

ART. XIV.—*Cumberland Parish Registers. No. 1, Brampton Deanery.* By the REV. H. WHITEHEAD, Vicar of Lanercost.

Contributed at Lanercost, August 8th, 1895.

WHEN dealing with Westmorland Parish Registers (*ante*, xiii, 125-141) I had to rely, for summary of contents of each register, on the printed document, known as the Parish Registers Abstract, compiled from returns made by the clergy, and presented to Parliament in 1833.

But with Cumberland Registers I am not dependent on the Abstract for the summaries, having copied in the British Museum the original returns of the Cumberland clergy.

My chief difficulty in this paper on the Brampton Deanery Registers, the custodians of which have courteously afforded me every facility for inspecting them, will be to avoid saying too much about them. But I will try to exercise self-restraint.

The reader must bear in mind that the returns were made in 1832, and refer only to registers of earlier date than 1813; that Whellan's *History of Cumberland* was published in 1860; and that Bishop Nicolson wrote his *Miscellany Accounts of Carlisle Diocese* in 1703-4.

The name prefixed to each summary is that of the clergyman who made the return in 1832.

If it be asked why, after personal examination of all the Brampton Deanery Registers, do I concern myself at all with the returns of 1832, the answer is that those returns are part of the story of the registers; and it is not uninteresting to notice how far they tally with or differ from what is ascertainable about the registers at the present time; nor is it uninteresting, where some of them differ from the statements of a present-day observer, to shew why they differ. It

It will be seen that only one of the existing registers in this deanery dates from before the Restoration, "few of those on the Borders", as Bishop Nicolson in 1704 observed, "being of elder date" than 1661 (Bp N's *Miscellany Accounts*, p. 105); which may in some cases have been due to neglect of the Commonwealth civil registrars to return them to the churches at the Restoration. But registers of later date than 1661, and even than Bishop Nicolson's time, have disappeared from border parishes; the loss of which has perhaps been mainly due to ignorance of their value on the part of some of their custodians.

BEWCASTLE.

J Graham, Rector:—"No. I, baptisms & burials 1737-1812. No. II, marriages 1738-1812. No deficiencies".

Whellan (p. 635):—"The parish registers commence in the year 1737, but registers of an earlier date are in the registry at Carlisle".

Mr Graham, rector from 1806 to 1834, correctly described the books as he found them. But the marriages from 1738 to 1754, as shewn by an index on the fly-leaf of No. I, and as every one acquainted with the history of parish registers would expect, were originally registered in No. I; from which book the leaves containing them seem to have been taken out, and sewn into the separate book (No. II) procured for marriages by order of Lord Hardwicke's Marriage Act in 1753, where Mr Graham found them in 1832. At some time subsequent to Mr Graham's incumbency they were restored to No. I; but, in consequence of having been shifted about, they have become so dilapidated that, when the present rector (Rev T Laurie) recently had No. I rebound, it was necessary to leave them loose. I have, by permission of Mr Laurie, copied these marriage entries of 1738-1753 into some blank pages of No. I, and in places where the MS has been effaced or worn off I have supplied, from the transcripts* at Carlisle, in red ink so as to distinguish them, the missing words and dates.

The Bewcastle transcripts at Carlisle, containing "registers of an

* For free access to the transcripts, and other diocesan documents in his custody, I am greatly indebted to the kindness of the bishop's courteous registrar, Mr. A. N. Bowman.

earlier

earlier date", mentioned by Whellan, begin at 1665, in the handwriting of the then curate, John Raper. Some of them between 1665 and 1690 are missing; but after 1690 only that for 1729 is missing. Whoever then will undertake to copy the contents of the remaining transcripts from 1665 to 1737 into some of the blank pages of No. I, would do a useful work. Nor should he copy only the baptismal, marriage, and burial entries; for the transcripts incidentally supply curious and interesting information outside the province of the register. Often the churchwardens sent in their "presentments" and answers to the visitation "articles of inquiry" on the same paper on which they wrote the transcripts, throwing light on the condition of the churches and the manners of the parishioners in those days.

This register has for the most part been carefully posted up, chiefly by successive curates, the rectors having often been non-resident; and down to 1806 the names of the curate and churchwardens in each year are generally subjoined to a memorandum of the delivery of the transcript to the bishop's registry.

The border families of Armstrong, Graham, Elliot, Ewart, Forrester (Forster), Nixon, Story, and Telford, figure conspicuously in this register, and are still represented in the parish.

BRAMPTON.

T Ramshay, Vicar:—"No. I, baptisms, burials, and marriages, 1663-1729, deficient for five years from 1707 to 1713. Nos. II & III, baptisms and burials 1729-1812, marriages 1729-1754. Nos. IV-VI, marriages 1754-1812".

Whellan (p. 650):—"The registers commence in 1663".

The deficiency reported by Mr Ramshay, vicar 1795-1841, occurred during the incumbency of Richard Culcheth, vicar 1702-1714, who for five years neglected to post up the register. It has evidently not been caused by loss of leaves. The missing entries, however, are in the episcopal registry at Carlisle; where, while vicar of Brampton, 1874-1884, I took a copy of them, and afterwards wrote them in some blank pages of No. III. It may seem strange that there should be at Carlisle a "true copy" of what has never existed. The explanation I take to be this. The entries in those times were sometimes not made until the end of the year (March 24), when they were posted up from rough notes kept by the vicar and clerk; and, but for the necessity of sending in the transcripts, it is likely that the rough notes would sometimes not have been preserved, and the register would have been entirely neglected by careless custodians, as for five years by Mr Culcheth, though during those years he regularly

regularly sent in the transcripts. Even in years when he did post up the register he often made the entries shorter than in the transcripts. Something of the same kind I have noticed when collating other registers with the transcripts; in which cases the transcript seems to be the original document, and the register the copy. This gives additional interest to the transcripts.

In this diocese, with very rare exceptions, the transcripts now extant all date from a time subsequent to the Restoration. The Brampton transcripts begin at 1663.

The churchwardens' presentments are of interest in connection with the history of Brampton Nonconformity.

The register, though in some places the ink is fading, is on the whole in good condition; and the present vicar (Rev S Falle) and churchwardens have had Nos. I & II rebound.

No. I begins with a memorandum, dated "fFeb 8, 1662", of the reading of the xxxix Articles by a new vicar, Philip Feilding, signed by himself, the four churchwardens, and the parish clerk. The date, being "old style", must be regarded as fFeb 8, 1662/3. Mr Feilding's predecessor, Nathaniel Burnand, had been ejected by the Act of Uniformity, which came into operation on August 24, 1662. That an older register book had then already disappeared is evident from a few entries on the flyleaf bearing such dates as 1640, 1641, &c, in the handwriting of the parish clerk, William Collinson, doubtless inserted by request of persons who felt aggrieved at the loss of the older book; which perhaps was never restored by the civil registrar into whose hands it had passed in 1653. After signing the aforesaid memorandum Mr Feilding never again wrote anything in the register, which for more than 40 years was posted up by William Collinson, who also wrote the transcripts, and, though evidently an illiterate man, did this work with such praiseworthy diligence that I made him the subject of a lecture, entitled "A xviiith century parish clerk", addressed to the Brampton Literary Society. I also thought it worth while, as his handwriting in many places is very difficult to decipher, to make a transcript of all his entries in the register. Mr Feilding, who died June 22, 1692, aged 53, was only 24 years old when instituted to the vicarage; and the episcopal register shows that he was ordained deacon and priest on the same day, February 1, 1662/3, and instituted on the following day. Like many other vicars in those days he was a pluralist, holding, together with Brampton, the living of Crosby-on-Eden from 1666 to 1670, and Irthington from 1666 to the day of his death. But in this line he was surpassed by Mr Culcheth, who, says Bishop Nicolson, was "endeavouring to hold Stapleton, Upper Denton, and Farlam, in
Commendam

Commendam with ye liveing of Brampton" (*Miscellany Accounts*, p. 143).

It appears from the register that down to the beginning of last century most of the burials from Talkin, which is in Hayton parish, and some of them down to the middle of last century, took place in Brampton churchyard. The tradition on this subject is that funeral cavalcades did not care to encounter the wolves which infested the forest formerly existing between Talkin and Hayton church, and that it was for burying the Talkin dead that the vicar of Brampton had the Talkin hay-tithe; which he still receives. But, having found in old deeds relating to the barony of Gilsland places in Talkin township described as "in villa de Brampton", I incline to think that Talkin was anciently regarded as an outlying part of Brampton parish; and the prolonged continuance of the aforesaid practice may have been due to a survival of sentiment.

Much as I would like to linger over the Brampton register, the contents of which are very familiar to me, and of considerable local interest, I must resist the temptation, and will only add that it may be usefully consulted all the way down for information about the families of Atkinson, Richardson, and Hetherington, and down to about 1750 for the Milburns and Tinniswoods of Talkin.

There is extant a remarkably interesting non-parochial register, *viz.*, that of Brampton Presbyterian church, for many references to which see vol viii, pp. 348-372, of these Transactions.

CASTLE CARROCK.

Jno Watson, Rector:—"No. I (paper unbound & much torn), baptisms 1688-1722, burials 1679-1721, marriages 1679-1722. No. II (parchment bound & in good condition), baptisms & burials 1722-1812, marriages 1722-1754. No. III (paper bound) marriages 1754-1812".

Whellan (p. 671):—"The registers commence in 1689".

Whoever supplied the information to Whellan did not look beyond the first page of No. I, or he would have found that the burial and marriage entries commence, as reported by Mr Watson, in 1679. So also, doubtless, did the baptismal entries before No. I became, as Mr Watson found it in 1832, "much torn". It is indeed in very bad condition, without a cover, and much frayed all round the edges, to the partial detriment of its remaining contents; which however are not otherwise incomplete, no leaves except those recording the baptisms of 1679-1688 having been lost. It would be possible, though by no means easy, to bind it, and it is to be hoped that it may not be allowed to remain in its present condition. Its period exactly coincides with the incumbency of Christopher Rickerby,
rector

rector 1679-1722, who posted it up very legibly, and himself looms large in its pages. He records himself as married in 1681 to Ann Marryat "at St Mary's, Carlisle"; in 1691 to Theodosia Sargison widow "in the collegiate church of St Catherine's by the Tower of London"; and in 1708 to Hannah Perkin "in the parish church of Kelloe in Bishopricke". His daughter Ann was married in 1698 to Thomas Hetherington "laird of Blettarne in Irthington", and in 1706, described as "the lady of Blettarne widow", to William Atkinson "laird of Milton Hill". Her son, "borne August 17, 1707", he registers as "ye young laird of Milton Hill". In an entry recorded with unusual particularity his surname figures as a christian name: "1713, Rickerby son of Wm Atkinson of Drawdykes borne March 14 between 12 & 1 in ye morneing* & baptized April 9". His second wife's christian name, Theodosia, was adopted for children by three of his parishioners. His church was resorted to by important non-parishioners, e.g., by the vicar of Brampton, Theophilus Garencières for the baptism (1716-1721) of four of his children. Several members of the ancient Talkin families, Milburn and Tinniswood, were baptized, married, or buried there. Elizabeth, heiress of the Milburns of Hullerbank, a family which had supplied a rector (1589-1635) to Castle Carrock and a bishop (1621-1624) to Carlisle, was married in 1718 at Castle Carrock † to Isaac Holme. These particulars by no means exhaust the interest of Mr Rickerby's register, but for lack of space I must only add that it contains several pages of churchwardens' accounts, and a curious document, "a just and æqual division of the church at Castle Carrocke amongst the tenants & cottagers with the general consent, every man 3 yards & a half to each toft or tenement, this December 28, 1713", twenty-three men, names all recorded, with "1 pte" assigned to each of 18 of them, and "2 ptes" to each of the other five. The missing words in the gap, occasioned by a rent at the edge of the leaf, are supplied by the churchwardens' presentments for that very year (1713), when five of the 23 men whose names occur in the "just & æqual division" were presented "for not fencing their share of the church yard wall, all the rest being new fenced, & most of these persons dissenters". From which it appears, "all the rest being new fenced", that the "division" was not for a rate, to be paid to a contractor, but that each man was to do his own

* "Sometimes the time of birth was recorded with great precision to assist the astrologer in casting the nativity of the child" (C Waters on *Parish Registers*, p. 35).

† But there is also an entry of this marriage in the Hayton register.

"share"

“share” of the work, or to get it done, and that in five places on this occasion it remained undone; an odd arrangement, yet not unique, as I know from similar documents in other parishes, e.g. in Newton Reigny.

No. II, a parchment book of 120 pages, is not in as “good condition” as in Mr Watson’s time, some of its sections being now loose from the cover; but it might be easily repaired. Its first entry records the burial of Mr Rickerby on April 14, 1722, in the handwriting of his successor, Joseph Pattinson. But, though first in point of time, it is a long way from first in place, and only discoverable after research; for the book at first sight conveys the impression that at some time its leaves, having become loose, were re-sewn to the cover without due regard to the sequence of their contents, as will appear from the following summary:

No II.—Baptisms, Burials, & Marriages, 1740-1756, marriages relegated to separate book in 1754; Marriages (upside-down & backwards) 1722-1737; Baptisms & Burials 1756-1777; Baptisms 1777-1811; Baptisms (upside-down & backward) 1722-1739; Burials 1722-1739; Baptisms 1812; Eight blank pages; Burials (upside-down & backwards) 1777-1812.

Close examination however does not confirm the supposition that the contents of this book are not in their original places. The present disorder has resulted in this way. Mr Pattinson, rector from 1722 to 1738, began the burial entries on the 92nd page, the baptisms (upside-down) on p. 91, and the marriages (upside-down) on p. 85. This was not a good arrangement even could he have felt sure that his successors would continue it. The next rector, John Pearson, at once discarded it, and turning to the beginning of the book adopted the plan of recording the events successively as they occurred; for which method in those days, when a single book had to serve the three purposes of registration, there is much to be said. But here it involved in due course a skip over the upside-down marriage entries of 1722-1739, which now may easily evade the notice of anyone not well acquainted with the register. Mr Pearson died in 1777, aged 84, having been rector 38 years. His successor Richard Dickenson, who was buried at Carlisle in 1816, aged 93, may have been non-resident. Anyhow he left the register entirely to his curate, John Parker, p. curate (1765-1813) of Cumrew, who, relegating the burials to the end of the book, went on with baptisms alone, the marriages having of course since 1754 been registered in a separate book, until, after skipping over the baptisms (upside-down) and burials (right way up) of 1722-1739, he filled a page with the baptisms of 1812, at the end of which year all further progress in

No.

No. II was stopped by Rose's Act. Meanwhile he had been registering the burials upside-down from the end of the book until they too were stopped by Rose's Act, leaving eight pages blank. It may occur to some persons that the best thing to do with this book would be to detach the leaves from the cover, and rebind them arranged in the right sequence of their contents. The objection to this plan is that it would aggravate the confusion arising from several of the leaves having the entries on one page upside-down and on the other the right way up, the dates on the two pages being wide apart. Mr Parker and the late rector (T C Vaughan) supplied notes here and there directing where next to turn; and the story of the book, as I have now told it, will further lessen the difficulty of understanding its contents.

No. III, containing marriages 1754-1812, is not the authorised book "published according to Act of Parliament by Joseph Fox Parish Clerk to the House of Commons", with pages not only ruled but partly printed, and "specimen forms" filled up on its flyleaf. It is a book 8 inches by 6, each page of which has lines ruled in red ink, but with no heading or printed matter of any kind.

The Castle Carrock transcripts begin at 1667. Those for 1670, 73-4-5, 1681, 84, 87-8, are missing, but from those that remain all the lost entries of eight of the years from 1667 to 1679 and the lost baptismal entries of eight of the eleven following years can be recovered for the register.

The predominating clan in Castle Carrock three centuries ago, as shewn by the *Field Book of the Barony of Gilsland* (A D 1603), and, though to a less degree, in the last century, as shewn by the register, were the Hodgsons. But the present rector (Rev R G O'Gorman), to whom I wrote asking whether any of them still remained in the parish, replied that he buried the last of them the very day on which he received my letter.

CUMREW.

Jno Watson, Curate:—"No. I (parchment & bound), baptisms and burials 1731-1812. No. II (paper bound) marriages 1755-1811".

Whellan (p. 42):—"The registers commence at 1579".

Bp Nicolson (p. 111):—"The Register-Book is onely of paper; and begins at 1639. It appears in it that a great many Children of Foreigners were baptized here in the time of the Civil Wars by one Mr *Alexander Allan*; who, they say, was a *Scot* and reckon'd a more knowing and pretious man (in his way) than most of his brethren".

Mr Watson, curate (perpetual) of Cumrew from 1828 to 1866, and rector

rector of Castle Carrock from 1828 to 1839, failed to observe that the book at Cumrew which he reported as No. I contains marriages down to the passing of Lord Hardwicke's Marriage Act in 1753. Nor does he seem to have been aware of the existence of an older book, beginning at 1679; which Whellan, by a copyist's error or a misprint, has reported as beginning at 1579.

A still older book, beginning at 1639, but now missing, was evidently seen by Bishop Nicolson, when he visited Cumrew in 1703.

The oldest existing register, a paper book, 7 inches by 5½, bound in leather, contains

Baptisms 1679-1690, 1695-1707, 1709-1731

Burials 1679-1689, 1695-1706, 1709-1731

Marriages 1679-1731.

But these entries do not occur in the order in which I have placed them. The book begins with baptisms 1717-1731, without a flyleaf or heading to its first page, suggesting the inference that these baptismal entries do not now occupy their original place in the register; which inference seems to be confirmed when later on we find baptisms 1709-1717 ending with an entry dated October 8, 1717, at the bottom of a page, and turning back to the first entry in the book find it dated October 31, 1717, all the entries from 1709 to 1724 being in the same handwriting. But this is a matter on which the story of the Castle Carrock No. II forbids the drawing of hasty conclusions.

At intervals throughout this Cumrew book occur various and mostly copious memoranda: churchwardens' accounts, with special reference to extensive "reparacon" of the church in 1684-5-6; forty "king's briefs" from 1679 to 1697, the amounts collected varying from "6-4½ for relief of Irish Protestants" down to "1d for reparacon of St Alban's", the brief for Irish Protestants signed by "Will. Nicolson, Archdeacon"; long memorandum in 1715 of "absolution & release from sentence of excommunication"; two baptismal entries dated 1676, and two 1667, doubtless originally in older book no longer extant, one of them recording baptism (in 1667) of "Marke son of Henry Gill", ancestor of present-day Gills of Cumrew; farewell note by Mr John Calvert, stating that he "served the curacy from October 1679 to July 1690, and left ye church complete within & without, and ye people in good order, good xtians, Soli deo gratia"; scraps of Latin, not always as correct as Mr Calvert's, by other curates, e.g., "scriptum per me quintus die mensis Novembris 1697", and "parcere subjectis atque debellare superbos"; yearly distribution of "interest of church stock" among the poor; notices of nomination of new incumbents

incumbents; sixty one affidavits of "burying in wollen" with names of the witnesses and officiating minister; items (undated) of assessments, church rate, "prognall and income tax"; and several long and curiously worded memoranda of gifts bestowed by John Calvert and others on the church, attested by the signatures of the churchwardens and some of the leading parishioners, e.g., "September 11, 1687, Mr John Beacham and Tho Simpson churchwardens, Mr John Atkinson, Thos Ivison p'ish clerk, Mr John Dixon (procter), Chris Gill, Adam Hodgson", each of whom made "his mark".

Much more, if space permitted, might be said about this old book; which, if printed, well edited, and carefully collated with the transcripts, would be highly interesting to students of local history. Meanwhile it needs repair.

Of the aforesaid names Atkinson, Gill, and Ivison, still remain in the parish. But who and what was the "procter"? The churchwardens for 1713-4 in their "presentments" say: "The churchyard wall is not canonical but ought to be repaired, & ye house yt belongs to ye procter of Cumrew". There is not now in the parish, nor has there been within living memory, any one called the "procter"; and this designation would have puzzled posterity if Bishop Nicolson, writing in 1704, had not incidentally explained its meaning. Speaking of the church as "stuff'd a little too much with seats" he says: "There's one for the Curate himself, or (his patron) the Dean and Chapter; another for the procter, as they call him, or Lessee of the Tithes; and a third for Laird Atkinson, the richest man in the parish" (*Miscellany Accounts*, p. 111). The procter then was the man who, according to the custom of those times, leased the tithes from the Dean and Chapter, to whom they then belonged. They now belong to the incumbent, to whom they were made over in 1872. He is therefore now virtually the rector, though for some reason which I do not understand he can only legally be called the vicar*; which designation, like all other pcurates, he received by Lord Blandford's Act in 1868.

The separate book for marriages (1754-1812) is, as at Castle Carrock, not the authorised book, but one 8 inches by 6 $\frac{3}{4}$, ruled with red ink lines, without printed matter of any kind.

The transcripts begin at 1665; but those for 1668, 1671, 1673, 1675, 1676, and 1678, are missing. Some of the later transcripts

* Bishop Goodwin, when instituting me to Newton Reigny, in 1885, said: "You *are* the rector; but I may not call you so". The Newton parishioners, however, always speak of their minister as "the rector".

are

are also missing; but the loss of these is of the less consequence as the register begins at 1679. I found, by the way, among the Cumrew transcripts, one from Raughton Head (1755-6) signed by "Jos Sevi-thwaite, † Vicar", which had been put there by accident, and has now been transferred by the registrar to its proper place.

Mr Calvert, whose name figures conspicuously (1679-1690) in the miscellaneous contents of Cumrew register, and who devoted himself with considerable energy to the repair of the church, when signing his last transcript, wrote (in very ornamental style): "Our church is completely repaired within & without, and nothing is wanting in her to a church, nor will be we think for 60 years to come if ill hands keep off". He was evidently anxious that posterity should not be unacquainted with his work. Yet his name has not found a place in the local histories. Whellan, the only county historian who gives any list of the Cumrew incumbents, records none of earlier date than William Wilkinson, nominated in 1724. In partial remedy of this defect I subjoin the names of some of Mr Wilkinson's predecessors, recovered from various sources. Christopher Rickerby, afterwards rector of Castle Carrock, signs the Cumrew transcripts as curate in 1674-1676. John Calvert, afterwards p. curate of Rockliffe, was p. curate of Cumrew from 1679 to 1690. Philip Musgrave is mentioned as curate in connection with briefs in 1690 and 1691. John Atkinson nominated 1695. John Wilkinson signs distribution of church stock in 1696 and 1697. Thomas Addison signs as curate in 1699, and is mentioned as curate by Bishop Nicolson in 1703 (*Miscellany Accounts*, p. 112). Christopher Rickerby junior, nominated in 1704, signs the stock in 1706 and 1707. John Hunter was curate 1709-1724, and may be identified as the scribe whose entries raise the question whether some of the contents of this book are in their original order (*ante* p. 220).

John Parker, p. curate (1765-1813) of Cumrew, was from 1777 to 1813 assistant curate to Rickard Dickenson, rector (probably non-resident) of Castle Carrock (*ante* p. 218).

CUMWHITTON.

Samuel Hudson, P. Curate: — "No. I, baptisms, burials, & marriages, 1694-1731, very imperfect and in some places almost illegible. No. II, in better condition, baptisms & burials 1732-1783,

* Vicar of Castle Sowerby 1739-1762.

marriages

marriages 1732-1753. No. III, christenings & burials 1783-1812. No. IV, marriages 1754-1812".

Whellan (p. 673):—"The parish registers are preserved from 1731".

Whellan or his informant failed to notice No. I, which is still extant. It is an octavo volume, 7 inches by 5½, bound in rough boards, perhaps originally covered with calf, containing 64 leaves of rough white paper; the first nine of which record burials 1695-1711 and marriages 1699-1700; the next 32 leaves are blank, except one page, on which are seven entries relating to the Morley family; and the last 23 contain (upside-down) baptisms and marriages 1701-1731, and burials 1711-1731.

This volume is certainly "imperfect", especially in the marriage entries, down to 1711, but nowhere "illegible". The first nine leaves are also much worn away at their edges; but with care the book might and should be repaired.

On the flyleaf are recorded three baptisms (two dated 1681 and one 1685), the burial in 1694 of "Francis son to William Morley", and (with the date worn off) "Eliz. Dridon buried". These entries were doubtless made in consequence of the loss of an older book which had contained them, and because of the importance of the families with which they were concerned. Two p. curates of Cumwhitton married into the Morley family:—

1713, May 31, Mr Nicholas Reay & Eliz Morley married

1726, Aug 31, Mr Andrew Bell & Mary Morley married.

Mr Reay's marriage, by the way, is also recorded in the Castle Carrock register. Hutchinson (vol i, p 177), writing in 1794, and quoting from Housman's *Notes*, says: "The family of Dryden are said to have been settled here for several generations; they are people of property, and have always been greatly esteemed for their industry, honesty, and simplicity of manners. From an old writing remaining in the family, made in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, it appears that Erasmus Dryden, of Canons-Abbey in Northamptonshire Esq, had then some estates in Cumwhitton parish, and the present possessors are of the same family". Both of these names, Morley and Dryden still remain in the parish. Dryden also occurs, variously spelt, in Brampton, Lanercost, and Walton registers.

The same flyleaf contains memoranda of eight "briefs" in 1704, and four in 1705, the total sum collected by the twelve being only 5 shillings, more than half of which was "concerning the poor sufferers of Orange".

Mr Nicholas Reay, noticed above as wedded to Elizabeth Morley in 1713, deserves honourable mention as an exceptionally careful registrar

registrar. Beginning with his "nomination, November 23, 1711, from ye Worshipful ye Dean and Chapter of Carlisle, to ye Curacy of Cumwhitton", he prefaces his entries with this heading: "A Register of all Weddings, Births, and Burials, in the parish of Cumwhitton, since January the first Anno Domini (according to the Supputation of ye Church of England) 1711". It was a mere coincidence that he began his work in the register on the first day (January 1) of the historical year. So he was careful to note that his chronology was "according to the Supputation of ye Church of England", since at that time, whereas January 1 had long been adopted as the first day of the historical year, the ecclesiastical as well as the legal and civil year did not begin till March 25. His date, January 1, 1711, therefore, according to historical computation, was January 1, 1712. It is noticeable that, whereas he describes his register as of "Weddings, Births, and Burials", the only birth-date he records is that of one of his own children: "1716 April 6 Margaret daughter of Mr Reay born". His other children, and all other children, he registered as baptized. His daughter Margaret was doubtless baptized elsewhere. Why then did he record her birth in Cumwhitton register? Because of Act 7 & 8 William III, c. 36, for some account of which see *ante*, vol v, pp 35-6; and it may have been owing to the same Act that he substituted births for baptisms in his heading to the register. He wrote quite a copper-plate hand, which it is a pleasure to read. We shall meet with it again in two other registers in this deanery.

The transcripts begin at 1665; but from that date to the first year of the existing register (1694) only nine are extant. Thence to 1711 eight are extant. None of Mr Reay's transcripts (1711-1718) are missing. He wrote them with his accustomed care, and on excellent paper. Too often in those days transcripts were written on such scraps of paper that it is no wonder that many of them are now missing.

To the meagre list of Cumwhitton p. curates supplied by Whellan (the only local historian who gives any list at all) which begins with Edward Anderson (1813) may be added from various sources a few other names. Lord William Howard's *Housebook* has these items: "1624, Nov 16, Pay'd to Sir Thomas Millburn, clarke, late curate of Cumwhitton, for serving the cure thear since my Lord's entrance to the same, xxx^s" (p 219); and "1633, Dec 13, To Richard Gibson, Viker of Cumwhitton, for his halfe yeare's wages for serving the cure ther, due at St Thomas' Daye, iij^{li}" (p 339). In Cumrew register an affidavit of a "burial in woollen" was written on July 3, 1681, "coram Johanne Stanwix curate de Cumwhitton", who signs the

Cumwhitton

Cumwhitton transcript in 1689. Bishop Nicolson in 1704 mentions "Mr Robley their new curate" and "Mr Sommers ye late curate here" who "modest and humble as merely schoolmaster quitted them soon after he had gotten Deacon's orders; let not Robley do the like" (*Miscellany Accounts*, p. 113). Nicholas Reay was p. curate here 1711-1718. Andrew Bell was nominated in 1725.

Besides the two names already mentioned, Dryden and Morley, the following names, prevalent here 200 years ago, are still represented in the parish; Fisher, Hall, Hewitson, Leach, and Pearson.

On a pew appropriated to the Fishers of Nunfield in this parish are, in raised letters, the initials F R & M F, and the date 1700. The name Nunfield is derived from Nunnery in Ainstable parish, to the lord of which in accordance with an ancient custom the owner of Nunfield estate formerly paid a goose and a cartload of coals yearly (Whellan, p. 673).

Samuel Hudson, who forwarded the return in 1832, though not included by Whellan among the p. curates of Cumwhitton, is mentioned by him as rector of Castle Carrock 1832-1835; on which I have to remark that the lists of p. curates in the local histories are far more incomplete than those of rectors or vicars, the reason being that the Carlisle episcopal registers, as far as I have searched them, while recording the institution of the latter seldom record the licensing of the former. The present vicar of Cumwhitton (Rev J Maudsley) informs me that Samuel Hudson's first entry in the register is dated June 11, 1821, and his last July 7, 1835. I do not, as a rule, think it worth while to supply names of incumbents unmentioned in the local histories since 1754, because they can easily be obtained from the marriage register after that date, and from the baptismal or burial register after 1812; of which facility however the historians have insufficiently availed themselves. There was a Samuel Hudson who was vicar of Castle Sowerby from 1801 to 1841, perhaps the father of the p. curate of Cumwhitton; for Castle Sowerby is too distant from Cumwhitton for it to be likely that both livings were held by the same man.

DENTON NETHER.

T Ramshay, Rector: "No. I, baptisms & burials 1703-1812, marriages 1703-1753. No. II, marriages 1754-1812. I certify this to be the amended return. T.R."

Whellan (p 624): "The registers commence in 1711".

Whellan is incorrect. The registers begin, as reported by Mr Ramshay, in 1703.

Mr Ramshay,

Mr. Ramshay, rector of Nether Denton 1795-1834, was also (1795-1841) vicar of Brampton, where he resided, and had perhaps left the return in 1832 to be sent in by his curate, who must have made some mistake, which was perceptible to Mr Rickman, clerk of the House of Commons, to whom all the returns were addressed, and who was from first to last the prime mover in this useful work. He it was who first suggested the call for the returns. "The value of such a test, it was not doubted, would be very great, if government would sanction the addition of this to the population inquiries. This sanction Mr Rickman obtained, and hence the publication of that useful document the *Parish Registers Abstract*" (Burn's *History of Parish Registers*, p 13). There is extant in the British Museum a letter from Lord Melbourne's secretary, stating his lordship's approval of Mr Rickman's further suggestion "that the answers of the clergy with regard to extant parish registers should be deposited in the British Museum", and desiring him "to take the necessary steps to carry this arrangement into effect". Nor did he discharge this duty in a perfunctory manner; for when he had reason to think that a return was incorrect he wrote to the sender, asking him to amend it, e.g. to Mr Ramshay, whose reply shews that Mr Rickman's doubt had been well founded. I suspect that inaccuracy was often due to the reporter's ignorance of the way in which the registers were affected by Lord Hardwicke's Marriage Act. Such inaccuracy would of course be detected by an expert; though, by the way, Mr Rickman should have asked for an "amended return" from Cumrew (*ante*, p. 220).

Mr Nicholas Reay, formerly p. curate of Cumwhitton (*ante*, p. 223), rector of Nether Denton 1718-1736, in his answers to the *Articles of Inquiry* in 1718, said: "There is no parchment book, wherein the year and day of each wedding, christening, and burial, are recorded". He could not have meant that there was no register book at all, but that there was only a paper book; the contents of which, since 1703, we find that he copied into a parchment book, to which he prefixed this heading: "The Register Book of the Parish of Denton wherein the Day of every Christening, Wedding & Burial in the sd Parish is registered since the year of our Lord God 1702. N.B. The year of our Lord God still beginneth on the 25th of March". Mr Reay, as I have before noticed, was an excellent registrar, and one might naturally think that he found no register extant of earlier date than 1703, or he would have copied it; but this, as will be seen later on, cannot be taken for granted.

The existing No. I, its cover and leaves having become loose, has recently been rebound by order of the present rector (Rev A O'Connor) and churchwardens.

Among

Among the rectors preceding Mr Reay were the Culbeths, father and son; but how long the father held the benefice the county histories do not state. Thus Nicolson & Burn say (II, p 510): "In 1692 William Culcheth was rector, and resigned; after him Richard Culcheth; on whose cession in 1703 Thomas Pearson B A was collated by Bishop Nicolson". That W Culcheth held Nether Denton at least 25 years is evident from the fact of the oldest extant Nether Denton transcript (1667) being signed "W Culcheth, rector". He was probably a son of the "Mr Culcheth" who is mentioned in Lady Halketh's *Autobiography* (quoted in a note to p. 297 of Lord William Howard's *Housebook*) as "steward at Naworth Castle" in 1649. Richard Culcheth's "cession" of Nether Denton occurred soon after, and perhaps in consequence of, his institution to Brampton in 1702. Bishop Nicolson, visiting Nether Denton on May 7, 1703, calls him "the late incumbent" (*Miscellany Accounts*, p 3); and Nether Denton was not one of the four livings which the bishop on February 26, 1703-4, said he was endeavouring to hold (*ante*, p. 215).

The transcripts begin at 1667; between which year and 1703, when Mr Reay's copy of the old register begins, fourteen of them are missing. Thence to 1718 five are missing. Of Mr Reay's transcripts (1718-1736), beautifully written, as usual, and on good paper, none are missing.

Equally characteristic of Mr Reay's love of order is the following protest in the first "presentment" after his institution as rector: "1718, the steeple of our church is not in good repair, neither have we any bell; no decent communion table in the chancel, neither is there a carpet of silk or other decent stuff to cover the same in time of divine service, neither is there any linnen cloth to cover the elements of bread and wine".

Among the most prevalent names in this register are Bell, Carrick, and Hutton, the two former of which still remain in the parish.

Down to the year 1736 the baptisms, burials, and marriages, of over Denton parish, were registered at Nether Denton.

DENTON OVER.

Geo Gilbanks, Perpetual Curate:—"There are no registers anterior to 1813. Baptisms, burials, and marriages, 1736-1812, were entered at Lanercost, and previous to that period (from the best information) at Nether Denton."

Mr Gilbanks, p. curate (1786-1845) of Lanercost, Over Denton, and Farlam, correctly reported from personal observation that the Over Denton "baptisms, burials, and marriages, 1736-1812, were entered

at

at Lanercost", and was accurately informed that they were entered "previous to that period at Nether Denton".

Over Denton, a small parish of 1039 acres, though in the county of Cumberland, was anciently regarded as in the diocese of Durham, but in 1703 was transferred to the bishop (Nicolson) of Carlisle (*Miscellany Accounts*, p. 4), when Richard Culcheth, if he ever held it at all, after his "cession" of Nether Denton, only held it a few months. From 1704 to 1736 it was successively held by Thomas Pearson and Nicholas Reay, rectors of Nether Denton, but in 1736, on the death of Mr Reay, was transferred to Thomas Fawcett, p. curate of Lanercost, by whose successors it was held with Lanercost and Farlam until 1859, when it was annexed to the then newly-formed ecclesiastical parish of Gilsland.

Some years ago a correspondent of one of the Carlisle newspapers wrote: "I respectfully submit that there is no place known to the oldest inhabitant as Over Denton; there are certainly Upper and Nether Denton, and they are sometimes spoken of as High and Low Denton". But, whatever they may be called by inhabitants, old or young, documentary evidence inclines to Over and Nether. It is true Bishop Nicolson (1703-4) and Lord William Howard's *House-book* use indiscriminately Over or Upper. But they are Over and Nether in the Denton MSS (1610), in Speed's Map of Cumberland (1610), Nicolson and Burn (1774), Hutchinson (1794), Lysons (1828), and the Ordnance Map (1867). Whellan (1860) and the Lanercost register use Upper; and High Denton only occurs in Brampton Presbyterian register.

In this parish is situated Sir Walter Scott's Mumps Ha'. Nether Denton burial register has the following entry: "1717 Margt wife of Thos Carrick of Monks Hall Dec 15". In other years the name occurs in the register as Mumps Hall,* and indeed is so styled on Margaret Carrick's tombstone in Over Denton churchyard. We may therefore perhaps regard "Monks Hall" as merely a guess on the part of the then rector of Nether Denton, Thomas Pearson. Margaret Carrick is stated on her tombstone to have died "in the 100th year of her age". In the same churchyard lies her granddaughter "Margaret Teasdale of Mumps Hall who died May 5, 1777, aged 98 years". Tourists, misled by some of the guide books, identify Margaret Teasdale with Meg Merrilies. But she (Mt Teasdale) was the original of the landlady of the inn, called in the novel *Tibb Mumps*, and in local tradition Meg of Mumps' Ha'. Her burial is registered at Lanercost.

* Mumper=a beggar. Mumps Hall=Beggars' Hall. A cottage is not likely to be a monks' hall, while it might be a beggars' hall.—R.S.F.

FARLAM.

FARLAM.

G Gilbanks, Curate:—"No. I, baptisms & burials 1700-1782, marriages 1700-1753. No. II, baptisms & burials 1783-1812. No. III marriages 1754-1812.

Whellan (p 676):—"The Parish Registers extend over 200 years".

Mr Gilbanks, who resided at Lanercost, seems to have been unaware that there was extant at Farlam an older book; now very dilapidated, which in 1832 or even in Whellan's time (1860) may have dated from 1660. It is of parchment, has long been without a cover, and now contains baptisms 1665-1724 and marriages 1672-1724. It should be rebound.

The book regarded by Mr Gilbanks as No. I is for its first 24 years a copy of the last 24 years of the older book, in the handwriting of Mr Nicholas Reay, p. curate (1711-1718) of Cumwhitton, rector of Nether Denton and p. curate of Farlam and of Over Denton from 1718 to 1736. We have seen that the first 15 years of the existing Nether Denton register are a copy made by Mr Reay from an older book no longer extant; and, seeing that he did not copy the old Farlam register from its beginning, we must not assume that he copied the Denton register from its beginning. We should have been glad if he had copied all he found in both of them. But as he did so much it would be ungracious to complain that he did not do more. Nor, as he preserved the old Farlam register, may we doubt that he also preserved the old Denton register, the loss of which has probably occurred since his time. It is to be noticed that his copy of the old Farlam register includes six years (1718-1724) of the time when he was p. curate of Farlam. He resided at Denton, and until 1724 left the Farlam register to be posted up by an assistant curate. After making his copy he himself posted up the register in the new book during the remainder (1724-1736) of his incumbency.

In 1886 or thereabouts the late Mrs George Thompson of Farlam Hall, observing the condition of the old register, undertook to copy it from its beginning in 1665, and with exemplary perseverance copied the whole of it down to its end in 1724, presumably unconscious that a copy of its contents from 1700 to 1724, in the copperplate handwriting of Mr Reay, was in the parish chest, where it had lain for 150 years.

Mr Reay, though included by the county historians in their lists of the rectors of Nether Denton, is not mentioned by them as p. curate of Farlam. They are capriciously defective in such matters. Thus, while no Farlam incumbent later than Robert de Hayton (1373) is mentioned by Hutchinson or by Nicolson & Burn, Whellan
has

has no record of any earlier than G Gilbanks (1786) except his immediate predecessor whom he mentions as "Townley—". No doubt the making even of an imperfect list, where the benefice was formerly neither a rectory nor a vicarage, is not easy. But some additional names may be supplied. Henry Gill often signs the transcripts from 1674 to 1694, and Thomas Milburn in 1700-1, of whom Bishop Nicolson in 1703 (May 7) says: "The present curate (Mr Milburn) is an honest man, and deserves a better support" (*Miscellany Accounts*, p. 4). Ten months later (February 26, 1703-4) we find Richard Culcheth "endeavouring to hold" Farlam with three other livings (*ib.*, p. 143). Whether he succeeded in holding Farlam, and, if not, who did hold it from 1704 to 1718, there is nothing either in the register, the transcripts, or the county histories, to shew. The succession continues thus, Nicholas Reay 1718-1736, Thomas Fawcett 1736-1746, George Story 1746-1774, William Townley 1774-1786, the last three of whom, as well as George Gilbanks, held Lanercost and Over Denton with Farlam.

The transcripts begin in 1665, and except for the years 1673, 79, 80, 90, 92-3, 1703, and 1719, are complete as far as I have examined them, *i.e.*, to 1736. Mr Reay, residing at Denton, did not for three years (1718-20) himself write or sign them. When he did take them in hand he never missed sending them.

The register may be consulted for information concerning the ancient Farlam families of Bell, Bowman, and Milburn; of which only Bell now remains in the parish.

In 1670 the churchwardens in a lofty spirit of self-satisfaction wrote: "As for answer to ye inquiries they are as sufficient as any in the Barony". Not so in 1704, when two men are presented "for refusing to give account of money collected for ye public use of ye Parish", another man "for refusing to give account of the Church stock", another "for embezzelling ye Church stock", and another "for saying he would not come to be churchwarden". Nor again in 1724, when two men are presented "for profaning the Lord's day by unlawful games & threatening the churchwarden when he reprov'd them & told them they shd be presented for so doing in saying that if he presented them they would be full of his flesh".

HAYTON.

R Rice, P. Curate:—"No. I, baptisms 1637-1730, burials and marriages 1620-1730. No. II, baptisms to 1811, burials to 1782. No. III, marriages 1754-1811".

The Parish Registers Abstract* has a different summary of Mr

* Our local antiquaries may like to know that the Cumberland and Westmorland parts of the Parish Registers Abstract are among the books bequeathed by the late Mr W Jackson F.S.A. to Tullie House.

Rice's return, *viz.*:—"Nos. I—III, baptisms 1637-1720, 1730-1812, burials 1620-1810, marriages 1620-1753; interrupted by IV, burials 1782-1789. Nos. V & VI marriages 1754-1812". This looks like an "amended return", which I may have overlooked when copying the returns in the British Museum. Or it may not have been deposited there.

Whellan (p 678):—"The registers commence in 1620".

A valuable paper on "Hayton Parish Registers" was contributed to these Transactions (*ante* iv, 425-456) in 1879 by Canon Dixon, the well known church historian, vicar of Hayton 1875-1883.

He says that "the earliest remaining book carries on the three events of life from 1622 down to 1722", and "is followed by a thin paper book, half of which is taken up by churchwardens' accounts, while the other half carries on the baptisms, marriages, and burials, from 1722 to 1730; the third register, a parchment book in good preservation, contains baptisms and burials from 1730 to 1810, and marriages down to 1753".

Speaking of the oldest existing book Canon Dixon says: "It is a book of paper, and has been very badly kept. The covers are gone, the book itself is nearly broken through the middle, the beginning and end are so dog-eared that little can be made of them. The baptisms come first, and the first five or six leaves of them are undecypherable through these causes" (p 426); which seems to explain why the baptisms were reported by Mr Rice as beginning at 1620. Having had occasion many years ago to study this book for several purposes I can fully substantiate Canon Dixon's description of it. I have never seen a register in a more deplorable condition; which was the more to be regretted as its contents are very interesting. Canon Dixon, lest it should go further to pieces, and doubting whether it was possible to bind it, had a special case made for it. In 1893, however, his successor (Rev T Wallace) had it rebound, and the work has on the whole been remarkably well done. But unfortunately the binder has cut away an important part of a famous entry. The story of that entry I need not repeat, as I have told it at some length in a paper entitled "Robert Bowman's supposed baptismal register" (*ante*, v, pp 33-38). One sentence, however, I must quote: "After all its inspections, by Dr Barnes and others, by successive vicars of Hayton, by myself when uncritically glancing at it, and after certificated copies of it have been sent here and there as the baptismal register of Robert Bowman, this much-examined entry turns out to be no baptismal entry at all; nor does it mention the christian name or even the sex of the child to whom it has reference. Let the reader examine it himself in the accompanying

panying fac-simile" (*ib*, p 35). The fac-simile is a photograph of the entry in question, at the foot of a page, ending with the words "the birth of a child", the bearing of which upon the alleged longevity of Robert Bowman (119 years) is fully explained in the paper. Well, those words will never again be seen in the register; and, but for the photograph, it would be open to question whether I accurately observed them.

Among names occurring all the way down the register a foremost place is taken by the Grahams of Edmond Castle; and "most of the familiar surnames of the district, as Milbourne, Noble, Robson, Thompson, Knight, Dixon, Railton, Mulcaster, Hill, Bird, and Newton, occur from the very first" (*ante*, iv, p 426).

Availing himself of "chance references" in the register "to determine approximately the succession of p. curates or ministers, and the dates of their cures", incompletely recorded by the other county historians, Canon Dixon says: "Thomas Knight was curate in 1698, and still remained in 1716. George Hodgson succeeded him; he was a very bad writer, or at least used very bad ink. Christopher Rickerby was curate in 1698, and still remained in 1716. Hugh Browne probably succeeded him in or before 1732, and remained to 1755. Edward Wills began in 1756, a pluralist, holding Cumwhitton with Hayton, and was buried in 1804". Edward Wills was not the only p. curate of Hayton who was a pluralist. Christopher Rickerby must have been either the rector of Castle Carrock or his son the p. curate of Cumrew; and George Hodgson—whose bad ink, by the way, but not very bad writing, may be seen in Cumrew register, in which, when occasionally taking duty for Mr Calvert, he wrote and signed the memoranda of burials in woollen—was vicar of Ainstable from 1680 to 1737.

This register, alone among the registers in Brampton deanery, is extant from a time earlier than the Restoration; but, unlike most of the pre-Restoration registers, it does not contain a single trace of the changes in registration ordered by the Barebones Parliament. Nor can any indication be detected in its pages of disturbance arising from the Civil Wars and Commonwealth. It pursues the even tenor of its way just as if no such events had occurred.

The Hayton transcripts begin at 1665, forty three years later than the register, but not on that account to be considered useless. For instance, it was from not finding Robert Bowman's alleged baptismal entry in the transcript that I was led to examine more particularly the entry in the register, with what result has been stated above.

The story of that entry, as told by me vol v of these Transactions,

I

I have said that I need not here repeat. But I must add to it something which further acquaintance with Brampton deanery registers has brought to light. When the subject of Robert Bowman's alleged abnormal longevity was discussed, at considerable length 30 years ago, in *Notes and Queries*,* great stress was laid on the age of his younger brother Thomas, who died at Grinsdale in 1810 at the reputed age of 99 or as some asserted 103. Robert, buried at Irthington in 1823, was said on the authority of his supposed baptismal entry at Hayton in 1705, to have died at the age of 119. "If Robert Bowman's age be a delusion and a snare", wrote one of his advocates, "then is also the age of his brother Thomas. The two must stand or fall together". To this statement that "the two must stand or fall together" the late Mr Thoms assented. But, referring to the Hayton entry of 1705, he said: "If this be the baptism of the centenarian Robert, the same register would in all probability have contained the register of his brother Thomas, said to have been born in 1707 or 1711". That the baptismal register of Thomas is not found at Hayton is not strange, because, as I have shewn, neither is Robert's baptismal register found there. But what is strange is this, that, whereas it was stated that "after searching the registers of four adjacent parishes no entry of any kind has turned up to shew that any person of the same christian name and surname" as Robert Bowman "has been baptized at a later date, *i.e.* within a reasonable time", it does not seem to have occurred to any of the searchers to examine the register of the adjacent parish of Farlam, in which they would have found

1726 Robert son of John Bowman of Low Bow Bank bapt
October 23

1728 Thomas son of John Bowman of Low Bow Bank bapt
July 7.

These seem to fulfil the requirements of the case, especially when we bear in mind that Robert Bowman named his eldest son John, presumably in accordance with the Cumberland custom of naming an eldest son after his paternal grandfather; from which it appears, on hypothesis of these Farlam entries relating to the reputed centenarian and his brother, that Robert died aged 97, and Thomas 82.

IRTHINGTON.

John Topping, Vicar:—"No. I (bound), baptisms, burials, and marriages, 1704-1723, imperfect between 1723 to 1732. No. II (bound), baptisms, burials, and marriages, 1732-1812".

* For report of which see *Longevity of Man* by W. J. Thoms, pp. 193-207.

No. I, the leaves of which are of paper, is now "imperfect", not only "between 1723 to 1732", having also a gap, due to loss of leaves, from May 17, 1715, to January 2, 1719/20. The imperfection "between 1723 to 1732" is a gap, due to the same cause, from 1723 to 1729. From 1729 to 1732 there is nothing missing. The leaves are now all loose from the leathern cover, which still remains. They are not of equal size, those from 1729 to 1732 being longer and broader than those from 1704 to 1723. The inference is that the leaves from 1704 to 1723, and probably to 1729, belonged to a book which began, perhaps far back, in the 17th century, but had lost most of its leaves when Mr Topping sent in his return in 1832. A few interpolated entries, dated 1691, 1692, and 1700, indicate that the loss of earlier leaves than 1704 occurred not long after that date. A note dated April 6, 1729, says: "This Register book was bought att the charge of the Parish of Irthington, price 7 shillings"; and in the churchwardens' account "for the year ending Easter 1729" there is this item, "Paid for a register 10 shillings". These two memoranda probably refer to the same book; but to what book? The few leaves, containing the entries from 1729 to 1732, cannot be regarded as a book, costing even 7 shillings. I suggest that the book bought in 1729 was not used until 1732, and that the section of paper leaves used during that period was at some subsequent time sewn into the old book, where Mr Topping found them in 1832, since which time it, as well as the earlier leaves, have become loose from the cover. They are so frayed all round the edges that it would be difficult to bind them; but, with the example of the Hayton register before us, it cannot be regarded as impossible. The vicar from 1692 to 1723 was John Gosling. There is nothing to complain of in his writing. But his Latin was peculiar, *e.g.* "nupciated" for "married".

The book bought in 1729 I take to be Mr Topping's No. II, which is of parchment, and complete as far as its contents are concerned, but in need of repair, as some of its sections are becoming loose. Mr Topping's description of it is very inaccurate. Its marriage entries, as one would expect to find, cease at the end of the year 1753; and its baptismal and burial entries both end in October 1783, the book being then full. The three departments of registration in this book are kept separate, except from 1763 to 1771, when the events are entered as they occurred. The writing in those years (1763-1771) is that of William Townley, curate to John Stamper, who also held Walton. Mr Townley's handwriting is very familiar to me, as he had previously been curate of Brampton, and from 1775 to 1785 was p. curate of Lanercost and Farlam, in each of which parishes he

he posted up the registers with great care and neatness, though crowding the entries too closely together, and too much addicted to flourishing of capital letters. The Irthington vicars during the period of No. II were Matthew Wilkinson 1731-1745, James Farish (1745-1763) who was also rector of Bewcastle, and John Stamper who held Irthington and Walton 48 years.

No. III, which Mr Topping seems not to have noticed, or at all events did not report, contains baptisms and burials from 1783 to 1812.

No. IV, also unreported by Mr Topping, is the separate book for marriages ordered by Lord Hardwicke's Act, but not one of the authorised books. It is of the same kind as the separate marriage registers for 1754-1812 at Castle Carrock and Cumrew, but somewhat larger.

An important person in Irthington during the latter half of last century was one Lachlan Murray, of whose antecedents nothing was ever known on this side of the border beyond the fact of his having come from Scotland with Prince Charlie's army in 1745; for he was a mysterious man and very reserved about his private history. Whether he left the army during the siege of Carlisle, or during the retreat from Derby, certain it is he did not return to Scotland, but settled himself at Irthington, where he kept a school, taught land-surveying and the classics, became parish clerk, was twice married, and died in 1801, aged 80 years. The worst thing known about him is that he could not, at all events did not, prevent his wife (whether the first or second tradition does not specify) who kept a grocer's shop from using the leaves of the parish register as wrappers for tea and tobacco. The authority for these particulars concerning him was the late Mr Thomas Graham, of Beanlands, Irthington, whose grandmother, from whom he heard the story, died in 1838, aged 95. Mr Graham, whose fore-elders, alternating all the way down as Thomas and David, had owned Beanlands (now owned by his son) since 1607, often proved himself an invaluable depository of local tradition.

Other names occurring in the register from its earliest extant pages to the present time are Hetherington, Law, and Wannop.

The transcripts begin at 1669; and down to 1704, when the register begins, 17 are missing. Thence to 1714 seven are missing. But from 1714 to 1729 only one (1728) is missing, so that both the gaps in the register, except for the year 1728, can be filled.

LANERCOST.

Geo Gilbanks, P. Curate:—"Nos. I—IV, baptisms & burials, 1684-1812, marriages 1684-1753. Nos V & VI marriages 1754-1812".

Whellan

Whellan (p 685) :—"The parish registers commence in 1644".

Bishop Nicolson (p 57) :—"There's no register book (either here or at Walton) of anything done in the parish before Mr Dickenson's coming among 'em, which was about Twenty years agoe".

Mr Dickenson was p. curate of Lanercost and Walton from 1681 to 1724. That no register was kept here before his time is unlikely; nor need we understand Bishop Nicolson, who visited Lanercost in 1703, as meaning to state more than that no such earlier register book was extant in 1703.

The oldest existing book begins, not in 1644 as stated by Whellan, but in 1684 as reported by Mr Gilbanks; who, however, failed to observe that only the baptismal entries begin in 1684, the marriage entries not beginning till 1687, and the burial entries not till 1689.

The transcripts begin at 1666. Some of them for the period 1666-1689 are missing; but those for the years 1666-7-8, 70, 74, 76-7, 82, 84, 86, and 88, are extant, each containing baptisms, burials, and marriages.

The churchwardens for the year ended March 24, 1684/5, in their answers to the bishop's inquiries, say: "We have a register book of parchment in which are set down the names of all persons baptized, married, and buried". This cannot be the book (No. I) now extant, which is a paper book, containing for the first few years no entries of marriages and burials, and headed "A true Register of the names of children baptized for Leonard Coast p'ish 1684", as if originally intended only for baptisms. Moreover down to 1711 it is manifestly a copy.

From the foregoing data I draw the following conclusions, which the reader may take for what he thinks them to be worth, *viz*: that in 1681 Mr Dickenson found here a book, which had been used by his predecessors, and himself used it to 1684 for all purposes, thence to 1687 only for burials and marriages, and thence to 1689 only for burials; meanwhile in 1684 he procured a "parchment book", erroneously reported by the churchwardens as "containing baptisms, burials, and marriages", which at first he used only for baptisms, but later on for all purposes; that in 1711, the old book having disappeared, and the new parchment book being regarded, for whatever reason, unsatisfactory, he procured the existing paper book, into which he copied, or caused to be copied, all the entries from the parchment book. On which points the Walton register, presently to be dealt with, will throw further light.

Whellan is the only county historian who gives a list of the Lanercost p. curates, and that a very imperfect one, beginning with G Story, licensed in 1746. I therefore subjoin the names of some of

Mr

Mr Story's predecessors, recovered from the register and other sources. Samuel Constantyne signs the transcript of 1666, and William Birkett that of 1668. Bishop Nicolson's unpublished diary supplies Thomas Bell licensed in 1679, and Wm Dickenson licensed in 1681, who died in 1724. Anthony Wilton, who signs the transcripts in 1726 and 1728, was succeeded in 1730 by Thomas Fawcett, who, as also Bell and Dickenson, held Walton with Lanercost. Anthony Wilton from 1722 to 1731 was rector of Kirkclinton, and perhaps p. curate of Walton. Whether Fawcett continued to hold Walton when Farlam and Over Denton were added to his charge of Lanercost I have not yet been able to ascertain; nor whether Constantyne and Birkett held any other benefice with Lanercost. George Cowper "curate" signs the transcript of 1667.

Farlam and Over Denton were held with Lanercost by Fawcett's successors down to 1845. Lanercost, to this day a very large parish, included in those times what is now the ecclesiastical parish of Gilsland. The total area then of the parishes under their charge was 4432½ acres. The former prevalence of plurality in this deanery was doubtless due to the poverty of the livings.

The form (Leonard Coast) in which the name of the parish appears in the heading to the oldest existing register is one of many variations of it in the early register and transcripts, due to the liberty of spelling exercised in those days. But in the Lanercost chartulary from the earliest times the name occurs as now spelt.

The register shews that two names, Tweddle and Robson, once predominated in the parish to a remarkable degree. Tweddle, though to a less extent, still abounds here; but Robson has dwindled to a single representative. Of other old names Barnfather, Burt-holme, and Harding, remain in diminished numbers. Crowe, formerly well represented, has entirely disappeared.

In the answers to the Articles of Inquiry for 1666 we get the following piece of information concerning the educational status of the parish: "Parish Clerke or Schoolmaster we have none but a young boy". A few years later the churchwardens were much exercised with persons "refusing to come to church", whom they indiscriminately style "papists or nonconformists" and sometimes "recusants" or "ffanatics".

I may here mention that, while rector (1885-1890) of Newton Reigny, I was permitted by the late episcopal registrar to arrange the transcripts of that parish, that they might be bound in a volume by Messrs Thurnam; and Mr G Howard (now Lord Carlisle), on my telling him what I had done, agreed to pay the cost of binding the Lanercost transcripts. The same work has been done for four

other

other parishes, Bishop Goodwin paying for the binding of Dalston and Stanwix transcripts, the late Miss Hill of Castle Bank for those of Appleby, and the parishioners of Aspatria for their own. From the Lanercost transcripts I have now copied all the extant entries from 1666 to 1689, and the names of the churchwardens down to 1812, into a book which I have placed in the parish chest. The Newton Reigny register does not contain any burial entry from 1679 to 1711, the period of "burying in woollen". They were doubtless registered in a separate book, which has been lost. But I recovered them from the transcripts at Carlisle. For a similar recovery from the Brampton transcripts see *ante*, p. 214.

STAPLETON.

J Hope, Curate:—"No. I (bound), baptisms, burials, and marriages, April 11, 1725, to April 18, 1771, imperfect between July 29, 1723, and February 27, 1732. No. II (bound), baptisms and burials 1771-1813, perfect. No. III marriages 1771-1813".

Whellan (p 693):—"The parish register commences in 1728, and continues to the present time, but there is a deficiency for three or four years previous to 1738".

Mr Hope, who made the return in 1832, was for more than 20 years curate to the non-resident rector, Thomas Pattinson, and succeeded him as rector in 1834.

His return requires explanation; for how could a register book be described as imperfect before it begins? The register, instead of explaining the return, makes it more difficult to understand; for the oldest existing book, which seems not to have lost any of its leaves, does not begin until February 27, 1732, and continues to June 16, 1782. The explanation of these discrepancies between the register and Mr Hope's return is supplied by the following note subjoined to a copy of the register: "I, John Hope, curate of the parish of Stapleton, do declare that the writing hereto annexed, purporting to be a copy of the Parish Register of the said parish from the 11th of April 1725 to the 18th of April 1771, contains all the entries of Births, Marriages, and Burials, contained in the said Register, and which remain legible at the present time, and that no error is designedly contained in the same. Witness my hand this 17th day of June 1825". There must then have been extant in 1825 the remnant, perhaps loose leaves, of an old book which ended at 1732, the earliest remaining leaves of which (1723 & 1724) were in such a mutilated condition that Mr. Hope did not think it worth while to copy any entries previous to 1725; and in 1832, when sending in his
return

return, it was his copy (1725-1771) and not the original that he reported as No. 1. This copy, beautifully written in a "bound" book, with a line ruled above and below each entry, must have cost Mr. Hope a deal of time and trouble; and perhaps he or one of his successors thought that it rendered the loose leaves of 1723-1732 not worth preserving. Anyhow they have disappeared.

The original book (1732-1782) is now in a very precarious condition, and should be rebound, that it may not go the way of the loose leaves of 1723-1732, and of the earlier leaves of the book to which they belonged. That whatever book was in use during the last 30 years of the 17th century and the first 14 years of the 18th was likely to be in danger of falling to pieces will easily be imagined by any one who has read Bishop Nicolson's report on Stapleton church, which he visited in 1703. Referring to the then rector, Richard Culcheth, he says: "His father & he have kept this Liveing many years, and are answerable for all its deficiencies" (*Miscellany Accounts*, p. 54). The father occurs in the county histories, without date of his institution, as "William Culcheth —"; but the period of his incumbency is approximately indicated by his signature to the transcripts from 1669 to 1683. He resigned in favour of his son Richard, who was rector of Stapleton from 1683 to 1714. Bishop Nicolson in 1703 found in Stapleton church "not one pane of glass in any of the windows, no Reading-Desk, nor did they ever hear that they had a Bell, only some few scraps of the Common-prayer book, and an insufferably torn Bible of the old Translation, no Surplice to be found, nor did ever any such thing (as far as any one present could remember) belong to the Church" (*ib*). The register was not likely to be in any better condition.

The rector who succeeded Richard Culcheth in 1714 had a long innings, the end of which is thus recorded in the register: "The Rev^d James Jackson, Rector of Stapleton, was buried 29th February 1771 (aged 83 Gentleman)". Whether he ever posted up the register himself I cannot say. But down to 1739, judging from a signature on the flyleaf, I think it was posted up by "John Richardson, parish clerk and schoolmaster". In 1771 a new rector appears on the scene, announcing himself thus: "Be it remembered that on the 17th of July I William Graham late curate of Kirkandrews on Esk was presented to the Rectory of Stapleton by R Graham clerk M.A. Lord of the Manor of Solport". It was not until November 9 that Mr Graham took the register in hand, and proved himself a very efficient registrar. He was a scholarly man, a translator of Virgil's Eclogues; for an interesting account of whom see Hutchinson, vol ii, p. 562.

It

It is to be noticed that Mr Hope reported his copy, which he called No. I, as containing marriages to 1771. This is also true of the original, as no separate book for marriages was procured in 1754. But neither in 1771 was a separate book procured for marriages; which, however, from 1771 to 1778, entered in accordance with the form prescribed in 1754, are relegated to a separate place in the original, in which also are contained the baptisms and burials from 1771 to 1778, kept apart after 1773 in accordance with an injunction thus recorded in the register: "1773, June 16, The General Chapter at Carlisle, when it was enjoined that the Registers of Burials & Christnings should be kept separate and apart from each other as in the following pages".

The predominant clan in Stapleton in the last century, as shewn by the register, were the Forresters; and the Elizabethan register, had it been now extant, would doubtless have shewn that they had the same predominance in the 17th century and earlier. "The chancel", says Hutchinson (ii, 560-1), speaking of the old church, since taken down and rebuilt in 1830, "is large in proportion to the church, and seems to have been designed as a burial place for the Forresters of Stonegarthside, dated 1598". They are still represented in the parish, some of them abbreviated into Forster. Other old Stapleton names are Armstrong, Carruthers, Gillespie, Graham, Kennedy, Lamb, Moscrop, Musgrave, Nixon, Storey, and Telford, all of which but the last three are still represented here.

The transcripts begin at 1665. But down to 1723, when Mr Hope's copy of the register begins, more than half of them are missing.

The presentments often complain of "clandestine marriages without banns or licence"; also of the prevalence of Quakerism, *e.g.*, "1667 manie in Solbert quarter are more ready to go to heare the Quakers than to come to church, the Quakers meeting place being now at Parkrigge". Quakers are not mentioned in the presentments from any other parish in this deanery. Perhaps they were mostly relegated by churchwardens to the general category of "phanaticks".

WALTON.

"No. I, baptisms and burials 1684-1813. No. II, banns & marriages 1754-1813".

Whoever forwarded the return in 1832, besides omitting to sign his name to it, omitted also to examine attentively the first volume of the register, or he would have seen that down to 1753 it records marriages as well as baptisms and burials.

The

The marriage entries, however, as at Lanercost, do not begin till 1687, and the burials not till 1689. Both of these registers, be it noticed, begin at 1684; and the Walton register, like the Lanercost, is manifestly a copy down to 1711. On its cover is a note stating that "this book was bought March ye 15th, 1711"; and doubtless the Lanercost book was bought at the same time. We have seen that in 1684-5 the Lanercost churchwardens reported "a register book of parchment in which are set down the names of all persons baptized, married, and buried". In like manner the Walton churchwardens in 1684-5 report "a register book of parchment wherein we have sett down the names of all persons baptized maryed and buried with a transcript thereof caryed every year into the Bishopp's Register". What I have said about the Lanercost book or books of earlier date than 1711 applies equally to the old Walton book or books. But I have now to suggest that whatever register book was used at Walton or Lanercost before Mr Dickenson's time, and for some years after his coming, was common to the two parishes. The Lanercost transcript for 1668-9 is headed "A true note of all ye persons baptized married and buried within ye parish of Leonardcost and Walton from September ye 12 (68) till May ye 6 (69)"; for 1682-3 "a true note of the Register book of Abbey & Walton"; and for 1686-7 "A note of the Register Booke of Walton p'ish and Leonardcost". It is true that in 1682-3 and 1686-7 the entries from the two parishes are not mixed as in 1668-9, and that in other years there is no such heading as is above noticed. But the p. curate may usually have sorted the entries for the transcripts, while occasionally giving in the heading an incidental sign that there was only one register book. This arrangement, I suppose, was at last found to be inconvenient, and two new books were procured in 1711, into which the entries from 1684 to 1711, properly sorted, were forthwith copied.

The p. curate of both parishes from 1681 to 1724 was Mr Dickenson, who seems to have resided at Walton, as both he and his wife were buried there. Of his predecessor T Bell, and his successors Anthony Wilton and T Fawcett, who all held Lanercost with Walton, I have already spoken.

Whellan alone gives a list of Walton p. curates, which *more suo* is a very meagre list, beginning with "Stamper —", and next to him "T Ireland 1804". Mr Stamper, as we have seen, also held Irthington, to which he was instituted in 1763.

In one matter the nameless p. curate who wrote the Walton return in 1832 deserves commendation. His is the only return from this deanery which mentions "banns"; which the Parish Registers

Abstract

Abstract excludes from its summary of the Walton return. Too often, when search is made for a marriage entry, the banns book is overlooked. But suppose a marriage certificate wanted, and only the bridegroom's parish known to the searcher. A case in point happened to me only a few months ago. Some one wrote to me asking for a certificate of the marriage of a man known to have lived and died in Lanercost. My correspondent did not know the wife's name or parish. I did not find the marriage in Lanercost register; but the banns book, revealing the wife's maiden name and parish, enabled me to specify the church in which the marriage must have been solemnized. And I soon received a letter stating that the required certificate had been obtained.

There is a local tradition that Walton was anciently part of the parish of Lanercost. But we learn from the Lanercost chartulary that before the foundation of Lanercost priory Walton was a rectory. It was by consent of Enoc, rector of Walton, that Gilmor, the Celtic lord of Gilsland, erected a chapel of wickerwork at Triermain, which place, now in Lanercost parish, must then have been in Walton parish. Enoc's successor as rector of Walton was one Thomas, during whose incumbency, in or about 1169, Robert de Vaux, the second Norman lord of Gilsland, founded the priory. Thomas became a canon of the priory, to which Walton rectory was forthwith appropriated, and its church was served from the priory until the dissolution, when its revenues with the rest of the priory possessions were seized by the king. Triermain, then, having been anciently in Walton parish, and there being nothing in the chartulary to shew that before the foundation of the priory there was any parish church of Lanercost, it is not unreasonable to infer that part of is now the ecclesiastical parish of Lanercost was included in Walton parish; on which subject, if space permitted, more might be said.

I have, as I expected, found it not easy to confine this paper within the space at my disposal, especially when dealing with the register with which I am best acquainted. More than twenty years have come and gone since the editor of these Transactions asked me to contribute a paper on Brampton Parish Register. Whereupon I carefully studied the Brampton register, with the result that I found in its pages matter enough for half a dozen lectures to the parishioners on "Bygone Brampton". But to this day the paper for the Transactions remains unwritten;

written ; for what I have now written is but a fragment of the story of Brampton parish register. I am grateful however to our editor for having started me on a line of investigation which has been to me ever since an unfailing source of interest.

I have only to add that, while collecting the materials for the foregoing paper, nothing has more strongly impressed me than (1) the need of repair or rebinding of the older books, which in some cases has recently been attended to in this deanery, but in other cases, both here and in other deaneries, should forthwith be taken in hand, (2) the need of fire-proof safes for proper custody of the registers, which, when kept in the old wooden chests or in the iron chests ordered by Rose's Act in 1812, are in greater danger of destruction by fire than if there were no chest at all, (3) the desirableness of supplementing the registers from the transcripts, and of binding the transcripts, and (4) the importance of custodians of parish registers making themselves acquainted with their contents, seeing how incorrect were some of the returns made in 1832, and the information supplied to Whellan by some of the incumbents in 1860.

Addendum, p. 223, line 33: after "Erasmus Dryden" supply: "who was ancestor of the poet Dryden" (Hutchinson, vol. i, p. 177).
