ART. XI.—*Westmorland Parish Registers.* By the REV. HENRY WHITEHEAD, M.A., Vicar of Lanercost.

A CLAUSE in the Census Act of 1830 ordered the vicars and churchwardens of every parish to make a return of all their then extant registers of earlier date than 1813; and a printed summary of the returns, known as the Parish Registers Abstract, was presented to Parliament in 1833.

This Abstract, having now become very scarce, is difficult to obtain, and therefore is little known. It would be well, then, if each Archæological Society were to republish in its Transactions the summary of the returns from the parishes of the county or counties with which it is concerned, supplementing them, wherever possible, from other sources of information.

At present few persons but their custodians know what registers are extant. Often the custodians themselves know nothing at all about them. Neglect and ill usage are responsible for much injury to them. Leaves gradually disappear, the covers having become loose. Sometimes a whole volume is found to be missing. Perhaps it has been lent, and never returned. Or a vicar dies suddenly, or is seized with a mortal illness, takes to his bed, and never again enters his study. After his death away go all his books and papers, and with them sometimes any parish documents that do not happen to be in the chest. The place thereof knows them no more.

One of the best means of preventing such mishaps is publicity, of the same kind as was provided for the church plate of this diocese by the now well-known book devised by the editor of these Transactions, which has led to the publishing
publishing of similar books in half the dioceses throughout the country; and it is in the hope that a like result may eventually be secured on behalf of the registers that I contribute this paper to our Transactions.

I would have liked, in this work, to begin with the county of Cumberland, both because I have copied the Cumberland returns from the original MSS, preserved in the British Museum, of which the Abstract is an abbreviated summary, and because I am well acquainted with the contents of many Cumberland registers. But for that very reason it is better to deal with the summary of the Westmorland returns, as they will afford me less occasion for digressions which might extend this paper to a length that might try our editor's patience. Moreover there are fewer parishes in Westmorland than in Cumberland.

I have personally examined only one Westmorland register; and the authorities on whom I depend for information about the rest sometimes differ from one another. When they agree we may presume they are correct; and, even when they differ, as they were not contemporaneous, we may occasionally learn something from their discrepancies.

The available authorities are (1) the Abstract, the Westmorland portion of which I shall quote in full, (2) Whellan, who in his history of Westmorland, published in 1860, often notices the registers, but only for the most part to record the date at which each is alleged to begin, evidently not obtaining his information from the Abstract, but probably from the vicars of his time, (3) some papers in these Transactions, and (4) Bishop Nicolson's Miscellany Accounts of the Diocese of Carlisle, which, however, embrace only the parishes included in the ancient diocese, and do not always mention the registers.

We might have expected much information about the registers from Nicolson and Burn, especially as Dr. Burn was Chancellor of the diocese from 1765 to 1785. But, as Mr.
Mr. J. Holme Nicolson said in a paper read at Orton on July 3, 1890, "Dr. Burn, the historian of the county, and vicar of Orton from 1738 to 1785, makes no mention of the registers; indeed he curiously enough seems to have ignored such records all through his history of Westmorland" (ante, xi, 251-2).

It is still more curious that Chancellor Waugh, when preparing in 1749 his famous "form of a proper terrier", which he hoped would be "of great use to posterity", demanded no account of the registers, and does not mention them in his manuscript annotations to Bishop Nicolson's Miscellany Accounts, though he had himself visited many of the parishes.

Nor is it without surprise that we find no reference to the registers in the Westmorland Note Book, published in 1888-9 as a "repository for interesting notes and jottings from all quarters; in short, intended to comprise everything that may add to our information on local history".

The Abstract deals separately with the four ancient wards of Westmorland, arranging the parishes of each ward in alphabetical order. But I here arrange them chronologically, and in three periods, viz., those which have registers beginning (1) in the 16th century, (2) in the 17th century, and (3) between the years 1700 and 1813.


The first paragraph under the heading of each parish is copied from the Abstract.

I

It will be seen that 22 Westmorland parishes, nearly a third of the whole number in the county, were reported in 1833 as having registers dating from the 16th century. Nearer the Border the proportion of ancient registers still extant is considerably less. North of an imaginary
imaginary line passing through Hesket-in-the-Forest from east to west across the county of Cumberland there are only three 16th century registers remaining, and not more than five others of earlier date than 1640.

**Kirkby Lonsdale V.**—Nos I-III (parchment) contain baptisms and burials 1538-1812, marriages 1538-1766. Nos IV-VI marriages 1767-1812; including baptisms, burials, and marriages, of the chapelleries of Middleton, Barbon, Hutton-Roof, Mansergh, Firbank, and Killington.

Whellan (p. 887) says that the Kirkby Lonsdale registers “commence in 1530”; which is obviously incorrect, as parish registers were not instituted until 1538.

Bishop Ware (in vol i, pp 200-2, of these Transactions) says they begin in 1538, but are blank from 1556 to 1560 and from 1566 to 1570. The reporter in 1831-3 either overlooked the blanks or thought them not worth mentioning.

Act 26 George II, c. 33, A.D. 1753, commonly called Lord Hardwicke's Act, ordered all marriages to be thenceforth registered in a separate book; but it appears from the Abstract that compliance with this order was delayed at Kirkby Lonsdale for 11 years. In some parishes, as we shall presently see, the delay was much longer, and in others was prolonged to 1812.

**Lowther R.**—No I: bap, bur, 1539-1812; marr 1539-1753. No II: marr 1754-1812.

Bishop Nicolson in his Miscellany Accounts (p. 72) says: “The Register-Book commences A° 32 Hen 8, A.D. 1540”. W. (p. 798): “The Registers commence in 1540”. Here, as with few exceptions throughout the county, we find the order for a separate marriage register book at once obeyed.


W. (p. 802): “The registers commence in 1638”; which is doubtless a mistake, as Canon Simpson (ante, i, 17) says they “commence about 1538”.


Mr. G. E. Moser (ante, iii, 50) says: “Between the years 1558 and 1679
1679 the registers for 58 years are entirely wanting, and amidst the existing entries are frequent notes to the following or like effect: 'The rest of the entries for this year are wanting'. The whole register book between 1631 and 1679 is missing. Some wag had suggested that the lost register might have found its way into a lawyer's office, and never been returned'.

It may also be suggested that on the death of some vicar it may have happened not to be in the parish chest, and was carried away with his books and papers.


Here, also, if the above return is correct, a whole book is missing, viz., the marriage register for 1754-1793.


Bp. N. (p. 41): "The Register Book begins at 1559, and has been neatly enough preserv'd".


Bp. N. (p. 46): "The Register Book begins in 1559".

There appear to be duplicate entries here for the period 1685-1697, perhaps owing to the condition of the concluding leaves of No I being such as rendered it necessary or advisable to transcribe their contents into No II.


No separate book for marriages reported here.


W. (p. 799):
W. (p. 790): "The registers commence in 1565".
It would seem, as the gap from 1654 to 1662 exactly corresponds with the period of civil registration, instituted by the Barebones Parliament, that during that period a separate register book was used at Cliburn, which was not given up to the rector at the Restoration.

Askham V.—I: bap, bur, marr, 1566-1723, deficient 1624-1627.
II: bap, bur, 1524-1783; marr 1724-1753. III: bap, bur, 1784-1812.
IV: marr 1754-1812.

W. (p. 792): "The register commences in 1570".

W. (p. 738): "The register commences in 1570".
For probable cause of "interruption" see note on Great Musgrave.

Grasmere R.—Bap, bur, marr, 1571-1812.
W. (p. 824): "The register commences in 1570".
There may have been only one book here; but it should have been stated if such was the case. The same remark applies to the returns from Asby, Natland, Underbarrow, and Selside.

Bp. N. (p. 43): "The Parish Register begins at June 12, 1577".
W. (p. 767): "The registers commence at 1570".
The present vicar, the Rev. K. W. Metcalfe, has undertaken the praiseworthy and laborious task of transcribing the Ravenstonedale Registers for publication. No I, covering the period 1571-1710, is already in print, and may be obtained from the publisher of these Transactions. It is the only Westmorland register as yet printed. No one who has not attempted a similar work can have any idea of the labour it involves. Mr. Metcalfe in his Introduction says of the oldest volume: "It has suffered from neglect and ill-usage, which have combined to render portions almost illegible. The pages, in particular, recording the burials from 1648 to 1653, are so much discoloured from the effects of damp or some other causes as to add considerably to a transcriber's difficulties". Unfortunately the transcripts
transcripts at Carlisle for that period are not extant, or they would have annihilated his difficulties. He says: "The forwarding of the Ravenstonedale duplicates does not seem to have been commenced until the year 1667; at least none of an older date are in existence. From this year, however, the transcripts are, with but few exceptions, continuous, and have proved invaluable in supplying gaps caused presumably by the corresponding page of the register having first become loose and then lost". The transcripts, in this diocese, were certainly forwarded to Carlisle before 1667, though none of earlier date than the Restoration, except a couple of leaves, one (dated 1589-1590) belonging to Dalston and the other (1587-1588) to Langwathby, are as yet known to be extant; on which subject see a paper by the Rev. J. Wilson (ante, xi, 238-249). Bishop Nicolson's statement that the register begins June 12, 1577, which is seemingly at variance with the Abstract and Whellan, becomes intelligible when we find on the flyleaf a memorandum to this effect: "A register book of all weddings christenings and buryall beginning the 12th of June 1577 and so continuing until the 10th of Janewarye 1598 with as manye more as could be founde in the same church of Raywinstondall before the sayde day". This memorandum was of course written by some one complying with the Elizabethan injunction of 1597 to transcribe the contents of the then existing paper registers into a parchment book; and Bishop Nicolson, accepting the transcriber's statement that the book began June 12, 1577, did not examine the book to see whether it contained any entries that "could be founde before the sayde day".


Here, and at Betham, Martindale, and Mallerstang, the contents should have been specified.

Where, as here and at some other places, Whellan gives a later date than the Abstract does for the commencement of a register, it is possible, as he wrote 27 years after the completion of the Abstract, and leaves may have disappeared in the interval, that each of the two dates may have been correctly recorded. But we have seen at Kirkby Lonsdale and Morland that Whellan's informants were not always accurate.


**APPLEBY,
WESTMORLAND PARISH REGISTERS.


The Rev R. Bower (ante, iv, 372-3) says: "The Rev T. Machell (rector 1677-1699) must upon his institution to the living have found an old dilapidated parchment register; and, from the style of writing, he at once employed a clerk to copy into the existing one the entries which were in danger of being lost. . . From November 1598 to September 1602 the registers are evidently lost, for we have the following: 'Here wants a great deal, see Parchment Register'. . . In the parchment alluded to before were also the entries from 1609 to 1643. This book, now lost, seems to have been in good condition in Machell's time. After passing over a few blank leaves we read: 'The old Register Book breaks off at June 4, 1643. This Supplement begins 1646; so ye 3 years are lost'".

It appears, then, that the existing book No I has at least two gaps, viz, 1598-1602 and 1609-1646, which escaped the notice of the rector who made the return in 1831-2. Probably he had never examined the register, and supposed it was complete. Some of his predecessors since Machell's time may have been under the same impression, and therefore did not care what became of the "old dilapidated parchment register" which Machell transcribed and of the book "in good condition in Machell's time" containing the entries from 1609 to 1643.

But where are the marriage entries 1730-1753?


W. (p. 763): "The registers commence in 1596".

Bp. N. (p. 44): "The Register-Book begins the 28 of Mar. 1654, which is said to be A° 6° Car 2. And so it goes on, 1655 A° 7° &c, Mr Fothergill, a true Cavalier, being then Vicar".

Mr J. H. Nicholson (C. & W. Arch. Trans, xi, 252) says: "The bishop seems only to have been shown the volume then in use, and to have been ignorant that there was a still earlier one in existence. Probably when he was in Orton it was a loose collection of paper and parchment leaves. In its present form it consists of both paper and parchment leaves much intermixed".

Bishop Nicolson's "true cavalier" had superseded one Alexander Featherstonehaugh, a chaplain in the puritan army, who was instituted
tuted in 1643. The landowners, who claimed the right of appoint-
ment, "filed a bill in equity, and at length Mr. Fothergill was
established". Nevertheless "in 1662 he was ejected by the Act of
Uniformity, but afterwards conformed, and was presented to the
living of Worsop in Nottinghamshire" (Nicolson and Burn, i, 484).

It is not clear from the Abstract whether or not there was a sepa-
rate marriage register book at Orton. It may be that No III is such
a register, containing only marriages 1754-1812. One would expect
to find it so, seeing that the vicar of Orton when Lord Hardwicke's
Act was passed in 1753 was Chancellor of the diocese.

**Warcop V.**—I & II: bap, bur, 1597-1784; marr 1597-1753. III:
bap, bur, 1785-1812. IV: marr 1754-1812.

Mr. G. W. Braithwaite, in his *Handbook to Kirkby Stephen, Appleby,
&c.*, A.D., 1884, says (p. 62): "The Warcop parish registers com-
mence in 1597. In an old book in the registry chest are many
curious entries, and some Jacobite songs".

Mr. Braithwaite, in his useful handbook, should have told us
something about the registers of other parishes in or near Appleby.
The Bongate "parchment rolls", for instance, must be a curiosity.

**II**

**Heversham V.**—I: bap 1601-1697, bur 1604-1683, marr 1605-1688.
II & III (parchment): bap, bur, 1691-1812; marr 1691-1778. IV:
marr 1779-1812.

W. (p. 829): "The registers commence in 1600. The church-
wardens' book also commences at the same time".

Separate marriage register not adopted here for 26 years.

**Betham V.**—I-IV: Registers 1608-1641, 1662-1812. See ante, note
on Troutbeck.

**Patterdale C.**—I (parchment): Register 1611-1642, in parts
illegible. II & III (parchment): 1653-1755, 1763-1812. IV: marr
1754-1812.

**Windermere R.**—I-III: bap 1617-1625, 1670-1762, 1776-1812;
bur 1617-1625, 1670-1812; marr 1617-1625, 1670-1812.

W. (p. 876): "The registers commence in 1670".

The gap between 1625 and 1670 was probably caused by the
gradual disappearance of end leaves from a coverless book; and, if
Whellan is correct, the few leaves (1617-1625) remaining in 1833
were missing in 1860.

**Killington C.**
WESTMORELAND PARISH REGISTERS.

W. (p. 894): “The registers commence in 1619”.
Here, and in the return from Windermere, nothing can be inferred about a separate marriage register.
For an interesting account of this chapelry, and of the relations of such chapelries to the mother churches, see papers by Bishop Ware and Canon Simpson (ante, xiii, 93-119).

W. (p. 784): “The chapel is supposed to have been rebuilt in 1633. The registers commence in 1633. All the rites of the Church are performed here, except the solemnization of matrimony”.


These “parchment rolls” are the only Westmorland register which I have seen. They were shown to me when I lectured at Ambleside four years ago on “Parish Registers”. I made a note of them, which I cannot now find. But I remember remarking that they did not seem to have been originally “rolls”. The leaves, I thought, had been cut out from the register book, and pasted together lengthways. Anyhow I considered it a most inconvenient arrangement.
The Abstract shows that the adoption of a separate book for marriages was postponed here for 39 years.


ASBY R.—Bap, bur, marr, 1657-1812.
See ante, note on Grasmere.

BOLTON C.
WESTMORLAND PARISH REGISTERS.


W. (p. 756): “The first legible entry in the registers occurs in 1678”.

It perhaps may not be a mere coincidence that the “first legible entry” occurs in a year in which the then newly appointed rector of Kirkby Thore, the Rev T. Machell, issued precise instructions to the chapel-wardens of Temple Sowerby and Milburn, townships of Kirkby Thore, concerning the registration of burials in woollen; “which registry,” he said, “must begin on the 1st of August 1678” (ante, iv, 379).


W. (p. 864): “The chapel was erected in 1712, when the burial ground also was consecrated. The registers commence in 1670”.

No separate marriage register here.


W. (p. 822): “The registers commence about 1631”.

Discrepancy here of 39 years between Whellan and the Abstract, and of a kind which does not admit of our supposing that each of them was correct for the time being.


W. (p. 791): “The registers commence in 1675”.

The late rector, the Rev W. Keys-Wells, when the Cumberland and Westmorland Archaeological Society visited Clifton on July 10, 1879, “exhibited the oldest register, dating back to 1675” (Transactions, iv, 541).

Bishop Nicolson, who visited Clifton on August 30, 1703, says: “I saw not the Registers of Broughton and this Parish: But the Rector (at whose House they are kept) assures me that they are each above 100 years old, and that the former gives a particular acct of King James the First entertainment (hunting, &c) at the Castle, as he returned this way from Scotland”.

The rector of Clifton and Broughton in 1703 was the Rev Rowland Burrowes.
Burrowes, who died in 1707; and if, when he died, the ancient registers of both parishes were still at his house, instead of being in the parish chest, it is probable that it was then that they disappeared (see ante, note on Kendal).

The existing register at Clifton records on December 19, 1745, the burial of "ten dragoons killed by ye Rebells in ye skirmish between ye Duke of Cumberland's army and them at ye end of Clifton Moor next ye Town"; and Chancellor Ferguson, in his paper on the "Retreat of the Highlanders through Westmorland in 1745", says: "I have been told that before the English dragoons were buried 'the clerk's wife stripped their holland shirts from them; and that woman never did a day's good after'" (ante, x, 212).

**MILBURN C.**—I (very imperfect): bap, bur, marr, 1678-1718. II: bap, bur, 1719-1812; marr 1719-1753. III: marr 1754-1812. See ante, note on Temple Sowerby, concerning the date 1678.


The rector who in 1617 recorded in the register, now missing, the visit of James I to Brougham Castle, was the Rev Cuthbert Bradley. In those days rectors and vicars wrote what they pleased in the registers, on which account the loss of an ancient register is the more to be regretted. Mr Bradley was not, like Mr Burrowes, rector both of Brougham and Clifton. Nor has any one except Mr. Burrowes ever been rector of both those parishes; which makes it the more probable that the two old registers disappeared at the time I have conjectured (ante, note on Clifton). There is no harm in a rector keeping the registers in his house if he also keep the parish chest there, and the registers in the chest. But if the chest is in the church, and the register in the rectory, the register is then in danger of being lost when the rector dies; which danger was of course all the greater in the bygone days of pluralities.

Separate marriage register here postponed for 18 years.


W. (p. 809): "The registers commence in 1684. All the rites of the Church of England, with the exception of marriage, are performed here".

Whellan and the Abstract are at variance here, unless marriages have been discontinued since 1812.

W. (p. 715): "The parish registers commence in 1654".

Whellan, as at Kirkby Lonsdale and Morland, is incorrect in giving an earlier date than the Abstract does for the oldest register. The present vicar, Canon Matthews, says: "The earliest extant begins in 1694. A considerable portion of the bottom of each page, nearly all through, has been damaged by the water of a great flood which got into the church (date unknown) so that many entries are hardly decipherable" (ante, vol. viii, 403).

The transcripts of the registers of this parish, preserved in the episcopal registry at Carlisle, have been arranged, mounted, and bound in a volume; and, as all the existing transcripts of the ancient diocese begin soon after the Restoration, the lost entries of the St Lawrence register for about 30 years previous to 1694 can be recovered. By the same means it would be possible to recover the lost entries of all post-Restoration registers in the ancient diocese of Carlisle (see ante, note on Ravenstonedale). The transcripts of registers belonging to the parishes which were added to this diocese in 1856 are at Chester. They should, one would think, be transferred to Carlisle. I do not know how far back they extend, or what is their condition.

III

Of the 23 places in this list all but one (Long Marton) are chapelry, viz., 12 in the parish of Kendal, 5 in Kirkby Lonsdale, 2 in Kirkby Stephen, 1 in Burton, 1 in Brough, and 1 in Heversham. Most (if not all) of the chapels are of ancient foundation. Mr G E Moser (ante, vol. ii, 52) says: "The parish of Kendal is a very large one, and includes many townships; and until Lord Blandford's Act the various solemnizations of rites, if they did not take place in the parish church, were transmitted from the various chapels to the Kendal registry." Lord Blandford's Registration Act was passed in 1812; before which date it appears from the Abstract that most of the registers of the Kirkby Lonsdale chapels were transmitted to Kirkby Lonsdale church. But the Abstract does not shew that transmission of chapel registers to the parish church was to the same extent the rule in Kendal parish. It is not, however, made quite clear in the Abstract what are the real facts concerning some of the chapelry registers.

KENTMERE C.—One register, 1701-1812.
One Register of what?

Also included for the years 1704-1758 in the return from Burton. Was there then a duplicate of the register for those years?

Also included (duplicate?) for the years 1708-1769 in the return from Brough.

Mallerstang C.—Registers, 1714-1753, 1756-1812.
W. (p. 750): "The chapel is licensed for burials and baptisms. The burial ground was consecrated in 1813. The registers commence in 1739."

This chapel, according to an inscription in the porch, "after it had layne runious and decayed some 50 or 60 years, was newe repayred by the Lady Anne Clifford, Countisse Dowager of Pembroke, in the year 1663." (Nicolson and Burn, i, 563.)

Leaves of register from 1714 to 1729 lost, if the Abstract and Whellan are both correct, between 1833 and 1860.

W. (p. 817): "Registers commence 1717."


Nicolson and Burn (i, 144): "Chapel rebuilt in 1708, and soon after made parochial."

Helsington C.—Registers, bap, marr, 1728-1812, deposited in the church of Kendal.
Whellan (p. 862): "Chapel erected 1726. All the rites of the Church are performed here."
Burials here since 1812?

Hugil or Ings C.—I: bap 1732-1775. II: bur 1732-1775; from which period baptisms and burials have been imperfectly kept on scraps of paper. III: marr 1775-1812.
W. (p. 863): "Chapel rebuilt 1743. All the registers previous to 1813 have been lost."
If so, they must have been lost between 1833 and 1860.

Natland C.
NATLAND C.—Bap. marr, 1735-1812, deposited in the parish church of Kendal.

W. (p. 865): “Registers commence 1777”.

Nicolson and Burn (i, 105): “At the time of Mr. Machel’s survey there was at Natland a ruined chapel. About the year 1736 the inhabitants rebuilt the same.”

UNDERBARROW C.—Bap, marr, 1735-1812. No burials prior to 1813.


CROOK C.—Bap, marr, 1742-1812. Earlier registers entered in those of the parish church at Kendal. Burials do not take place at this chapel.

W. (p. 858): “Registers commence 1742”.

SELSIDE C.—Bap, bur, marr, 1753-1812.

W. (p. 868): “Registers commence 1752”.

BARBON C.—One Book, entering bap 1790-1812. Other registers included with those of Kirkby Lonsdale.

W. (p. 890): “Register of baptisms commences 1813, of marriages 1839, of burials 1848”.


CROSCRAKE C.—I & II: bap 1796-1812. No burial ground until 1822.


Evidently either Whellan or the Abstract very incorrectly reports the commencement of this register.


Nicolson and Burn (i, 108): “Chapel built in the year 1739.”

W. (p. 866): “Register commences 1741.”

Same remark about commencement of register applies here as at Croscrase.

SOULBY C.—There are no registers prior to 1813.


HUTTON ROOF C.—Registers included with those of Kirkby Lonsdale.

W. (p. 893):

Bishop Ware (ante, i, 203) says: "Hutton Roof had a chapel in 1692 at all events, even if the chapel which existed there prior to the Reformation had been lost for a time."

Firbank C.—Registers included in those of Kirkby Lonsdale.
W. (p. 892): "Chapel re-built 1742."

Mansergh C.—Registers included in those of Kirkby Lonsdale prior to 1813.
W. (p. 894): "Chapel erected 1726."

Middleton C.—Registers included with those of Kirkby Lonsdale prior to 1813.
W. (p. 895): "Chapel erected 1624, re-built 1813."

Nicolson and Burn (i, 260): "Chapel built in 1634; made parochial in 1671."

Bishop Ware (ante, i, 193) says: "The Middleton chapel or chantry was founded Oct. 20, 1486. . . . All the chantries were suppressed in the reign of Edward VI."

Doubtless there was a chantry in almost every one of these Westmorland townships, and when resuscitated as chapels in post-Reformation times they were until the 18th century often served by lay readers. Bishop Nicolson mentions the five chapelries in the parish of Crosthwaite (Keswick) as so served in 1703 (Miscellany Accounts of the Diocese, p. 98.) The earliest reader of whom there is any account in a Crosthwaite chapelry was Anthony Bragg, appointed to Newlands in 1630, and the first ordained minister of Newlands was the Rev. Joseph Fisher, licensed in 1731, in whose time the chapel was rebuilt. Bishop Ware says that "in 1717 it appears from the Kirkby Lonsdale registers that Mr. Park was 'reader' at Hutton Roof chapel"; and he has "heard it said that a lay reader, licensed by the bishop of Chester, officiated at Barbon chapel in the last century" (ante, i, 203.) The bearing of these facts on the matter in hand is this. Doubtless, during the time of the readers, the rites of baptism, marriage, and burial, were all performed and registered at the parish churches; and in some cases, even after the appointment of ordained ministers, the registering at the parish churches, as shown by the Abstract, continued until 1812. It must not then be inferred, from the fact of the chapelry registers with few exceptions beginning as late as the 18th century, that earlier registers have been lost. Only the curate of Crook seems to have recognised the importance
importance of recording in his return in 1833 that "earlier registers were entered at Kendal parish church." Other curates should have made a similar return, as the loss of earlier registers, supposing any such to have been lost, is not due to carelessness on the part of the chapel authorities.

I only profess to have given in the foregoing paper an approximate account of the present condition of the Westmorland registers. The Abstract was compiled in 1833, and Whellan wrote in 1860. Nor were the clergy who supplied the information in those years always correct in their returns. A new Abstract, correct to present date, should now be made, and in these archæological days there are doubtless Westmorland antiquaries both able and willing to take up the subject where I leave it.