to questions from the Bishop of Lincoln, Johnson observed: 'the church is too small for the number of inhabitants',35 a sentiment that was unlikely to be shared by many of the parishioners. Iles held similar views to Johnson, and led a deputation to the Bishop about the need to rebuild St. Gabriel's.36 However, even with the backing of these wealthy and influential men, the rector still lacked sufficient support within the vestry to carry out any improvements.

Much later, in 1871, Huntley was to accuse his Treasurer, William Fawsett, and his churchwarden, John Iles, with complicity in diverting church funds to subsidise the poor rates.37 This, however, as we shall see, may have been the action of an increasingly desperate incumbent facing a major financial crisis following the completion of the building work on the new church.

During the years of sequestration, discussion and debate concerning the church continued in the parish. In 1855, a surveyor's report on behalf of the Attorney General (concerning the parish charity) concluded that St. Mary's was in, 'a very dilapidated state and past repair and did not afford sufficient accommodation for the parishioner's'.38 The surveyor proposed a scheme to pull down the existing church and build a new one. This scheme was put into motion, with a plan to build the new church on a more convenient site provided at his own expense by one of the parishioners (not named). The Louth partnership of Fowler and Maughan was commissioned as architects in 1858 (Fig. 2). However the Rector's approval could not be obtained due to the sequestration of the living, and it appears that the plans fell at this legal obstacle.39

object and consequently on reviewing the scheme prepared by or under the instruction of the church wardens submitted to the last meeting for absorbing the whole of the charity in the building of a church that instead thereof the sum of £600 only shall be disposed of by the Trustees on the enlargement (if necessary) and repairing the present Church and the sum of £200 towards the erection of a Mortuary Chapel in accordance with the resolution passed at the last meeting and that the remainder of the charity estate and funds shall be appropriated towards the building and endowment of a free school.

The motion was proposed by John Benn and seconded by Thomas Bland. Both these men were independent, owner-occupier farmers. The very minutes which record this motion also contained the following (minority) resolution.

We the undersigned, Curate and churchwardens of the parish of Binbrooke hereby protest against the proceedings of the meeting of November 1st entered as above, and state that no legal notice of that meeting having been given by any of us or with our authority.

R. A. Thompson Curate
John Iles Churchwardens
W. Fawsett

The debate continued during the following year, and became particularly heated about the amount of money to be spent on the church. This time a motion proposed by Cornelius Stovin and seconded by William Richardson stated:

ample accommodation can be provided for every person who wishes to attend the Church and for any increase in the congregation that is likely to occur for an inestimable number of years.

An additional motion (on this occasion proposed by Bland and seconded by Benn) reinforced the point:

the meeting taking into consideration the extent of Glebe land and the value of the living sum, by protests against any portion of the funds of the Church being used towards the repairs, enlarging or rebuilding of the chancel of the Church which it considers ought to be done from the revenues applicable to that purpose—the Income being above six hundred pounds a year.42

Huntley recalled (in 1880), his return to Binbrook in 1864 in the following manner:

my very first act was to get a Church of Divine Worship. I set on foot a subscription with my own donation. I do not think, therefore, that it can be charged against me that I was imbued with rancorous feeling for the slight put upon my Church without asking my permission.45

A committee was formed in November 1864 to organise the building of a new church.44 At a meeting held in the National School on 21 September 1865,45 it was decided to apply to the Church Commissioners for a grant towards a new church. In their letter to the Commissioners, the churchwardens declared:

The church is an ancient and rude structure consisting of a nave, chancel and tower. With the exception of the tower, the fabric is in so dilapidated a state as to be scarcely safe for Divine Worship; and could the whole be put into repair it would still be totally inadequate to the Spiritual Wants of the Parishioner—the entire space not affording at the most more than 150 sittings in a population of 1335 souls.46

Huntley had few natural allies within the parish. Only three of the leading tenant farming families, the Johnsons/Clarke's, the Iles and the Burkinshaws appear to have been on his side, although he did have the support of two of the largest landowners, Christopher Turner and Edmund Denison. These two gentlemen, however, were absentee landlords, and whilst they might be counted on for financial assistance, they did not have the physical presence required to assert any measurable levels of direct social control. Huntley's dependence on so narrow a power base is well illustrated by a letter from

---

Fig. 2. The proposed new church of Binbrook St. Mary, 1858. (Michael Slight)
him to Christopher Turnor, concerning the death early in 1867 of Henry Clarke of the Manor House. Huntley considered Clarke's death was:

a loss which can hardly be replaced by his successor, and it is without any disparagement to your Tenants to say of them that there is not the influence left to reconcile conflicting interests as was the case under Mr. Clarke's management. This is the voice of an anguished cleric faced with a vestry that was hostile to the rebuilding of the church, in a parish where there was no dominant, resident landowner to support the Church of England.

iii. The building of the church.

If we now look in more detail at the period when the church was built, it becomes clear that opinion within the parish was still much divided and feelings were running high. The entire venture appeared destined to create turmoil and conflict at every turn.

As we have already seen, Huntley established a Church fund in 1864. By 1867 it was sufficiently well established, due principally to contributions from the local landowners and tenantry (Table 1), for the work to begin. The old church of St. Mary's was pulled down in May 1867, and the foundation stone of the new church was laid in October of the same year. The parish charity contributed £1351 to the building costs in 1868.69

Table 1.
Binbrook Church Fund, Principal Subscribers (£).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowners/Gentry</th>
<th>1867</th>
<th>1870</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bishop of Lincoln</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Turnor</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. B. Caton</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. the Rector</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Gen. Angerstein</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Benn</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenantry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Johnson</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. H. Clarke</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Johnson</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Iles</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Burkinshaw</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Burkinshaw</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Mr. Marris</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Fieldsend</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Parr</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: I.C.B.S. 6663.

James Fowler of Louth was commissioned as architect, and the overall cost was estimated at £4851. This was based on the retention of the existing tower of St. Mary's church — the only part of the church considered structurally sound. Huntley estimated that they would be between £800 and £1000 short of the required money. As a result he wrote to the I.C.B.S. asking for a grant towards the church; he was duly awarded a grant of £75 in August 1867.

By mid-1868, it had become clear that the old church tower was not safe and was going to have to be replaced:

When...we came to carry out the necessary work connected with the Tower, we found it absolutely rubble put together by road scrapings and altogether unsafe, nay inadequate to sustain any weight whatsoever. We had, therefore, no alternative but to raise it to the ground and to commission with new foundations by which we incur the unfortunate outlay of £477 in excess of our estimate.50

Huntley appealed for a second grant from the Society, and the increasingly fraught tone of his letters indicates that he was under severe financial pressure.51 He appealed to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, who owned land in the parish, but they refused to pay anything towards the church.52 The Commissioners did, however, offer what they considered to be the financial equivalent of an acre of land for a parsonage house. Huntley refused the offer, considering that the money would only buy half an acre.53

At this point, Binbrook church appears to have cost the rector personally 'upwards of £800'.54 He claimed, with a large degree of truth, that 'we have here few but Dissenters',55 and that 'we are a purely agricultural parish abounding in distress. You will hardly say that we have not made every exertion to repair the neglect of our predecessors'.56

The new church of St. Mary and St. Gabriel (Fig. 3) was built by Wallis & Son of Market Rasen, partly of stone from the two previous churches,57 but mainly using Walsby stone given by the Angersteins, faced with Ancaster stone, lined with chalk.58 It was finally opened in August 1869 by the Bishop of Lincoln and the Bishop of Ely, with a grand procession of the visiting dignitaries from the Manor House to the church (Fig. 4). However behind the grand ceremony lay yet more crises. Huntley was obliged to try and raise a second subscription. He succeeded in raising about £600, but the final outlay was now expected to be above £6000, 'leaving us considerably in debt'.59

The grant from the I.C.B.S. had not been received by the beginning of 1870, and Huntley wrote again, 'We are in debt...I can do no more and I know the landowners will not; indeed I have not the face to ask them'.60

By the end of 1870, Huntley was faced with yet more difficulties. At about this time, he received Fowler's ground plan for the church, 'I refused to accept it', he advised the I.C.B.S. 'and someone clandestinely abstracted it from my vestry. I have witnesses and [had] threats'.61

The width of the church on Fowler's plan was forty-eight feet; the church as completed was forty-eight feet ten inches wide. As a result of this discrepancy, which appears to have been the fault of the architect, the grant was withdrawn. Huntley's relationship with Fowler appears to have broken down at this point, the final 'straw' being the architect's ordering of expensive oak pews rather than the fir pews agreed with the rector.62

It is unclear why these problems occurred. Huntley took both the builders and the architect to court. He wrote in December 1870 to the I.C.B.S.:

I am compelled according to the advice of two eminent counsel, to bring my action against the Architect, Mr. Fowler, he having advised proceedings against me in consequence of his own negligence.63

One might speculate that the clash of personalities between the single-minded and combative rector and a much-respected architect at the height of his power and influence had much to do with this chain of events.

![Fig. 3. The parish church of Binbrook St. Mary and St. Gabriel. (Stephen & Nicola Clarke)]
a classic example of the religious and social conflicts and tensions that existed at that time between the Established Church and Clergy and their supposed congregation.
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